

5851.

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 1.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JAN. 1, 1874.

NEW YEAR ADDRESS.

In the good providence of God, we have been permitted to pass through another year, with varied cares, joys, and griefs, and are allowed to begin the year 1874. We have been much encouraged by the evidences of good accomplished through the Advocate, which we have received during the year which has just closed, and on account of which we feel it to be our duty to still persevere in the work; not for the sake of gain, but of doing good. Since we reduced the price of the Advocate, it has paid scarcely anything at all, beyond its own actual expenses of publication. The editors have performed their editorial labors almost for nothing, so far as pecuniary reward is concerned. We say not these things complainingly, but for the information of some who think we are making money by the operation. And in view of these facts, we once more ask our brethren, if they think the paper is calculated to do good in the cause of Christ, to aid us more earnestly in its circulation this year. Surely the brethren can afford to spend a little

time in making up subscribers, if we can spend a large proportion of our whole time in its publication, without pecuniary reward. And besides, we propose an extra copy to any and every one who will send us ten names and twenty dollars, in which arrangement you get 1200 pages of good reading matter, for the little labor and time spent in making up a club. May we not then hope for a much larger list of subscribers the present year? We shall still strive to make it as good a paper as we can. We shall still try to relieve the pure gospel of Christ, and its obedience from the errors of human wisdom by which they have been cumbered for ages past, and let the friends who desire the truth in its purity, be enabled to see it. The doctrines of total depravity, and abstract spiritual influence are still exerting an extensive influence over the people, and destroying their confidence in the word of God. Thousands of our contemporaries are induced to look for direct spiritual power from on high to move them, and while they thus look and wait, the word of truth will have little or no effect. One of the most

important labors to be performed at the present time, is to restore confidence in the sufficiency and power of the word of God, and induce the people to regard the word of truth, as given to us in the Bible, as the only source of light and life from heaven to men on earth. We need much labor, earnest and true, in this direction. There is perhaps no work before us of more importance at the present time. This involves also the prayer system of getting religion. What a pall of darkness hangs over the minds of the people on this subject! And never while it thus lowers over their hearts like the gloom of December, will they be induced to trust the word and promises of God in the New Testament. Another work of great importance is the edification of the Church. The promise of everlasting life is only to those who hold out faithfully in the service of God to the end of life. The most effectual influence to be brought to bear upon the people of the world where there are Christians, is a devotional life among those who claim to be the followers of Christ. We shall endeavor to devote large space in the Advocate still to this work. Especial attention also shall be given to maintaining the truth that full directions are given in the word of God, for carrying on the entire work of the Lord's house; so that in nothing are we dependent upon man's wisdom to do the work required to be done by the church of God. There is nothing more certain, than that divisions, contentions and strifes will always be the result of turning away from the wisdom of God which came down from above, and stands revealed in

the New Testament, and adopting rules and regulations and plans of man's devising. Man is so much inclined to trust to his own wisdom, and to work by his devising, that it becomes very difficult for him to deny it all, and trust alone to the wisdom of God in all matters of religion. Yet this must be done, if we would successfully do the work of the Lord. Jesus said while on earth, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." And it is not more certain that there will be a resurrection morn, or a day of judgment, both for the righteous and the wicked, than that this saying of the Savior is true. Then why should men who claim to be the Lord's people, spend so much time in trying to do something the Lord never ordained, and at the same time leaving undone things which he has ordained? Much is yet to be learned on this subject; not only among the denominations, but among our own brethren also in some respects. We as a people make high claims, and we ought to do noble work. There is a mighty struggle going on in the world, between the authority of God, as expressed in his word, and the authority of men, as expressed in the creeds and confessions of faith. And whether one or the other will conquer, or the struggle go on to the end, is a question of the far-off future. Some believe the time will come when all opposition to the truth will cease, and when all on earth will submit to the reign of Christ. From anything directly revealed on the subject, we are not prepared just now to say so. But sure it is that there will have to

be a wonderful amount of work done yet, before such a state of things takes place. And moreover, we ought to work as earnestly for the triumph of truth, and the downfall of error, as if we expected it all to be accomplished in one year. Let us one and all try to bring it to pass, in the good providence of God, as extensively as possible during the present generation, and during the incoming year. We ask our brethren everywhere, to give whatever information they think will be interesting to our readers, regarding the success of truth, and of the cause of Christ in our land. The year that has just closed has been quite an eventful one, and the incoming one may be even more so. The signs of the times indicate a very hard conflict between truth and error. The opposition is strengthening its bands, and the upholders and defenders of the truth ought to do still more. If men in error will make such tremendous efforts in the defence of error, can we not afford to make still greater ones in the defence of the truth as it is in Jesus? If not, we are unworthy the great trust which God has placed in our hands. We ought often to feel ashamed, to see how much is done by the advocates of error, and how little comparatively we are doing to advance that glorious cause of truth, and that wonderful plan of redemption, which cost not only the life-labor and self-denial of the Son of God, but his tragical death upon the cross. And if we do not prove ourselves worthy of so great a trust, the Lord will take it from us, and give it to a people that will.

Whither are we Drifting.

Brethren L. & S: History gives warnings in thunder tones to the present generation; but the signs of the times seem to indicate that even the first coming generation will see the same history repeated. The Bible is used very adroitly as authority for religious movements of man; but in fact human wisdom coupled with love of power stands today between the world and the Bible, as the authoritative interpreter of the Bible. And comparatively few are now humble and wise enough to let the Bible be its own interpreter. Pious zeal controlled by wisdom is a good thing; but pious zeal without a knowledge of God's righteousness and wisdom, has heretofore—is now—and ever will be, a national scourge in a lamentable degree. God in his wisdom has so arranged his kingdom and laws as to be a blessing to man; his kingdom is a spiritual one into which none can possibly enter without being born into it by water and by his Spirit. It is completely consolidated in Christ Jesus so that all who enter are one, members of the same body—constituting the body Spiritual of Christ, who is the one head. This oneness Christ prayed for, and his prayer has stood answered till now. So completely consolidated in one body, that there are no such distinctions as male or female—bond or free—Jew or Gentile—servant or master—or Lord, except the one Lord—one God and Father of all who is head over all.

That birth which places us in this spiritual temple is not a birth of flesh

but our spirits still have to dwell in this temple of flesh, or body of ours till released by death. Consequently the warfare between the Spirit and the flesh, and that we might be helps one to another by edifying, comforting, teaching &c., God in his great wisdom ordained that the subjects of his temple whilst having to wrestle with the flesh should meet together upon the first day of every week, not all together (that is impossible,) but in the respective towns, cities, and neighborhoods, and these are congregations (churches) of God or of Christ. Now there is not one word of authority in the New Testament to consolidate the churches of God into one church. It is an utter impossibility to do it in fact; and whenever it has been done in name, by having an earthly head to control it has proved the bane of that country where it was done. John wrote to the seven churches in Asia, not to the church of Asia. In our progressive age many have conceived the pious thought in their hearts of consolidating all the denominations and think that is the kind of union or oneness Christ prayed for.

Many efforts having failed human wisdom has devised another scheme under the imposing name of the "Evangelical Alliance." But when the motley mass of religious tenets and theological speculations met in one body, the incongruity for bade a oneness. I suppose not one went there expecting to sacrifice anything, but hoping others would. No matter how many *isms* may be brought together, they still all exist. Our Lexington difficulty has for its basis

the idea of consolidation, the charter of the University reveals the idea of vesting the right of property in the "Christian Church." We know many Churches of Christ in Ky. But when men talk of the Christian Church in Ky., and learned men draft a charter for the Lexington institution asking the Legislature of Ky., to present property and rights for the benefit of the Christian Church of Ky., we want to know what they mean. The Church of Christ on earth is much too large for Ky., to hold it. When we talk about the disciples of the Lord in Ky., as distinguished from those in Tenn., we talk about the Churches of Christ in Ky.

We must always keep a distinction in our minds between that body into which we are all baptized, and those congregations of believers which come together for worship afterward. The former being the church of God and the only one. The latter being churches of God planted over the earth. A consolidation of these churches is just what God has never authorized.

Human nature is the same now as it ever was, and we are all of one blood; and it is vain for us to argue that we would not do what Roman Catholics and others have done; if we had the same power. The mischief is in the nature of the organization and not in a difference in the religion of the respective parties. When we keep close to the order God has given us all is safe; but when we go beyond, then our mischief is just in proportion to our power, and our power depends on our compactness in human organizations.

There is a Church of Christ at Caney Fork, in the neighborhood where I write, that is no part of the Christian Church of Ky., and has no claim to any part of the Church property at Lexington and is in no way responsible for their difficulty. But we are sorry that those brethren who were once the Lord's free men, have to some extent sold themselves under a formal consolidation to the head of an institution that is now giving them trouble. Bastards may escape a long time; but the Lord's people soon catch it when they transgress.

It is the duty of every church of Christ to train young men to preach the Gospel, but the learning is to be done now as it was directed to be done by the Apostles. When any number of Churches of Christ unite in a literary institution to be carried on in the name of the Christian Church, or Church of Christ, it is an unlawful union; especially when they connect a state institution. And how incongruous a Bible College, and military College; the one to teach men to love their enemies: the other to teach men to be skillful in carnal warfare. Has not the "Man of sin" sent his emissaries across the line to deal in contrabands? The wine of illicit mixture which has made all nations drunk is forbidden by our king.

Evil is upon us now; and if we repent not, ruin is upon us, for it is now at our doors. We have a host of young College preachers, seeking salaries through pastorates, (forgive the expression.) Where churches are wealthy, they grow proud and lavish salaries on young men who can make display of scholarship; and

give no encouragement to young preachers who have not been to College. Were it not now for hard-fisted preachers who are preachers, who are preaching in poor rural districts, the poor would be cut off from the gospel. All this ado about religious colleges to be sustained by and in the name of religious denominations, belongs to the denominations or seats and not to the churches of Christ.

When by the power of the gospel in the hands of our pioneers J. T. Johnson of Ky. was converted, he was willing to leave the Halls of Congress and make the echo of his voice sound from hill and vale when engaged in preaching to poor and rich the unsearchable riches of Christ. The business of the Churches of Christ is to convert the learned and unlearned and fill their hearts with the love of truth so that they will preach to others.

There is now no time for idleness among the Lord's people. Wolves are howling all around. We had better not cry peace, peace, when destruction is so nigh. May God avert the destruction of which we speak.

U. WRIGHT.

Dry Fork, Barren Co., Ky.

Another Denomination.

During the late session of the Evangelical Alliance in the city of New York, Bishop Cummins, and some other prominent Episcopalians took the supper with the Presbyterians, which was contrary to Episcopal rule. Bishop Cummins then resigned his position as Bishop in the Episcopal church, and on the second day of December, he and others,

mostly Episcopalians, entered into a new organization, to be known as "The Reformed Episcopal church." The present Prayer-book of the Episcopal Church was rejected by the New organization, and the old one of 1785 was adopted in its stead. A Declaration of Principles was read on the occasion by bishop Cummins, which, together with the following resolution was adopted.

Resolved, That we, whose names are appended to the call for this meeting as presented by the Presiding Bishop, do, here and now, in humble reliance upon Almighty God organize ourselves into a church, to be known by the style and title of The Reformed Episcopal Church, in conformity with the following declaration of Principles, and with the Right Rev. George David Cummins, D. D., as our Presiding Bishop :

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

I. The Reformed Episcopal Church holding the faith once delivered to the saints, declares its belief in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and the sole rule of faith and practice ; in the Creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed ; in the divine institution of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and in the Doctrines of Grace substantially as they are set forth in the Thirty nine Articles of Religion.

II. This Church recognizes and adheres to Episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of church polity.

III. This church, retaining a Liturgy which shall not be imperative or repressive of freedom in prayer, accepts the Book of Common Prayer

as it was revised, proposed and recommended for use by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church A. D. 1785, reserving full liberty to alter, abridge, enlarge, and amend the same as may seem most conducive to the edification of the people, "provided that the substance of the faith be kept entire."

IV. This Church condemns and rejects the following erroneous and strange doctrines as contrary to God's Word :

First. That the Church of Christ exists only in one order or form of ecclesiastical polity.

Secondly. That Christian ministers are priests in another sense than that in which all believers are "a royal priesthood."

Thirdly: That the Lord's table is an altar on which an oblation of the body and blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father.

Fourthly. That the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is a presence in the elements of bread and wine.

Fifthly. That regeneration is inseparably connected with baptism.

It will be seen by the above declaration of Principles that they do not claim any divine right for Episcopacy but simply adopt it as a very "ancient and desirable form of church polity." This is a very frank admission. It is certain that all denominations as such, are built upon human wisdom, but few of them have had the frankness to admit it. Whenever all the denominations of Christendom will strike out all human wisdom from their platforms, and leave nothing but the pure wisdom of God as it came down from heaven, and

stands recorded in the word of God, then will there be but one people and their name one, with one Lord, one faith, one baptism. But if this ever takes place at all, it will certainly be in the distant future. There is but little indication now, that denominations will ever give up their worldly wisdom, and adopt the pure word of God as their only guide. This new organization, in adopting the prayer book of 1785, reserve to themselves the full liberty of changing, remodeling or modifying it as they may think proper; so there is to be no certainty or permanency in their existence in the present form. They deny that the church of Christ exists in only one form of ecclesiastical polity. If they are correct in this, then either God has established more than one, or else he has left to man the right to establish as many as he pleases. If God has established more forms of government than one for the Church of Christ, where shall we find them revealed? for that they are not in the New Testament, is certain. And moreover, if he has delegated to man the right to remodel, and change the form of the government of the church of Christ, he has failed to tell us so in his word, and those that are doing so, are presumptuously acting upon their own responsibility. They however deny that ministers are priests in a higher sense than that in which all Christians are "a royal priesthood." This is an indication of light dawning among them, and if they would practically carry out this principle, all clerical distinctions and authority would at once crumble among them. But while they deny this principle

they have elected George David Cummins their presiding bishop, with the titles Right Rev. and D. D. This looks a little like contradiction between principle and practice. But still we are glad to see any indications of light among them. They also deny the idea of an oblation of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, and deny the real presence of Christ in the bread and wine. But they have a long distance to travel yet, before they reach the truth in all its fulness.

E. G. S.

Away up in Tennessee.

BY J. M. BARNES.

(Continued.)

The husbandman and pike-maker have endeavored either incidentally or intentionally to obliterate this trace of fiendish civilization so that now with difficulty it can be traced out. On yonder height, pointing away across Big Harpeth—somebody's Knob—I have forgotten the name, were heavy guns that threw shells into the ranks of the Southrons. There is a tree that was torn badly by a cannon ball. It had tried to heal over the wound but had not. I thought that many hearts had tried to do the same thing and failed. The scars are there yet and the breaches made in households are there and await an eternity to settle who is to blame. "You see that house yonder. The man who lives there was on the Federal side, whilst his son was a gallant soldier on the other. Absent on duty a long time, he fought his way back to his father's house and

fell at the door and was carried lifeless into the home of his youth. Oh, cursed war, how many heartrending pictures you present to man to look at, and still he will persist in settling difficulties dog-fashion! The bullet-holes in the houses around here and the old gin-house tell that this is the war path. But the mention of the gin-house brings to mind the gallant Cleburne. I called up the subject to brother John Measle since my return home. Said he, "Just at dark I saw him; he waved his sword, spurred his horse forward and said, "Come on boys," the next I saw of him he was cold in death and blood. We slept on the battle-field that night, 'mid the dead and dying, groans and crying, blood and ghastly sights. Our regiment numbered twelve next morning, and when the army moved on for Nashville we were left behind on account of our fewness." Here was a good general, Christians have a better. Here were brave, determined soldiers. Has Christ as good? Let every true-born child of heaven answer. We went to the Confederate Cemetery. Mr. M'Gavock gave a beautiful piece of ground adjoining his family burial place, for the interment of these braves. Some patriotic young lady—sorry I have forgotten the name—raised means to have it enclosed with an iron railing, and there they sleep, in rows and groups of States, no more to be aroused by war's alarm. The stillness here is oppressive. I walked slowly along the dead of Arkansas, then Tennessee, afterwards Mississippi, and came to Alabamians. "Unknown" is written on most of the head pieces. I thought as I crept softly among these graves, what does "unknown" mean? Ah, the body that lies beneath this mound once had a name but has lost it! The fond mother, the loving wife, the dotting sister no longer know it. They have the name and treasure it in their hearts as a valuable keepsake, but the body they know not, and care not for it. The body and name have lost each other. Does no one know? Does not God know it? Is it one of those of whom Paul speaking says, "if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you?" If it is, then all will be well, 'tis only *unknown* to man. But if one of those to whom Christ will say, "I never knew you, depart from me ye that work iniquity," then it will be "unknown" indeed and this will be worse than death, a night upon the gloomy field of death and a cold, lonely sleep away from kindred and friends in a stranger's burying-ground. I ran hastily over the dead of my State. There I found the sleeping place of Robert Croxton, a noble youth. Ah, thought I, how little did you have to do in getting up the difficulty, one of the results of which was your death! There are a few monuments here erected, some to brothers, some to husbands, and one to the man who died while re-interring these dead. Bro Moss, who went with us, counted one row and made an estimate of fifteen hundred buried here. It has been a custom to decorate the soldiers' graves on a certain day in the Spring. Great expense attended these mani-

festations of patriotism. I gave offense on several occasions by suggesting that the money expended for frills and flounces, extra dressing of every kind and show be appropriated to the support and education of the children of the dead. But in our State they have schools for these children. Fairs, dinners, suppers and tableaux are the means of raising money for their support. The gifts made thus after the fashion of our time are not spiritual gifts or spiritual offerings. The flesh is addressed, and 'tis this that makes the grant. It is not done because the spirit suggests it as a matter of duty, but the flesh enjoys it. Would-be religious people know the flesh is a good lever and they use it, to wrize money out of the pocket of "outsiders" as they are called, and the indifferent insiders. Besides, much of the zeal of our time needs help to get money out of its hiding-place, therefore the carnal man is invited to give a lift. But I will not attempt to write down the many uninvited thoughts that flitted through my mind while on this portion of earth's domain, so let us pass away from the place of the dead and hasten where we are daily trying to get me to prepare for death, the grave, the judgment and eternity.

Bro. Rogers still kept me entertained from his store of information. He had heard that General Forrest, once when lost, went into a fit of cursing the Tennessee people for not having sign boards to show which way you are going. Just at that time they passed a grave-yard, when a soldier, who had too much good sense to be classed with wags, called to the infuriated leader and at the

same time pointing to the grave-stones, said, "Look, General, there are sign-boards telling us all which way we are going. There is a lesson here, but I guess General Forrest and most other great or many other worldly men do not study at the school of the dead. Though dead, they yet speak and teach. But some will not learn. I met a man while gone who said his rising thoughts were sometimes good, but he banished them from him—he ran from them. I have heard of the man who when a good feeling came over him, would go out and say "damn it," just to see that he was not converted; and so some shut their eyes upon such sign-boards as graves and their sepulchral stones, gray hairs, dimmed eyes, deafness and the like. But they point for all that. The meeting over I found myself with a slight sore throat and a little worse for wear, so away to Nashville I bent my course, seated by brother F. H. Davis, in his buggy, drawn by his flea-bitten gray, the servant of many years, and one to be honored for having been actively engaged in many meetings in many parts of the country. He is not as limber-legged now as when young and his master is not forgetful of his interest in a drive of twenty miles. Brother D. was but little in the meeting owing to a streak of good luck that happened over at his house, which made him richer than before, by a boy; but he managed to get out and do the baptizing. So the trip gave an opportunity for cultivating, each, the acquaintance of the other and was enjoyed by both. I found him very agreeable. A work of years speaks for him, and a loving

and an appreciative brotherhood tell his deeds. 'Tis pleasant when visiting a community to hear the preachers well spoken of. It is commendable both to the brethren who do the talking and the subject of comment. I heard of but one complaint against brother Davis and I saw him meet the trouble, with the magnanimity, dignity, humility and devotion of the man of God. We got to Nashville too late for our dinner. Brother Sewell had gone home. Bros. Lipscomb and Farning were out at the fair-grounds at a stock sale, where heifers were bought for a thousand dollars. Well, all gone, a stroll over the city is proposed and with brother Charlie Brandon, we soon stood in front of the magnificent Methodist book concern. The Methodist concern called a church, is a tremendous affair any way you look at it. I regard it the best-greased and of course the best-running, and further, the best constructed machine men ever made. It is by far superior in workmanship to the tower of Babel and the Louisville plan, and the astonishing part of it is that those not satisfied with the simplicity of the Bible do not take this and work it.

But 'tis just like their vast man-made house in Nashville, whose own weight has bulged out its sides, and has now to be patched to keep it from falling. There arises, of necessity a demand once and awhile for a change in the Methodist tactics, to keep it up with the age, so their wise men meet and do this work in conference to keep it from falling. "Let's go to the Capitol," said some one, and soon we were there. Tennesseans know they have a fine house, and they take

care that all who wish shall see it. Up, up, up, and we put our heads out on the roof. This seemed high enough, but away went the janitor and we followed, up, up, and we were then two hundred and five and a half feet from the ground, and the ground is a right smart hill. Men in the streets looked like boys and horses like ponies. There was the Penitentiary, from whose threatening walls some of the best citizens of Tennessee could only look out upon the azure blue sky during the terrible scenes of trouble in this country. They were bound to these lone confines by the hand of might, that once rested heavily upon this fair land. A factory smoked in the distance. Now a train comes puffing along the high trestle and shoots out of sight in the tunnel, another is smoking afar off and there's that monstrous concern again, as imposing as the people who own it. Look yonder, see the smoke of the blaster's drill, can't hear the explosion. Getting more stone to make more houses. Nashville ought to stand when the rains descend, the floods come and winds blow, for it is founded on a rock. Yonder is the site of the Vanderbilt University, another huge Methodist concern that is to be. One, two, three, four, oh! I am lost counting the spires already vying with each other in stretching heavenward, and there are two more receiving the last touches of the mechanic's hand. When I stood on the Capitol of your State, Oh men of Nashville, I perceived in all things you are too religious. God only requires one church and you have, I might safely say, forty. But stop, is there a people here who have the

same faith and practice they had anciently and no other? Who obey the same commands and none others? Who follow the example of Christ and the apostles and none others? Who observe the same ordinances and none others? Who call Bible things by Bible names and no others? Who give a thus saith the Lord for all they do or teach and will not have it unless they can? Whose faith comes by hearing or reading the word of God, goes as far as the word of God and stops with it? Oh, yes. Then where do they worship? Well, said the brethren, let us see, and commenced a search for it. It took some time to find it. There it was, however, at last. It is just such a house as I think the humble people of God should have in the midst of such display manifested by the sects. Pure religion does not need proud steeples, stuccoed walls, frescoed ceilings; dim, religious toned lights, stained glass, Catherine wheels, loud bells, to herald its existence. It will out if any one lives it. If the lights of a congregation shine, the house may not be so easily found, but these luminaries reflecting heavenly light will be seen and understood by men. "We can never do anything in our town," said a brother once, "while our house is down in that out-of-the-way place." Where there are little piety, humility, love, devotion, if the people want something to commend them they had better build a grand, showy temple; but mercy, truth, holiness, kindness are of such a nature that they will crop out in beauty so as to be seen, amidst all the weeds, briars, and tares of pride, fashion, and luxury in a great city. They

can hunt their way from the little house, way down in the hollow on a back street, and come out into notice.

But let us go a sight-seeing again. Yonder are the dim blue lines of some distant hills, don't recollect their names. Then on every side are some of the fruitful acres in Tennessee, some having made a spring, some a summer and now others ready to make an autumn offering of their fruit to man's use and benefit. The Cumberland plays around the city and ripples on to the great father of waters. Just beyond is Edgefield, the well-grown firstling of the parent city, to which she throws her strong cords of love and bridges the chasm between them with iron, the two seeming one, so uninterrupted is the communication between them carried on by footmen, horsemen, carriages, buggies and street cars. This little one is a stout child. The question was agitated whether it is a daughter or a part of the city. Edgefield insisted upon her identity and sustained her claims. There are too many things to be seen from this standpoint for the eye to drink in all in the short space of half an hour, so unsatisfied with our bird's eye view of the agricultural, mechanical, architectural, religious, literary, medical, manufacturing, prison-house and mountain scenes, we began the descent to look at the artistic on a finer scale. Like that of Avernus, it is easy, but the coming up; here was the work, here the labor. The Indian said truthfully that he had too much breath when he went up the hill, and so did I. But we were next in the library. Bro. Davis wanted some one to help him look at something

he had found, bro. Brandon had made the discovery of a curiosity and wanted others to share in the pleasure the sight of it gave, in the meantime I saw things, so I did not know what to look at first, second or third. But wonderful mummy!! Who are you? Are you a Pharaoh or his queen? Were you alive when the pyramids were built? From what place did the stones, of which they are made, come? For what were they builded? What about the Sphinx? You mummy you, you are mum. There is but little to be learned from you on these questions. Though dead you yet speak in some points, but I will pass on and look at the old walking sticks, swords, melted things from the burning of Chicago, and that thing I take to be a heathen idol, for you cause a sort of grave-yard feeling about you, if you have been dead a few thousand years, and owed your preservation to the lost art. Robert Toombs says making ox-carts is now a lost art in Georgia. I wonder if spinning, weaving, blacksmithing and making tallow candles have met the same fate? But in this department of this great house, there are pictures of politicians and generals, men who brought on the war and carried it on. But I noticed there no poor farmer in his shirt sleeves, crowned with honest sweat, nor did I note the presence of an humble disciple of Christ giving a cup of cold water in the name of his Master. These have their names written in the Lamb's book of life. 'Tis not necessary to give them prominence in the capitol of the State and put their pictures upon paper or canvas. The outside show or physical appearance is the least interesting about the Christian. But he will look beautiful in that world where he will be with Christ and like him. Strickland, the architect of this great house, was honored with a resting place in a niche in the wall of his own erecting. But our stay was rather long and lost none of its interest, so we tore ourselves away and hastened to the office of the Gospel Advocate. Bro. Fanning had come and gone. As much as I wished to see him I could not take such a leaving as an invitation to visit him, and old gray's head was turned down Cumberland for a nine mile drive. After the twelfth mile had been passed over I thought we were lost, for certainly, for surely, no editor of the Gospel Advocate would separate himself from the rest of the world by such narrow defiles, mountain gorges, in fact by such roads. But sixteen miles nearly robbed us of hope, when about dark we drove up to the romantic home of David Lipscomb. He was looking for us, having returned to the office to see if we had arrived, and learning that we had left for his house, he went home, and got there and waited some time for us. Our trouble arose from going the round road, whereas we should have gone the through route. We had a pleasant night at the home of our brother, but I formed no new ideas of him as a man. These have been gathered from his editorial career for the past few years. In addition to his work in connection with the Gospel Advocate he is a live preacher. Quite a number of churches have been planted through his labors since the war. It seems to

me I heard that there are twenty-three. If I remember correctly this is good service. The brethren say in some places that he has written so much against stall-feeding preachers that many take advantage of his teachings and withdraw all help from spreading the gospel. I promised to call his attention to this matter, forgot it when with him and take this opportunity of asking him to give a few articles on spreading the gospel. Who should do it? The idea that a poor preacher with a family, a help-less family should sow the seed of the kingdom at his own charges, whilst the fat farmer, merchant or man of some other calling hoards up his overplus, is absolutely absurd and brother Lipscomb never taught it. But in case no help comes the preacher should do all he can any how.

The following extracts are from the *Nov. Galaxy*; written by Junius Henri Browne. The influences herein mentioned, properly tempered by the Christian religion, may be of incalculable advantage to man.

E. G. S.

-WOMEN AS TACTICIANS.

An Arabian fable narrates that an evil genius became enamored of the beautiful daughter of a bashaw of Bagdad. Finding her affections engaged, and that she would not listen to another wooer, the genius resolved to revenge himself upon the maiden by mastering the soul of her lover. Having done so, he told her he would remove the malignant possession only on condition that she should give him her heart. She promised. The

lover was restored, and the wicked spirit demanded the fulfillment of her word. She answered: "I would yield you my heart if I had it, but I have it not. One cannot give what one does not have. It is in another's keeping; it belongs to the man I adore. Ask him for it. If he will surrender it, my compact shall be preserved. If he refuses, you have no redress, for you cannot twice possess the same soul, and your allegiance to Amaimon compels you to abide by any covenant you can make with mortals."

The genius saw that he was foiled, and, roaring with impotent rage, disappeared.

The daughter of the bashaw was a very woman. She was a tactician. Woman, by her tact, has always been able to control her brother, and exorcise the spirit of evil. The eastern tale is as true to-day as when it was written. Give woman half a chance with the devil, say the Spaniards, and the devil will be outwitted. The argument of Eden does not disprove the aphorism. It was Eve's curiosity, not Satan's cunning, which undid her. Her most dangerous foe was witbin. Relieved of that, she would have cajoled the Prince of Darkness out of his gloom, and turned his mockery and sarcasm to the tune of tenderness.

One of the essential differences between man and woman is tact. He often has it; but it is acquired—usually through association. Tact is inborn with her: it permeates her system; comes unconsciously; is exercised instinctively. If a mature woman could spring into being at once, she would be found to own the

quality that softens asperity and rounds the angles of life. She would inherit from her mother, Nature, the fine impulses, the spiritual courtesies, the soul of adaptability, that make her gentle and keep her sweet. Feminine tact is more than tact, as commonly understood. It is according to its primitive meaning, touch, feeling—the touch of nature, the feeling of profound and pervading sensibility. It is readiness, inspiration, sudden and perfect understanding, instantaneous revelation of what is entirely fitting. Woman's tact includes tactics, particularly representing her disposition and capacity to manage. To say she is a tactician is to say she is a manager. She loves management as man loves power. On a desert island she would practise on external objects until humanity, in some form should present itself. In civilization she has ample scope for management. Circumstances stimulate her inclination, develop her faculty. The highest and most complicated social conditions suit her best, because they furnish her the fullest occupation, and employ her richest resources. Half of her attachment to society rises from the field it gives her for manipulation, direction, shaping of means to end. Her ambition is not large nor special but singularly busy and copiously general. Her thoughts of what she should do, her fancies of what may be done, fly through the air like swallows, whirling and turning on their flight, soaring upward and often but ever drawn backward by the odor of the earth.

How different man! Tact he is born without, and it is extremely

difficult to educate him to it. Woman must give him countless lessons before he has a glimmering of her meaning, and he is constantly forgetting what he has been taught. He is stupid as she is apt. The things he cannot learn he pronounces useless, and discourages her resolute attempt at instruction. Very frequently he lives and dies without the slightest apprehension of tact. A little acquaintance with it would save him a deal of friction and fretting; would conduct in a hundred ways to his success and satisfaction. But, ignorant of his loss, he has lost nothing and nobody can convince him that his deficiency is to his disadvantage. Tact he deems indirection, insincerity, dissimulation; he thinks he despises because he does not comprehend it. Seeing other men prosper by its aid, he calls them lucky; never suspecting that careful study might have yielded him the secret of their luck. A large proportion of the failures in life proceeds from want of tact, though those who fail invariably ascribe the mishaps to any other cause.

Management the average man either contemns or believes he does. He is prone to style it intrigue, and he stands so fairly with himself as to think he can win Fortune by striking an attitude which must direct her gaze to him. The mean, the weak, the dishonest are the managers, in his phrasing; and if he be himself a manager, he uses stronger adjectives—with a dim consciousness, perhaps of his own deserving. He is fond of asserting—the fondness is in proportion to the falsehood—that shrewdness, energy, and courage have gained

for him what he has; that he might have been better off had he been willing to stoop and cringe and play false, as others have done. But he is composed of finer stuff. He wishes to make it clear to every mind that he detests managers, and he will not bid them to the banquet of his self-sufficiency.

Tact is so purely feminine that a genuine woman can hardly be conceived without it. It belongs to her of right. As a weapon it is offensive and defensive. It is a substitute for and an offset to man's physical strength; it is quickness of mind against accumulation of matter, delicacy of spirit in contrast with rude aggression. Her tact is her protection. She holds it before her as a shield, and stands behind it as a rampart. The stoutest arm cannot thrust it aside; for it is elastic as the air—so yielding that it cannot be displaced.

All historic women, who were not amazons, have been tactful. Aspasia, in every sense the peer of Pericles, possessed tact to her finger-tips. So eloquent that she is said to have taught her lover and husband oratory; So gifted that Plato put into her mouth one of the finest speeches in all his dialogues—she yet leaned gracefully upon her subtle perceptions when she was weary with intellectual contest. Aristophanes asserts that her influence brought on the Samian and Peloponnesian wars. She moulded Athens, in the height of its power and splendor, by her grace, her beauty and her genius. She owed her acquittal, when tried for contempt of the gods, more to her tact than to Pericles' masterly de-

fence. The most gifted men of Greece felt honored by her hospitality; Socrates himself confessed the matchless charm of her society. Albeit her name was sullied, and matronly eyes were unable to see her early career, she glided gently but proudly into the admiration and affections of the whole people, and caused the haughtiest to bend before her graciousness. Not beauty nor eloquence nor genius, single or united, could have wrought such revolution. It was the immeasurable power of tact which placed her on the pinnacle of renown, and planted every letter of her name with the seeds of immortality. * * * *

But there is no need of reference to the past for the showing of feminine tacticians. They are abundantly contemporaneous and ubiquitous. Wherever woman is, tact is also. It enters into, forms part of, and illustrates her sex. Every civilized government is an unrecognized gynceocracy; man standing for the machinery, women for the motive force. She is almost as much a partner in affairs as in domesticity. The resonant public voice is made up of many feminine tones; public decrees reflect her counsels; public acts borrow her sanction. Veiled but watchful, she stands beside the prince, the magistrates and the executive; and when she withdraws, disorder and anarchy begin. The harmony of a country, like the harmony of humanity depends upon the union of both sexes. Man, alone, expresses the lawlessness, brute force, animalism. Woman is required to enlighten his selfishness, to dignify his aims to temper his resentment. Her tac-

is a higher intelligence, guiding his aggressiveness to fruitful results, preserving his resolution from the commission of injustice. By that quality she rounds his bluntness, and so feathers the arrows of his enterprise that they may strike the target of her hope. He rarely suspects she has aided the flight of his shaft, and she is satisfied with the private consciousness of her doing.

Never had woman such scope as he now has for management, and, be sure she profits by it. Management was formerly confined to the upper ranks; was the privilege of the privileged few. In these days of diffusive democracy, the entire sex are managers—the lowest as well as the highest. The mistress manages the servant, and the servant in her native way, essays to manage the mistress. Feminine children, inhaling the cunning of their elders, undertake to prevail over their nurses by deliberate adroitness. Women are on their guard with each other. Each knows the weapon of her companion, and does not care to provoke a contest, while men are open to attack. The management they practise on one another is preparation for the higher and more exciting game. Inherent as their directing disposition is, they love to cultivate it by every means offered. They seldom lose opportunities, and, when wanting, are fond of making such that they may be the gainers thereby. Their devices are usually as miscellaneous as they are ingenious, as ambitious as they are abundant. They begin with inanimate forms and steadily ascend. The forms are dolls, which they, poetically gifted, endow with

life and all its passions. Rising above dolls, they take birds, kittens, and puppies, as pets; then choose companions; then accept lovers; transform them into husbands; have children, and when these are grown to maturity, have the duty and delight of looking after the marriage and social settlement. They become grandmothers in due season, and their grandchildren appeal to them almost as much as—sometimes more than—their own offspring. No marvel woman becomes an adept in management. Possessing genius for it primarily, she unfolds it by perpetual training and exercise; has it at the highest, generally, when she has fully ripened. Then it is that she comes into the largest contact with man, who, as her loving enemy and formidable friend, requires certain and continuous regulations at her hands.

As a general proposition, it may be safely stated that all men are managed by some woman—usually by many women. Every one of us must have a mother; most of us have sisters, sweethearts, wives, daughters. Running such a gauntlet, where is our chance of escape? We may not have any recollection, any knowledge of our management, any consciousness of it, even, while it is going on—so deftly and delicately is it commonly done. The ordinary man dislikes to be managed by women, and disliking it, is prone to think he is not. The extraordinary man, meaning the man of breadth, culture, and character, is aware of his fine manipulation by feminine fingers, and does not object—indeed he rather enjoys it.

It is evidence of our narrowness and weakness when we dread the influence of woman, reject her counsel, avoid her concurrence. It is evidence that we need what we decline, and that we really get in full measure what we assume to be able to do without.

As a rule, men who are most managed are the least conscious of their management; and those not conscious of it have the least of the thing. Superior men are not liable to suspicion; do not believe their dignity in permanent peril. They are willing to confess they receive something from their associates and associations. They do not fear management from those they esteem and love; comprehending that what they so derive must be similarly estimable and lovable. Being strong and elastic and susceptible, influences are acknowledged; gentle manipulations entertained and encouraged. They have sufficient force not to be turned from their bent; color enough of their own not to take on foreign hues. Management adds to their symmetry and development and they welcome from any source whatever helps them; turning their welcome into profoundest gratitude, if the help be recommended by affection.

Where is the man of parts and principles who has not been managed by women? What hero of the past (the present is slow to recognize its heroes) has not had his heroine, even though she be not so recorded?

* * * * *

The genuine, the spontaneous managers, who have no purpose but management, and are often unconscious of that, come nearer home;

are familiar to our daily lives. They are our wives, sisters, sweethearts, friends. They take charge of us, fancying we are not fully able to take charge of ourselves. Every woman deeply interested in a man has something of the maternal feeling for him, just as he, in like condition has something of the paternal feeling for her. Clytemnestra, erotic tigress that she was, had such attraction to Agamemnon, whom she slew, and to Ægisthus, on whom she brought such terrible retribution. Catharine of Russia, fiery amazon as she is shown, often regarded Soltikoff, and Pontiatowki as her sons. Half of woman's management springs from this feeling—vague, variable, and undefined—impelling her to direct, arrange, superintend in whatever she deems her proper sphere. Next to being taken care of by man, she loves to take care of man; nor will she be deprived of opportunity, which she will either find or make. She wants to be dependent, and to have others dependent on her. To lean and support are the bound and rebound of being. One is her rest; the other her activity: fluctuating between these, her contentment rises to the rim.

Man relies far more than he is aware for comfort and happiness on woman's tact and management. He is so accustomed to these that he is unconscious of their worth. They are so delicately concealed, and yet so ceaselessly exercised, that he enjoys their effect as he enjoys the light and atmosphere. He seldom thinks how it would be with him were they withdrawn. He fails to appreciate what is so freely given. He may be

reminded of them now and then; he may complain of intrusion or interference; but the frown is smoothed away by a gentle hand, the murmuring lips are stopped with a caress, and the management goes on.

Home would not be home without woman's management. It is the rythm of Nature's precious quality, the adjustment of spiritual irregularities. It comes when it is most needed; fits itself silently to its place. Man is saved by it from a hundred ills—from his arch enemy himself. He knows how solitude preys upon him; how constant society of his own sex palls, and frequently repels. Even women would weary him but for her management, whose fineness and fulness are proportioned to her sympathy and love. He enters her presence, sullen and bitter, he knows not why. The demon is in possession—the demon that would bid him, if all his hopes of happiness lay in a crystal vase to seize and dash it to pieces. She, sweet spirit of peace, smiles upon the clouded brow; prepares every trifle to his familiar liking; breathes all about her the aroma of gentleness and repose. No look or tone of tenderness from him. Coldness, stiffness, cruelly restrained are in the possessed. Her smile grows brighter, her air more gracious, her form more radiant with soft regret. Such influence is irresistible. The demon and the angel are opposed, and evil steadily retreats, as it always must in final field, before advancing good. Her arms are about his neck; her cheek against his breast; the old trite words are heard, which fresh whenever spoken in every language mean the same; and through

the broken cloud the peaceful sky bends down, as if to bless. The man is still possessed as Nature wills, with the gentleness and trust, the fidelity and tact, the management and love of his sympathetic sister, his proper partner, his devoted friend.

Management at its truest and best, is as the Therapnean temple that the Spartans, after her deification, reared to Helen. It softens the manners; lends grace to the graceless; confers beauty on the plainest woman.

JUNIUS HENRI BROWNE.

Henry Compton, Sr.

Died at the residence of his son-in-law in Nashville Tenn., in August, in the 99th year of his age. Mr. Compton was born at Boone's Station Ky., on the 1st day of May 1784. He emigrated to Davidson County Tenn. in the year 1806. The county was then but a sparsely inhabited wild. He settled five miles South of Nashville, near what is now known as the Granny White Pike. He hewed the logs and builded himself a house with his own hands, in which he lived until a short period previous to his death. Mr. Compton acted as Quarter master for General Jackson in the war of 1812. He was noted for strength of mind, decision of character, promptness and energy in business, was industrious and laborious; had a high sense of honor, which he kept burnished bright at all times. His integrity was such that he would much rather be wronged than do wrong. He was a member of the Masonic fraternity, and prided himself upon living up to the true spirit of that institution.

We first became acquainted with him about two years since. He was then one of the most remarkable men of his age for strength and activity of mind, we ever saw. He had been raised a predestinarian Baptist in sentiment. At the time of our first acquaintance he heard for the first time a presentation of the gospel as taught by our brotherhood. With his usual promptness and decision, he came to me after preaching and said, "I never heard preaching of that kind before, but it is true. If you will preach here regularly I will build you a good meeting house." I stated that was the wrong point at which to begin. The day before starting to Texas last year, I again spoke at the school house near his residence; I then particularly pressed upon the audience, the necessity of consecrating themselves to the service of God in the act of baptism. After the discourse he approached me, and said, "Do you think, if a man tries to do his whole duty to his fellow-men, is truthful and just in his dealings, never takes advantage of any one, is kind to the poor and suffering and tries to live a life of rectitude and honor in all things and fails to be baptized, that he will be lost, just for failing in that one small matter? In this conversation he stated that he had wronged his fellowmen at times, but said he, I never was too proud, no, I always had pride enough to correct the wrong. And time and again placed his hand upon his mouth, and stated he had determined in his soul long years ago, he would never meet his Maker with a lie of any kind on these lips. I stated to him that I would not answer his query, but would refer him to two cases

in the Bible, and I would simply ask him to honestly study them and work out his own answer from the Bible.

I knew he did not want 'o be saved like a thief or a murderer or a liar. I would not then refer to them, but I would refer to the salvation of an honest man., that was just to all, kind and merciful. that gave alms of all that he possessed and prayed to God always. Cornelius was such a person. Yet the spirit of God by Peter commanded him to be baptized, as words whereby he should be saved.

The other case to which I referred him was that of the Son of God, the sinless one, he said "thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness." Now sir, if there was a necessity that one as honest, as upright, as merciful, as devout, as Cornelius must be baptized that he might be saved, and if it become the spotless one of God, to fulfil all righteousness by being baptized, on what ground could you or I hope to be justified in refusing to submit to God in this institution? Take these cases, study them and answer your question for yourself; and I left him.

I did not see him again for more than a year. I received a message, in July, when in an adjoining County to come and baptize him. He was baptized by bro. Cook before I reached home. When I saw him, he told me he had taken the cases, and studied them, and they gave him no rest till he was baptized. He had been enfeebled by the cholera, but I never saw a person happier in the consciousness of having obeyed his master. His constant wish to his death was to have the presence and company of his brethren.

ren, hear them read, converse and pray. He once wished he had done his duty two years before, but he added, why this? I wish I had known my duty seventy-five years ago, that I might have done it. Think of a man regretting that he had been ignorant of the Bible seventy-five years. He had lived a life of honest, upright manhood. We rejoice exceedingly that he was permitted to clothe that life of noble, true manhood in the mantle of Christian submission to his maker, even in his last days on earth, that in Christ it may endure forever.

Except an obtuseness of hearing, he retained his faculties in full vigor to the end of life.

D. L.

A New Congregation.

Brethren L. & S: On the second Lord's day of October I commenced a meeting at Andrews school house nine miles east of Columbia Maury Co. continued fourteen days resulting in 23 additions. The brethren will organize and commence meeting every Lord's day to celebrate the outspread emblems of the broken body and shed blood of our blessed Master. They are making preparations to build a house of worship and hope to have it completed by the 1st of April 1874. From this point I went to Cave Spring in Giles County, preached six discourses resulting in eight additions.

May the Lord bless you in your labor of love is my prayer.

JAMES H. MORTON.

Berlin Tenn. Dec. 1st 1873.

OBITUARY.

Beulah Mitchell, daughter of John H. and Lucy A. Mitchell, of Colliersville Tenn., was born February 13th 1872, and gently passed through dreary death to blissful life, Oct. 5th. 1873, to meet her dear, Christian parents no more till "Faith is lost in sight, and hope in glad fruition." How often earth's brightest gardens are divested of dear attractions by the "icy hand of death," 'neath whose withering touch the pure and precious little buds of life and beauty wither. But thanks to our dear Father and the pure and perfect one who has said "suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven"—though severed from the parent while the Pure and sinless dews of the morning of life still rest upon their precious cheeks. they are not destroyed, but are transplanted by angels' hands, to the "garden of God," to grow, to bloom, to flourish, by the "river of life" forever.

Bless their dear, precious souls! it is hard to give them up; but let us remember, like David of old, that, though they can never return to us, we can shortly go to them. To this end let us labor—For this let us live.

Thou art gone, sweet Beulah, from the dark scenes of earth,

Where harvests of pleasure are oft followed dearth,

Where the purest blooms with anguish may swell,

To a home that the Savior has garnished for you,

To live with the angels, with the good and the true,

Then adieu, little Beulah—dear, sweet one farewell.

T. B. LARIMORE.

Mars Hill Academy near Florence Ala. Nov. 22nd 1873.

PROFESSOR AGASSIZ died Sabbath evening at ten o'clock, after a week's illness. He was in his sixty seventh year. The news of his death will be read with regret by people all over the land, and indeed all over the world, for his reputation was worldwide. He was born and educated in Switzerland, but came to this country nearly thirty years ago. His life was a busy one, always lecturing, always writing, and always studying. His additions to Natural History were greater than those of any other man. His death the result of paralysis.—*Ex.*

THE FIRESIDE.

(From the Methodist.)

Our Chat with the Little Folks.

"Whoop! Halloo!" shouts the winter wind. "Here I am. Let me in." And he rattles the windows, and knocks at the door or whistles through the keyhole to call our attention, for being old fashioned, he knows nothing about our modern bells, else, possibly, he might try them, too. But we turn a deaf ear to him as we sit around the fire, and refuse him entrance. Look out for him, then, when you step out of doors. He will repay all of your rudeness. "What!" he cries, "refuse admittance to an old friend who comes every year to visit you! Take that and *that* and *THAT*." Face and hands tingle from his blows. You can't outrun him. He keeps up at your side and storms away. "You gave me cold welcome. I will give you colder. You think me harsh, but I am far milder than I once was; for who goes nowadays to ox roasts on the rivers as they once did here? I am a summer wind with you to what I am up North where passers in the street call out to one another, "Father, your nose!" as a warning of my work. Go to the Arctic regions and see how I act when at home." But you run quick into the house and slam the door on him, leaving him roaring with rage outside.

Winter has come, and the cold wind blows, and Jack Frost, that busy painter, works all night long at his pictures on the windows. Think how fast he has to fly from house to

house to get them all done before the children open their eyes in the morning. That accounts for his drawings sometimes looking a little unfinished; he has so many orders to fill, so many pictures to make for the good children, that the others, especially if they have been somewhat naughty that night, are put off with rough, blurred sketches. Besides Jack Frost, and the snow, and the cold wind, the first day of this winter brought us sad news of the going down of a great ship, at sea, with nearly all on board. But I need not tell you of it, for most of you have read of it already, especially, I hope, those busy young students of history who ought not to be so intent on learning what happened a thousand years ago to the Greeks or Romans, or even a hundred years ago to the people in this country, as to neglect the history of what is going on to-day.

Now, let us go, as the winter wind requested, up to the Arctic region. Well, and what shall we learn there? Look on the map for the island of Spitzbergen, the most Northern known land, where, wise people tell us, for four months the sun never shines, and all the light is given by the moon and stars. It was by way of the Arctic Ocean that a Dutch navigator, more than two hundred years ago, tried to get to China. Look on your map again and see how near he would come to it. Instead of China he found these islands. The same thing has happened to other bold navigators. Instead of the East Indies he was in search of, Columbus discovered America; and all the wonderful stories of the search for

the Polar Sea began with the attempts of men to find a way to the Pacific by the North Pole. Now, let us come back to our Dutchman, Barenty was his name. Seeing that somehow he could not get to China by this route, he stopped for awhile where he was, and built huts on the coast for the shelter of his men. A short time ago these huts were discovered just as they had been left two hundred and seventy six years ago—the ashes on the hearth, the books on the shelf, the jugs and dishes ready to be used, the shoes of the little cabin boy who had died during the stay on the island. The cold had preserved them all. It was like stepping into a house whose occupants had just left.

Now, as we descend from the Arctic regions, if we stop in St. Petersburg this wintry weather we will sometimes hear the people in the streets as they hurry along cry out, as the winter wind did, "Father, your nose!" as a warning to some passer by that his is frost-bitten; for here the wind plays his trick before you know what he is about.

As to what this same wind said of ox-roasts on these rivers about us in former days, all these history-wise young folks ought to be able to give the answer that cultivation moderates the weather in any country; for instance, adds Master Knowall, France has a pleasant climate, whilst that of ancient and savage Gaul was noted for its severity. Very true, Mr. Knowall; so now, the next time you are out coasting, when you blow on your fingers to make them warm and the wind blows on them to make them cold, console yourself with the

thought of how much colder your grandfathers got at the same game. Blowing hot and blowing cold reminds me of the old story of the traveler who was journeying through a forest, when a goblin starting up at his side offered to be his traveling companion. As they went on together, the wind blew very cold, and the man blew on his fingers. "Why do you do that?" cried the goblin. "To make them warm," replied the man. At the end of the day they reached an inn where their dinner was a hot pudding. The man blew on his share. "Why is that again?" cried the goblin. "To make it cold," "What!" said the terrified goblin, "you blow on your fingers to make them hot, and on your food to make it cold; then I'll travel no longer with a creature that can blow both hot and cold from the same mouth."

What the wind said of frozen rivers brings up this story of

THE HEROIC PEASANT.

"In Italy, on the banks of the river Adige, stands the city of Verona. Over the river stood, for many years, a beautiful bridge, on the central arch of which stood a small house, the residence of the tollman. During an unusually severe winter the river was completely frozen over, and, a thaw succeeding the frost, the ice broke and went up stream, and some of the blocks swam up to the bridge and broke its central arch before the toll-collector and his family were able to escape. The ice was driven more and more violently up against the bridge, so that gradually its feeble walls gave way, and at last nothing was left but the single pillar on which the toll-taker's house was

built. The unfortunate man, who saw his own death and that of his wife and children staring him in the face, could only wring his hands and implore help. But although many persons were assembled on both sides of the river, and boats were at hand, no one had courage sufficient to venture to the rescue. A rich nobleman now sprang forward, holding a bag of gold in his hand, and exclaiming, 'This is for any one who ventures over the river to the rescue of the unfortunate family on the bridge.'

The assembled crowds heard distinctly the words of the generous count, but no one was seen to come forward and respond to it; for, at tractive as sounded the reward, no one had sufficient courage to attempt to win it, until a plainly dressed peasant made his way through the crowd to the shore, unloosened a boat, and, with his strong arm and resolute courage, forced a passage through the crashing ice. With anxious hearts the spectators watched him from the shore. The rescuer arrived at the cottage, but, unfortunately, his boat was too small to contain the whole family, and three times the peasant performed his short but perilous voyage. Those whom he had rescued overwhelmed him with expressions of gratitude, and the count placed the purse of gold in his hand. But he refused it, saying, 'I did not put my life in jeopardy for money. Give it rather to this poor man and his family, for they have lost all their goods in this flood.' And without waiting for an answer he made his way between the shouting multitudes and returned quietly to his home."

One of the greatest dangers of winter travel in these very northern countries is the troops of wolves whose appetites have been sharpened by the cold and lack of food. And this brings us to

SOME STORIES ABOUT WOLVES.

Of all the animals, perhaps the one of the least enviable reputation is the wolf. There are several varieties of them, but their general characteristics are so similar that we only say that the various species are scattered over almost the whole globe, inhabiting both the burning regions of the tropics and the everlasting snows of the polar regions. They were at one time a great scourge in Wales, but King Edgar imposed a tax of three hundred wolves' heads annually on that country, and by the fourth year the breed was extinct.

They are very suspicious animals, and stand in great awe of anything that looks like a trap, so that travelers have actually been saved by letting a piece of cord trail behind their carriage, and the wolves were so much afraid of this doubtful-looking piece of cord that they dared not venture to risk approaching and being caught by it. Their bite consists of a sharp snap, and their jaws are so strong that if they bite a man's arm every tooth pierces to the bone. They are not at all particular about their diet, and will eat almost every living thing, from human beings down to frogs, lizards and insects. Moreover, they are cannibals, and a sickly or weak wolf is sure to fall a victim to its companions, or if one of them gets besmeared with the blood of the prey that has just been killed, it will be hunted down and eaten by its ravenous associates.

A curious story of the cunning of a wolf is told by Captain Lyon in his journal. A captive wolf had been brought on board the ship apparently dead; but, as the eyes were observed to wink whenever an object was passed rapidly in front of them, it was considered well to tie the animal by his hind legs to the rigging, with his head downwards. Suddenly he threw off all disguise, made a vigorous spring at those near him, and then repeatedly turned himself around, trying to gnaw the rope by which he was suspended; and so full of life was he that it required several hard blows on his head and the use of the bayonet to reduce him to the state he had been feigning.

A wolf-hunt is very exciting, but very fatigueing, for though the wolf starts with a sort of shambling gallop as if half wearied out, it can keep up this pace long enough to tire out the best of horses. They keep their heads down, their noses to the ground and the hair of their tail and neck erect.

A Norwegian gentleman named Greiff reared up two young wolves till they were full grown. They were male and female; the latter became so tame that she played with me and licked my hands, and I often had her with me in the sledge in the winter. Once when I was absent, she got loose from her chain and was away three days. When I returned home I went out on a hill and called, 'Where is my Jussa?' as she was named, when she immediately returned home and fondled me like the most affectionate dog. She could not bear other people; but the male, on the contrary, was friendly with others but not with me, from the moment I punished him for seizing a hen. They grew very large and had fine skins."

One more winter story and then

we will stop. It is one of a snow storm and is called

THE LORD'S WALL.

"About fifty years ago, one bitter January night, the inhabitants of the old town of Selswick were thrown into the greatest distress and terror. A hostile army was marching down upon them, and fearful reports of the conduct of the lawless soldiery were hourly reaching the place.

In a large, commodious cottage dwelt an aged grandmother, with her widowed daughter and grandson. While all hearts quaked with fear, this aged woman passed her time in crying to God that he would 'build a wall of defence around them,' quoting the words of an ancient hymn.

Her grandson asked her why she prayed for a thing so entirely impossible as that God should build a wall about their house that it should hide it, but she explained that the meaning was that God should protect her.

At midnight the dreaded tramp was heard. An enemy came pouring in at every avenue, filling the houses to overflowing. But while the most fearful sounds were heard on every side, not even a knock came to their own door, at which they were greatly surprised. The morning light made the matter clear; for just beyond the house the drifted snow had reared such a massive wall that it was impossible to get over to them.

'There,' said the old woman, triumphantly, 'do you not see, my son, that God could raise up a wall around us?'

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

New Year's Address.....	1
Whither are we drifting.....	3
Another Denomination.....	5
Away up in Tennessee.....	7
Women as Tacticians.....	12
Henry Compton, Sr.....	18
A New Congregation.....	20
Obituary.....	20

FIRESIDE.

Our Chat with the little Folks.....	21
-------------------------------------	----

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 21

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JAN. 8, 1874

The Franklin Debate.

Our readers will expect something concerning the Franklin Debate. We are sorry we are not able to give a more lengthy and full report of it. We could not well remain there the whole time, so cannot give as full account as we would like. But one question was thoroughly debated. The action of baptism. We would like to give a full report of the discussion of this question. But we cannot. It was discussed five days, beginning Monday the 15th, closing Friday afternoon, the nineteenth. While the discussion of this question was more thorough and full than we had ever heard it—more authorities brought to bear on the subject, and while to every thinking and unprejudiced heart, the case was fully, clearly and satisfactorily made beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the immersion of the whole body in water was the apostolic baptism, and nothing else was, yet we did not think bro. Brents' style of putting the arguments and of meeting Mr. D.'s objections, so happy as at Fayetteville. A man cannot be always in his best mood.

At Fayetteville his arguments were put in a sharp, incisive style that allowed no room for even quibbling. Mr. D. showed his inability to meet the questions. At Franklin while the same arguments were used, they were to my mind not put in a manner that so completely forbade response and carried conviction to the most prejudiced that they were unanswerable.

I have no doubt that there was nearer an exhaustive examination of the subject than has ever taken place in public discussion. We may try at another time to give some of these arguments as here presented.

The question of Infant baptism was taken up Saturday morning and closed the same day. Two hours were devoted to the question by each of the debaters. Mr. D. led on this question and closed it thus hastily. We were not surprised at his anxiety to pass over this question speedily, after his experience at Fayetteville. We did not hear this question discussed. But we learn, on it bro. Brents was in his happiest mood. The brethren say he did thorough and destructive work. We have heard of some of the most intelligent

Methodists, who had had their babies sprinkled acknowledging that Mr. D. was completely routed on this question. We heard of the same acknowledgment being made at Fayetteville. Of course in two hours a very thorough discussion of the question could not be had. But as far as it went the error was well exposed, so all parties admit.

On the Monday morning following, the discussion on Design of Baptism was opened. Bro. Brents was again in the affirmative. The weather was bad, the audience small, but Bro. Brents made one of his happiest and most effective efforts. Those who heard it, say it was the best effort he made during the debate. Mr. D. followed with a poor effort. Bro. J. S. Sweeney was present, who has had two or three debates with him and heard him in several others, said it was the poorest effort he ever heard him make.

Before commencing the next speeches, Mr. D. proposed to Bro. Brents that if he would agree to it, and would not take advantage of it, he would agree to close the discussion; stating that then good feeling in the community prevailed, but if they continued the discussion bitterness of feeling would grow out of it. Dr. Brents and his friends feeling that on this question the advantage was wholly with him, after consultation with the brethren, told Mr. D. that if he could afford to leave the question as it then was, he (Brents) could, and they closed with one hour's speech each, on this question. The question of the Holy Spirit was yet untouched.

The Debate thus closed, but we

learn that Mr. Ditzler after using this maneuver to get clear of the discussion and Dr. Brents, after Dr. B. had gone home, stated the debate was closed by request, leaving the impression that Dr. Brents or his friends were privy to the request, and delivered sermons on the subject of remission of sins and the design of baptism. This we suppose accords with Mr. D.'s sense of honor and right, and suits his brethren who were so violently opposed to discussion. If so, we are sorry for them, is all we have to say.

It proves fully our statement that when he first came down here on his way to Ala. insisting we had backed out from the debate, he did not wish to debate, he wished to discuss these questions himself, to himself. He wished to present his side of the question, without the other being heard. He was forced into that at Fayetteville by Dr. Brents following him up from place to place, and leaving him no shadow of an excuse to avoid it.

Before the debate at Fayetteville Mr. D. wrote to Dr. Brents telling him that the Methodists at Franklin desired the discussion to be held there. It reached Dr. B. too late to then make a change. At Fayetteville, Dr. B. in response to this, stated to Mr. D. that as he had proposed a debate at Franklin, and Dr. B.'s friends desired it, he supposed they had better repeat it at that place. To this Mr. D. agreed. Yet Mr. D.'s brother published in the *Franklin Review*, that Dr. B. challenged Mr. D. to discuss at Franklin. We mention this, not because we or Dr. B. care for the responsibility of a chal-

lence, but to show how things are perverted to curry popular favor.

There were some things that occurred at Franklin to which we must refer. At the beginning of the debate Mr. D. selected Atha Thomas, a Methodist lawyer of the place, of experience, both as a man and legislator, for his moderator. Mr. H. H. Cook, a young lawyer, without experience or self-confidence in such business was chosen to act for Bro. Breunig. Col. McGavock served as presiding moderator a day or two, then Prof. McNutt then Mr. Gaut, a most estimable gentleman, but timid and wholly without experience in public and deliberative bodies.

While this latter was acting as moderator. Dr. B, commenting on 'the cloud and the sea,' pressed Mr. D. to give an exposition of how the baptism was performed if not by covering the persons with the cloud and then surrounding them with the sea, thus overwhelming in such a manner as to hide them from view, and chided him, with having taken one position at Moore's Chapel near Richmond Tenn., to wit, the cloud sprinkled water upon them, and at Fayetteville he said the east wind blew spray from the sea over them so as to baptize them. Dr. B. handed him a paper, which stated that he had taken the former position in a debate with Bro. Pickens a few weeks since. He asked him if it was true. He affirmed it was not. He had heard Pickens was publishing their debate, and that there was not a word of truth in it. (He had only heard he was publishing it, but could affirm there was not a word of truth in it) and that Pickens was the most untruthful man, he

had ever met with. I arose to a point of order, and stated I objected to the denunciation of any man's personal character in that manner, and wished to know if the moderators intended to tolerate such personal denunciations. Whereupon Mr. D. set upon me quite fiercely, and stated he objected to me, I had published things like Pickens's. He then let me know the ground of his complaint and the charge of falsehood he had made against me. In the GOSPEL ADVOCATE of May 1st last year, he stated that it was a typographical error in Wilkes Ditzler debate that Bloomfield, Olshausen, and Koenaale, were reported there as maintaining that, the concluding portion of the Gospel by Mark was spurious, and I spoke severely of him for not correcting these errors. This denunciation was suffered by the moderators, then a decision was made that it was all out of order, but no response should be made. This of course was an eminently proper decision, made at a proper time. But to permit, Mr. D. to make his attack upon the personal character of both bro. Pickens and myself and then prevent response, is where I fail to see the justice. I cared personally but little for it, and doubtless gratified both Mr. D., and his moderator, the active man on the board. He has borne me a goodly degree of not very kindly feeling for a number of years. He asked me once, to speak on a certain subject. I did not speak to suit him, it has accorded with his sense of honor since, to show bitterness, and when invested with a little brief authority by his position to gratify his personal feelings to-

ward me. Well if he feels better I am glad of it, I assure him I feel no worse.

We fully recognized that Mr. D. had the right to deny the truth of Pickens' statement. Notwithstanding both Dr. Brents and myself were as well satisfied then and are now, that D. said just what Pickens said that he said, as though we had heard it. We were satisfied of this because Dr. Brents heard him take the identical position in a speech while on his way to debate with Pickens, and replied to it in a review of Ditzler. I heard Brents charge this upon him at Fayetteville, where were a number of persons present who had heard him take the position, and he did not pretend to deny it. Pickens making a position for him could hardly have guessed the one he had taken a few days before. Still if Mr. D. had merely said he did not take the position, I certainly should have said nothing.

But I had spoken severely of him because he had not corrected his proved and confessed misrepresentations, and I treated some of them as though he had intentionally made them, when he claimed that they were typographical errors. Suppose they were typographical errors that had gone forth over his sanction, misrepresenting the truth on questions of importance, was he not under obligations to correct these typographical errors among those who were misled by the types? Certainly so, but he made no attempt, has made none to correct them where they needed correction among his Methodist brethren.

He has two or three times coarsely

denounced A. Campbell as a willful falsifier. He acknowledged at Flat Creek, he had done him injustice in the most flagrant case and said he had written to correct it. That correction has never appeared in the Methodist papers of this country. If he had a proper sense of justice and honor, if he were half as anxious to correct Jacob Ditzler's mistakes as he is to correct A. Campbell or D. Lipscomb's he would neither eat nor sleep until he had corrected these things concerning A. Campbell, Bloomfield, Olshausen, and Koenal, in every Methodist paper in the land, whether done intentionally, by his mistake, or through the types.

But why did we not give him credit for saying they were typographical errors. Mr. D.'s chirography, like my own, is not so easily read as print. We read it only in manuscript. He spoke of a mere error of certain letters, but the idea that the insertion of those names in that book were typographical errors is so preposterously absurd and utterly impossible, that it never struck me that he was aiming to say such a thing until at Fayetteville Dr. Brents insisted he did, and I again examined it and found it even so. Those names or some of them occur twice, and are placed in a connection the third time that indicate the same, at places over a hundred pages apart, in the Wilkes-Ditzler debate, revised by Mr. D. before type-setting, proof-read by him after it was set up. Bloomfield, Olshausen, Koenal, as deciding that, the last chapter of Mark was not authentic, as a part of the inspired word. They occur three times as explained, in the same con-

nection. In his first reference on page 143, two of the names Olshausen and Bloomfield stand first in his list of authorities. On page 278, Bloomfield stands first in the list, the other two are omitted in this list. On page 625, it is only inferentially intimated that the list there given, reject it. Koenal and Olshausen both are in this list. Now with all due deference to Mr. D., we say to him he is mistaken when he says the insertion of these names in these lists, is a typographical error. The types make wonderful mistakes at times, but these mistakes are within certain fixed limits. This is one of the cases that is utterly impossible. Every printer, every one familiar with printing knows that such a thing as a typographical error, of this character, is impossible. We would be perfectly willing to leave a question of this kind to Dr. Summers and the printers of the Methodist Book Concern. Every honest printer in the land would be compelled to say those words were put in these sentences by design of some one, and not by an error of the types. These words have no connection within a dozen pages of these lines. They are not typographical errors, Mr. D. If you did not put them there, your copy was tampered with, that is all.

But again at Flat Creek last January. 2 years after the publication of your debate, you used Bloomfield and Olshausen in precisely the same connection. Pres't Carver then and there called my attention to your misrepresentation of Bloomfield, and we looked at his work to convince me of your misrepresentation. Pres't Fanning also made a note of it there. It is a

strange coincidence that you should blunder into the same error that the types two years before had fallen. But the misrepresentation of these critics is not more unfair than that of Alford, Beya, Augustin, Wall, Stokius, Schlausner, Lynch, Smith's Bible Dictionary and others.

D. L.

Je us' Consolatory Discourse to His Disciples.

While that solemn company,—the Teacher and his eleven remaining disciples are still reclining at the table, (as we presume) the most impressive sermon that ever greeted the ears of mortal man began to be delivered by him who was about to be separated from his chosen friends and companions and cruelly put to death by his enemies. In sorrowing silence those loved disciples listened, as the pathetic tones of the teacher fell upon their attentive ears. Is it not possible for us, in some degree even at this distant day, to enter into the spirit of that meeting, so as to be duly impressed with the touching language of Jesus on that occasion? Let us now try to read, with the most care and attention, those precious sentences, uttered by the teacher in order to console his disciples.

"Do not let your heart be troubled, believe on God; believe on me, too. In my Father's house are many mansions: were it otherwise, I would have told you. I am going to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I shall come again and take you with me; so that, where I am you may be too.

And you know where I am going; you also know the way."

Thomas said to him:

'Lord, we do not know where thou art going; how, then, can we know the way?'

Jesus said to him:

'I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me. If you had known me, you would have known the Father too. But from this time on you will know him, having seen him.'

Philip said to him:

'Lord, show the Father to us and we will be satisfied.'

'Have I been so long with you, and have you not yet become acquainted with me, Philip? He who has seen me, has seen the Father. Then how is it that you say "show the Father to us?" Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me? The words that I am addressing to you, I do not speak from myself. The Father who dwells in me,—He does the works. Believe me, that I am in the Father and that the Father is in me. If not, believe me on account of the works themselves.*

Most assuredly I say to you, he that believes on me, such works as I perform, he also will perform; because I am going to my Father. And whatever you ask in my name, I will

*That is, if they could not yet believe on him as divine, if they could not fully realize that the Father was in him, and working through him, still they might have faith in him, on account of the works he had performed which proved him to be the Son of God.—the sent of the Father. A simple faith in Jesus precedes a "doctrinal faith," or that complete understanding of the character and offices of Christ, which the full-grown Christian obtains by studying the Scriptures.

perform; so that the Father may be honored through the Son. If you ask anything in my name, I will do it. If you love me, observe my commands; then I will ask the Father, and he will give you another advocate, who may remain with you forever;—the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. You know him, however; because he dwells with you and shall be in you. I shall not leave you as orphans; I am coming to you.

But a short time [will elapse], and the world will see me no more; but you will see me, because I shall [still] live, and you also will live. In that day, you will know that I am in my Father and you are in me, and I in you. He who has my commands and observes them, it is he that loves me; and he who loves me, will be loved by my Father; I also will love him and will make myself known to him."

Here, "Judas, [not the man of Kerioth, but the "Brother of James," author of the "Letter of Judas," in the latter part of the "New Covenant] interrupted the Teacher by saying to him:

'How is it that thou wilt make thyself known to us and not to the world?'

Jesus, replying said to him:

'If any one loves me, he will observe my word, my Father will love him, and we will come to him and take up our residence with him.

He who does not love me, does not treasure up my words; and [observe this fact.] the word which you hear is not mine, but [that] of the Father who sent me.

These things I have been saying to you while still remaining with you. But the advocate,—the Holy Spirit,—whom the Father will send in my name,—he shall teach you all things [which it is necessary for you to know.] and remind you of all that I have said to you.

Peace I bequeath to you;—my own peace I give to you; not as the world gives, do I give to you. Do not let your heart be troubled; do not let it be afraid. You have heard what I said to you,—“I am going away and am coming again to you. If you loved me, you would rejoice, because I am going to my Father; for my Father is greater than I.”

“And now I have told you before it happens, that when it does happen you may believe. I shall not talk much more with you; for the ruler of the world is coming; but [he] will find in me nothing worthy of death. But this happens, that the world may know that I love the Father, and that I am doing as my Father commanded me.—Arise; let us go from here.”

This much seems to have been spoken in the house, where the last Supper was eaten; and as the discourse was momentarily broken off here, we may embrace the opportunity of making a few comments, before commencing another chapter.

On this fourteenth chapter of John several useful observations may be made, and thus the most important points in Jesus' discourse be impressed on the mind and heart.

I. A simple belief in the existence of God is Deism, *now*; though prior to the Christian age, the true theology of the Fathers or Patriarchs, taught

that there is one God, who, in the beginning, “created the Heavens and the Earth” And Paul, writing to the Hebrews, says: “He who approaches God must believe that he exists.” (Heb. xi. .) But a mere deistical persuasion is not now acceptable to God, since Jesus exhorted his disciples, not only to believe on God, but to believe on him, too. It is, therefore, as important to have faith in Christ, as to acknowledge the existence of God.

II. Regarding the “many mansions” in heaven, I wish to remark that it is a source of delightful contemplation to the poor, the afflicted, the aged, and the tried ones of earth, to be assured that Jesus has gone to prepare a place for them,” where they may be with him, and enjoy his gracious presence forever. We cannot think those assurances, though addressed to the eleven primitive disciples alone, were intended only for their consolation. We think there will be room for us, too, in the heavenly “mansions,” if we belong to the faithful in Christ.

III. Jesus uses figurative language when he says, “I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.”

By believing, trusting, and walking in Christ, we pursue that way, or “course of life,” that leads to God and to the “Mansions of eternal rest.”

He is the *Truth*, because he is true “in word, and deed and thought.” He is the embodiment of the Truth, Love, and Wisdom of the Eternal Spirit. And he is the source, the Fountain, the Cause of all Spiritual Life in the soul of the Christian.

IV. The statement, that, “he who

has seen the Son, has also seen the Father," cannot be understood literally; for how could the Son be identical with the Father? But the meaning must be; he who sees the Son in his true character, cannot help seeing the Father manifested through him.

My father and I resemble each other so nearly, that we have been taken for brothers. Now, he who has seen me, has seen my father too, not in *propria persona*, but in likeness. Jesus was the "exact image" of his Father, as Paul says in Heb. i. 3, and could truthfully say to his Disciples: "He who has seen me has seen my Father, too."

V. Jesus exhorted the disciples to believe on account of his works," or miracles.

Our faith rests on the testimony of the Evangelists, the first and true witnesses for Jesus. But there are several links in the "chain of evidence" by which our faith in Jesus is established. The Miracles of Christ demonstrated to those who witnessed them, that supernatural power was possessed by those who could raise the dead, and cure all kinds of diseases without medicine. During the personal ministry of Christ, people believed on the testimony of miracles. But we believe on evangelical testimony. And we are dependent upon translators, who, we trust, have correctly rendered that testimony into our language. If we believe that we have the written testimony of the apostles; that their testimony concerning Christ's miracles is correct; and that those miracles must have been performed by supernatural or divine power; then we have just

and sufficient grounds for believing "with all the heart," that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

VI. Jesus seems to say, in general terms, that he who believes on him will be able to do greater works than he had done." And the apostles and others, among the primitive Christians, did perform miracles, equal to, if not greater than, any which Jesus performed. For instance: Peter's shadow cured the sick; handkerchiefs, proceeding from Paul were equally effectual; and the Apostles spoke in different languages. But Clarke thinks, that, as all the miracles of the Apostles were performed in the name of Jesus, it would be better to say, that the "greater works" were the converting of such vast numbers under the preaching of the Apostles. I am not sure of the correctness of this opinion. But the question arises in my mind,—or rather, is suggested to me, "are we to infer from the words of the teacher, here, that all who truly believed, would be able to work miracles? I think that, during the Apostolic age, which was peculiarly an age of Miracles, there were many besides the Apostles who had "the gift of healing," the power of "working miracles," (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10.) But can it be said, that, because Christians in the present age do not work miracles, therefore they have not genuine faith; that their faith is not so strong, or saving, or pure, as that of the primitive Christians?

Another question may be asked, in this connection, "Will the Savior do for Christians now, whatever they ask in his name?" Or was this promise limited to the Apostles?

Should not Christians ask for what they need, and what God may be thought willing to grant in the name of Christ? And may they not expect answers to prayers, that are in harmony with God's will?

VII. Was the promise of the Advocate, the True and Holy Spirit made to the Apostles only, or to all? So far as inspiration is concerned, it was, I think, confined to the Apostles; for it was to "remind them of all that he had said to them." But the Holy Spirit was no doubt promised, as a Holy Guest, to all the faithful followers of Jesus. But if the world "cannot receive" the Spirit as Jesus says in this discourse, how is it that many are claiming, that this same Holy Spirit operates on the sinner's heart in conversion? Is there not "converting power" in the Gospel, as Paul says, "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one who believes?" I am satisfied that the popular Spiritualistic theories of modern sensationalists are erroneous, unscriptural, and exceedingly dangerous in their influence and tendencies.

VIII. How does Christ now make himself known to his loving disciples? Is the modern notion, about Jesus mysteriously and sensibly manifesting himself to religious people, correct? Or is there not a way in which he reveals himself through his teaching, his providences, and the good influences of the Holy Spirit dwelling in the heart of the Christian?

IX. Respecting the Spirit's reminding the disciples of what he had said to them, we have no doubt that this was true of the apostles. But

does the Spirit now bring to the Christian teacher's mind those Bible truths, once learned, when discoursing to the people? In other words: Does the Spirit aid preachers' memories now, or inspire them with thoughts new and different from what they have had while studying the word of God? When the preacher prays for assistance in declaring the gospel does God in any way answer his prayer? It surely would not be right to ask for assistance, if he thought he did not need it, or that God would not be likely to grant it. As to how this assistance will be rendered, we may not know, exactly; but it must be in the same manner in which all other ways of "Providence" are carried on.

X. In reference to Jesus saying that he would "come again and receive the Apostles to himself," it may not be improper to inquire, whether this is the second or last coming—the Final advent of Christ to the World; or whether it is his coming to his disciples, after the resurrection. Would he come, in order to receive only the Apostles to himself; or did he mean that he would receive all his disciples?

Undoubtedly this promise relates to the coming of Christ at the end of the world; for, hereafter we shall learn that when Jesus comes back from the grave, after spending a few weeks with his apostles, he ascends to his Father in heaven without them: he does not now take them with him, but still leaves them in the world. And this promise must belong to us as well as to the apostles; for why should they alone be received into the Heavenly Mansions, and

not all the faithful followers of Jesus?

XI. Once more, and finally, let us observe these remarks of the Savior, which are very significant: "If any one loves me, he will observe my word;" "He who does not love me, does not treasure up my words."

How true it is that those who do not love Jesus do not delight in his teaching; do not care to learn his lessons; do not store up his sayings, commands and promises in their minds! While he who truly loves our Lord Jesus Christ is ever ready to exclaim like David:

"O how I love thy Law! It is my meditation all the day. Thou, through thy commandments, hast made me wiser than my enemies; for they are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers; for thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients because I keep thy precepts. I have refrained my feet from every evil way, that I might keep thy word. I have not departed from thy judgments; for thou hast taught me.

How sweet are thy words to my taste! Yes, sweeter than honey to my mouth. Through thy precepts I get understanding; therefore I hate every false way." (Ps. cxix. 97-104.)

W. PINKERTON.

Waynesfield, O., Dec. 25, 1873.

Future Rewards and Punishments.

Mr. Editor: D. L. has been giving us consecutive articles on the subject of "future rewards and punishments." He believes in the eternity and ferocity of punishment. He

is a good brother I reckon, but a very confident one. Is he not very, very confident, and somewhat ferocious, in the following paragraph: "We know God has never given an intimation of such a change in the future state, and he who exalts his wisdom and imaginations above the revealed will of God *deserves the unquenchable wrath of God* for his wicked presumption." But if "a fellow" through *weakness* believes so heterodoxically, would there be no chance for repentance? Is such a sin included in the contrabands of grace? How is this! Wouldn't the brother's denunciation damn by brigades and divisions? We would like to be prayed for if there's hope of mercy yet.

Again, says the brother, "God's love was *exhausted* in the gift of his Son." *How did* he find that out? In what book of chronicles was it written? To weak minds, the discovery is alarming.

A question or two for our charitable brother, if you please:

If death is the termination of our present existence of sorrow and suffering, what is the "second death?"

If the wicked, resurrected to a life of punishment adequate for their sins, are finally annihilated, would the penalty of sin—suffering and death, be inflicted upon them?

ONE WHO DON'T KNOW.

Rome, Ga.

We are certainly glad of any suggestions or criticisms or difficulties presented in a respectful and candid manner to anything we may write. We wish to be right and to aid others in getting right. Criticisms and

objections help us; difficulties pro-
pounded help us or give opportunity
to us to help others by removing
those difficulties.

We apprehend one difficulty with
our friend is, he has been accus-
tomed to a class of half hearted teachers
and professors of the Christian reli-
gion, who are in the habit of apolo-
gizing for the laws of God, and of
making excuses for his condemna-
tions and punishments rather than
justifying and vindicating them.
Many religious teachers apologize
for God's condemning the wicked,
hold out the idea that were it in
their power they would be more mer-
ciful than God, and would save all.
To our mind, the man who most
completely degrades God, is he who
apologizes for him, he who tries to
excuse his laws and judgments. We
have no sympathy with that kind of
religious professors. The true be-
liever in God, is assured that God's
laws are just, his judgments are right.
The true servant of God never apol-
ogizes for them—he vindicates them,
and conforms his own sympathies
and judgments to God's. He strives
to bring his own sense of justice and
right into full harmony with God.
If God condemns sin or the sinner,
he does it because it is just, it is
right. God's servant ought at all
times to be willing to fully and freely
declare this and to maintain it before
all people. Thus did his true and
faithful servants of olden time; this
they must do at all times.

We have no hesitancy in saying, a
man that God condemns *ought* to be
condemned. God would not con-
demn unless condemnation be just
and right. If to say so is *ferocity*,

every child of God ought to be *fero-
cious*. For all ought to maintain
and defend the justice and righteous-
ness of God's judgments. We are
perfectly confident in doing this.

We are not amiss, (for we have
studied God's revelation to man care-
fully and closely,) in saying that
there is not one word as to a change
in the future state. But, as we have
shown, the opposite is clearly indica-
ted. Now for man to exalt his wis-
dom and imagination above the re-
vealed will of God, certainly is to
depreciate that will and set it at def-
iance. To those who presume to set
God's law at defiance, both the Old
and New Testament are replete with
words of condemnation. Under the
Jewish law, the sin of ignorance and
the sin of weakness were pardonable,
but the sin of presumption was not
pardonable. "But the soul that do-
eth aught presumptuously, whether
he be born in the land, or a stranger,
the same reproacheth the Lord, and
that soul shall he cut off from among
his people. Because he hath despi-
sed the word of the Lord, and hath
broken his commandment, that soul
shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity
shall be upon him." Numbers 15 :
30 See also Deut. 17: 12. David
prays, in view of this fact especially,
"to be kept back from presumptuous
sins."

Jesus says, "In vain they do wor-
ship me teaching for doctrines the
commandments of men." Mat. 15 :
9. It has ever been a presumptuous
sin against God to nullify the force
and authority of his laws, with the
imagination of our own heart, or to
exalt our own wisdom above those
laws.

God condemns those who do thus, to wrath and woe. It is just it should be so, or God would not ordain it.

How did I find that God's love was exhausted in the gift of his Son? We of course meant that that love was so exhausted that nothing more would or could be done than what was provided through and by the death of his Son. The Bible plainly teaches this. He came, suffered, sorrowed, died, was buried as the impersonation of Deity himself. No greater sacrifice could be made. No dearer being has the Divine Father than Jesus the Christ, to offer as a sacrifice. He was the only begotten, the well-beloved of the Father. He was the first-born of all creation. When God sent him, sacrificed him, he had done all he could do for man's salvation. In view of this very truth, Paul says, "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Heb. 6: 4-6. The goodness of God leads man to repentance. That goodness to man was exhausted in the gift of the Son of God and the provisions made through him. When these failed to lead to repentance nothing more could be done for man.

"Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4: 12. Now the name of Christ

covers all that Christ commanded, all that was sealed by his blood. Whosoever is not saved through the laws and provisions ordained by God and sealed by the blood of the Son of God cannot be saved. The efficacy of Christ's blood, is exerted through the laws sealed by that blood. When man rejects the provisions of mercy made and given through Christ, he is lost, because there are no provisions of mercy beyond these. Again, Christ said, "no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14: 6. 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 that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." 2nd Thes. 1: 7. That is, those who are not saved through obedience to the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, the gracious provisions made through Christ's mission, will be destroyed with an everlasting destruction. Whoever rejects Christ and refuses salvation through trusting submission to his will, can never be saved. Because there are no provisions outside of or beyond these, through which man can be saved. "There is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved." God's mercy was exhausted in the provisions made through Christ. The Bible is full of this thought; Christ is the only hope. We never wish to be more charitable than God. That charity that sets aside God's law and holds out false

hopes to humanity, hopes while in disobedience to God, is no kith or kin to true divine charity that works by love. That saves through obedience to God.

The first question of our friend arises from a total misapprehension of death. Suffering and sorrow are death in one sense. Paul says, "I die daily," meaning he suffered and was afflicted daily. God said, in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. They did die the moment they touched it, in one, true, primary sense of death. They became mortal, suffering, perishing beings. This was death in the original, Divine use of the term. The devil used the term in a different sense, and humanity adopted the devil's use of the term rather than God's. Immortality is more than eternal existence. It is immunity from pain or suffering. It is freedom from corruption. Immortality is the opposite of eternal death—eternal suffering. With this divine meaning of these terms all is plain. Our existence is a continued death, a constant decay of our physical forces, renewed for a time, but finally wearing away, the last silken cord that binds together soul and body is snapped asunder, and what we call death is but the last act in a process of death, beginning in the womb and ending in the grave. This mortal suffering is frequently of God called death.

But in any meaning of death, it is not the end of sorrow and suffering to the wicked. We do not learn that it ends these to any. It passes them from this stage of corruption and sorrow to another. The second death, is an unending death, a per-

petual destruction—a place where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched—where there is wailing and gnashing of teeth. Neither death is spoken of as a termination of an existence of sorrow or suffering. That one is unalloyed suffering, unbroken woe. The second death is eternal death, never-ending suffering.

We are not sure we apprehend the purport of the last question. Annihilation is an impossibility—impossible with the character of God. He created matter and spirit to honor him. They will do it. To annihilate them would be to subvert the end for which they were created. God will not annihilate his own work, no other being in the universe can. It may be a weakness of mind to think God's love was exhausted in the gift of Christ. Yet it is a weakness that leads to true strength. It is a recognition of man's lost and hopeless condition that becomes the basis of true and abiding strength. If there are provisions of mercy outside of Christ, the Bible is not true. For it certainly places all mercies and blessings in and through him.

I simply ask our friend to lay aside his own preconceptions, his false ideas of human strength and wisdom, study the weakness of both his intellectual and moral nature (it is not totally depraved but is weak and frail, continually liable to be led wrong) read again carefully our articles, seeking not points for objection but seeking how much truth there may be in them, study the Bible earnestly to know the truth, as God sees it, and he will be benefitted.

D. L.

"WORSHIP GOD."

Religion may be divided into works and worship. Both must be done in obedience to God; but the former is for the good of man, while the latter is for the glory of God and the joy of the one who performs it. Neither can be neglected without calling down upon us the disapprobation of Heaven. They are wisely wedded. In nature, man cannot enjoy the highest degree of health and happiness without both eating and exercise. Let him cease exercise, the effect is indigestion; let him cease eating, the effect is starvation. So it is in religion: cease working, and you have spiritual indigestion which works infidelity; and cease worship, you have spiritual starvation which works superstition. Happy is he who in shunning Charybdis does not strike on Scylla.

In the present article, what is said of worship refers especially to individual worship, the foundation of all worship. From all that we know of the earth in its infancy, individual worship was the worship of the day. Even before the patriarchs, it must have existed; and all along through the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensation it lies nearest to the hearts of the pious. Abraham often prayed privately; seven times a day did David pray unto the Lord; and because "he kneeled upon his knees three times a day and prayed," Daniel was cast into the lions' den. Besides, it is said of every righteous man, that "his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night." The book of which this is a partial preface is

the best text-book of true devotion, showing the deep piety of that day.

The Savior says, "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret." This he illustrates by going away into the mountain and praying, and by his heart-rending agony in the garden of Gethsemane. Again he says, "when thou fastest, anoint thy head and wash thy face, that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father who is in secret." This he illustrates by his patience and want of parade in his temptation and last trials where he endured so much fasting and fatigue—where without breaking his fast from the last supper he bore on his brow the crown of thorns and on his back the cross of shame. And again he says, "when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth," which is illustrated by the adorable Redeemer's being led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearer—not opening his mouth in a word of complaint or a boast of revenge. Thus he gave himself a ransom for the world, and honor to God in the sacrifice.

The hypocritical leaders of the Jews, in the time of Jesus, had perverted private worship to get praise of men. We may learn from this fact and the foregoing lessons, that religion without its private element dwindles down to hollow hypocrisy. Either neglect or pervert from its pristine purpose this element and you take all heart out of religion. It is the salt of all divine service. Man in his weakness cannot continually come before the public without

pandering to the popular taste, unless he have this "balance of power" in religion—this constantly drawing nearer to God. Hence, the necessity of so much private devotion on the part of preachers. But the ministry are not in advance of what the whole brotherhood should be. Every member should be as zealous as the preacher of to-day is—should be as prayerful and as active. Then, we set it down as certain that no Christian can live long without more or less of the following secret service:

1. Daily study of the Scriptures is an obvious duty. The Savior says, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." This is pre eminently the food of the Christian, and as long as Christians neglect the study of the Scriptures they will be lean as Pharaoh's kine. The word is the seed of the kingdom, and until this seed be sown in good soil no grain will be gathered into the garner of God.

2. "Pray without ceasing" necessarily implies secret prayer, and that daily. Indeed we ought to deem it a glorious privilege to come to our heavenly Father with all our complaints, knowing that we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. "Pillow prayers" are not sufficient. They are too soft and airy—we want something more substantial. Meditations are good and right; but meditation and prayer are two distinct things. Paul speaks of "prayer and heart's desire," then prayer is not heart's desire. Prayer is expression of desire. Pride nor timidity should hinder us from coming before Jehovah on bended

knees. "Let us therefore come boldly unto a throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

3. Fasting is inculcated by the Savior as an individual service, with admonitions against hypocrisy. Fasting often tames the passions, and gives our better nature the sway. Hence, in time of great temptation and on other important occasions we should lean upon this appointment of the Lord.

All these observed would insure almost any one against the worst temptations, making one strong in the Lord and the power of his might. But how few are thus faithful! When will the day dawn again, that every saint shall be a host in himself, having on the whole armor of God? O, for the faith of other days! O for an Abraham, a Moses and a David; a Noah, a Job and a Daniel; a Peter, a Paul and a John, of whom the world was not worthy! "Wherefore, seeing we are also compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith."

C. M. WILMETH.

Intercession by Spirit.

Bro. Sewell: You say in the Advocate of the 11th Dec. 1873, page 1100, "If any man thinks he can give a Scriptural explanation, of how the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered," room shall be given for its publication."

I do not profess to be a writer, but I sometimes think. One thought that troubled me over twenty-five years ago, was the subject of the working of the Spirit. The particular passage in hand, of necessity, had to be dealt with. You shall have what satisfied my mind, and can use it for publication or not, as you deem well.

The general rule in reading the New Testament, is to make every passage where the word Spirit is used to mean the Holy Spirit of God. This is not correct. The eighth of Romans presents to us, at least, six Spirits—man's Spirit, 1st verse; Spirit of life, 2nd verse; Spirit of God, 9th verse; Spirit of Christ, 9th verse; Spirit of bondage, and Spirit of adoption, 15th verse. That the 12th verse, refers to man's spirit is clear, from reading it in connexion with the last verse of the preceding chapter, "So then with the mind, I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." The apostle here makes mind and Spirit synonymous. Even should we, with Beza, reject the latter part of this verse, the same principle is propounded in the fourth verse. The 16 v. all admit means man's spirit, when Paul says "the Spirit beareth witness with our Spirit." Now with all due reverence, I submit that the spirit, spoken of in the 26th and 27th verses is also the spirit of the Christian and not any of the other five Spirits named in the chapter.

We go back to the 23rd and 25th and learn that we Christians "groan

within ourselves, waiting for the redemption of our body," and with patience wait for it. Likewise the spirit, or mind, also helpeth our infirmities, from which infirmities we are to be delivered by the redemption of the body; for with the mind, or Spirit, we may serve God, while by the flesh we are led to sin. Rom. 7. 25. Our spirit helps us when we are unable to utter words to pray as we ought. These groanings of our mind within ourselves, to which we cannot find language to give utterance are intercessions for us with him who searcheth the hearts. God knoweth or acknowledgeth the mind of the Spirit when it maketh intercession. No man knows the spirit of another until he reveals himself by words or deeds, but God knows the spirit of man. The apostle carries us beyond this—to something almost inconceivable, and says he knows the "mind of the Spirit." It is easy to conceive the idea that God knows man's mind, but to get beyond this to the mind of the mind, or spirit is truly wonderful.

Every child of God has felt, at times, so impressed with the greatness of the love of God; at other times, so overwhelmed with grief, or his own want of proper appreciation of what Christ did for him, that it is impossible to express by the tongue what he feels in the heart. The poet seemed to have the idea I wish to be understood when he sang,

Prayer is the soul's sincere desire
Unuttered or expressed,
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast.

Prayer is the burden of a sigh
The falling of a tear;
The upward glancing of an eye
When none but God is near.

Paul wrote to the Ephesians, 6, 10, directing them to act in a similar way to that we have just been reading from the letter to the Romans and says, "praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints." Here, praying in the Spirit and watching were acts of the individuals addressed, and not deeds by the Spirit of God. He also tells them they may have blessings they are unable to pray for in words. "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us." Eph. 3rd. We "ask or think" in words, but these passages teach us we can pray in our spirits—away back in the innermost recesses of the heart—in the mind of the spirit, and expect from God favors above what we "ask or think." So I conclude Paul said the same to the Romans when he wrote, "the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered." No wonder the Saints cry out "How excellent are thy ways, O Lord."

R. B.

Away up in Tennessee.

BY J. M. BARNES.

(Continued.)

Friday, the two editors of the Gospel Advocate, brother Davis, and myself dined together at Bro. Sewell's home out in Edgefield, the pleasant town over the river.—I would like to say some things about these editors and their pleasant families, but must

spend the time in discussing the past usefulness, present worth and future prospects of the Gospel Advocate. I think all Christians should take religious papers, when these cause them to read the Bible more. I am much of the opinion that the degeneracy in piety, and love of the unadulterated truth, now so apparent to the discerning and thoughtful is to be attributed to the forsaking of the reading of the Bible or the lack of Bible knowledge. The generation of brethren just gone (a remnant of whom still linger on the shores of time) were well educated in the words of true wisdom found in the Bible, but perhaps much less acquainted with earthly things, with ancient and modern literature. Any religious paper that does not beget a desire for reading the Bible is not fit for a Christian to handle. Every writer, who wishes to benefit his brethren, weak and strong, should so dictate and pen as to direct the minds and affections of his readers to God and heaven through the word. Now I do not say the Gospel Advocate does this and other papers do not. I will say *it is a good paper*. I will say even more; I know a brother, who once read this paper and then he did not vote or trifle with politics, now he does; then he was punctual to go five miles on Lord's day and break bread with the brethren, now there is great complaint of him; then he went one Saturday in every month to attend to church business, now he can't leave the shoeshop; then he was ever ready to talk about some Bible theme; now he reads another paper. I do not say what has produced the change, but we are almost

sure to drink of the spirit of that we read, therefore we ought to draw from the book of books more than all. I do not take the tithe of a hair from the just deserts of other papers when I say the Advocate and Weekly are as sound as a Mexican dollar, still it is a common thing to find on the brethren's tables papers published farther from home, and these not there. We make a poor use of our judgment. A good blacksmith may be near a farmer, but he will go to the city and buy a Brinly, an Avery, a Lilly or a something else in the shape of a plow; a good wheelright may be ready to serve him, but his money goes northward for a Studebaker, Whitewater, Milburn or some other ring streaked, pided and green wagon; so about harness, ax-handles, and all other things from the smallest up to insuring lives, and the infatuation does not stop until it gets to religious papers, but reaches that lina of business and so there's where the money goes, and pop goes the Yankee's pocket book on it, and here we are a set of thoughtless thick heads, with eyes that see not and hearts that understand not that we are going down the hill of poverty as fast as time will move us on, with all our niggers and cotton. Mr. Jackson does not seem to understand that it is economy when he pays Mr Stough one hundred dollars to build him a wagon, and he, Mr. Stough, buys a horse from Mr. Jones for seventy five dollars, and he gives Mr. Saddler fifty for a yoke of oxen and M. Jackson receives for corn forty of the same money he paid out, which, when carried to Indiana or Illinois is gone forever and leaves a good mechanic

poorer by a hundred dollars, deprives the country of his services and robs it of the life that trade necessarily gives. By building up our neighbors, we strengthen ourselves, as the girl who married her cousin said, we keep the money in the family. But all want to slop the fatted sow.

The Advocate is not supported. The editors told me privately (and it may be confidentially but I'll let it out) that their services are given without remuneration. They offer the paper upon its own merits. They do not expect chromos, photographs, fashion bazaars, articles highly flavored with the strange, the romantic and sublime to attract you to it. But of its own weight it is expected to reach your attention. Ah, but I have some objection to the editors. What? "Well, I think brother Lipscomb was too severe on brother Kendrick." I do too. Bro. Lipscomb himself acknowledged he loaded his piece too heavy. He made as pretty confession as I ever saw. The man who sees his wrongs is not the one to fear, but he that blindly never knows his faults or knowing them proudly keeps them with persistent dishonesty. Who is the safe man, he that saw the storm would come and prepared for it, or he that saw it had come and contended against it; he that saw the Louisville Plan Society would be a stern self-willed power and fought it, or he that sees it has become such, and contends against it. Let us stand by our safe, true, faithful men. The times, the circumstances, the surroundings, demand it. I have seen men, who said they were running with a thing to

control it, but oh! is that right? Should we do evil that good may come? I have no confidence in men. It is only in so far as Christ reigns in him that I can trust any one. 'Tis only in this way that I can have a hope for myself. I do not "glory in man." 'Tis our privilege to use our brethren but not abuse them by slander or flattery. If brothers Lipscomb, Sewell and the Advocate are good servants then we have the right to turn their ability to advantage to the kingdom. 'Tis only in this light then I have said what I have. Believing this paper and the Weekly best suited to the furtherance of the cause in the South, we think the brethren should make a sacrifice to place them in the hands of all who will read. I think one good paper is better than several just barely able to get along. But the objection may be raised that the papers do not contain matter suited to the family, the uneducated brethren, and sinners. That may be true. A paper is to some extent what the brethren make it. Any brother can draw out information on any theme he thinks edifying by pursuing the proper course. All go to work then. I am willing to assist the brethren, to the extent of my ability in building the paper interest South. There is no such thing as doing too much good; after we have done all, we are unprofitable servants. Since we owe all to the Lord let us do all we can. I cannot leave Nashville without mentioning the very pleasant but short meeting with brothers Scobey and J. M. Carnes. The former has a good school at Murfreesboro, for young ladies, besides he is a preacher.

Every brother with whom I conversed spoke well of brother Scobey, still quite a number of their daughters, I found were going to Kentucky and Ward's at Nashville. There is again. What is the matter? Bro. Carnes is a good preacher, fine teacher, and editor of some experience and success. I have forgotten what else he is good at, for Jack-at-all-trades and good at none cannot be said of him. I do not have any idea he will think hard of me for saying I would be glad to hear of his settling down at preaching and sticking right to it, for I should expect to hear good results.

Old gray was discharged just as the bright spot in the West narrowed its semi circle down to nothing and was seen no longer. Bro. Davis and I shook hands hurriedly and he rested from his journey at his home, whilst I sprung into the buggy of brother Morris Bond, who had waited my arrival a long time. His horse, younger than the one that had just been turned in to corn and hay, and seemingly impatient with the delay, dashed on, whilst the shoes made the fire fly from the stone and the rattle of the wheels deafened the ears trying to catch the words of conversation. Saturday morning I awaked refreshed by a night's sweet repose at the house of brother James Sparkman, who helped me on my way to Beech Grove, the next battle ground, at which place I stood before the people at eleven o'clock and spoke to them the word of the Lord. This is a beautiful country, not so hilly as that around Hillsboro. The one is on Carter's Creek, the other on Leiper's Fork. The people, not to narrow

down to the brethren are seemingly clever and social. There was once a lively congregation here, but never very large I judge. War and other things had done a serious work. A few still clung to the faith and these were as true as any I ever met, so far as my judgment could discern. There was much to be done here and all seemed anxious to do it. The brethren expressed great satisfaction at the result of the meeting, but I have been sorry ever since I left, that I did not stay longer. Much good was done I trust and the harvest truly was still great for more labor. For a week incidents occurred here deeply interesting to me, but far more to the fathers, mothers, wives, husbands, sisters, brothers, neighbors, who witnessed the return of dear ones to the path of duty, and the submission of some to the law of the Lord. Bros. John Alexander, Potter, McConico, Roland Gooch, Rountree and others are of the more prominent brethren, and brethren Jas. Alexander and Dr. Terrill took their stand again with their brethren. I do not see anything in the way of this church's increasing its numbers and widening its influence. Right in this connection, I will say, I see churches that have no preachers and do not regard these as an absolute necessity—a *sine qua non*. I like that. A church should be—yes is a self-existent institution. From it the gospel sounded out anciently and it was the pillar and ground of truth. Preachers seem to be intended for the spread of the gospel, not to pet churches, or to be pets of churches. This is a work too little and belittling for preachers or churches. There is

too much ignorance in the church. There is a dignity that belongs to it and this should be asserted by holding the spread of the gospel as a heaven-granted prerogative. Every Christian should esteem it a privilege to participate in sending good tidings abroad. The churches I visited in Tennessee, do a good work in having the gospel preached in their own community, but is there not another work they could engage in? Several brethren told me of a district of country, in which there are a few brethren and no churches. Now brother Davis I dare say would love to do such a work. But he has a large family and cannot do it by himself. The gospel should sound out from Hillsboro, Boston, Beech Grove, South Harpeth and the echo should be heard as it comes up from the waste places, giving glory to God through his church. The brethren at these places will take no offence at my suggestions. I found them doing well so far as this world is concerned. That is, they have as fine lands as I ever saw, health good, plenty to live upon and something to sell. I remarked that Alabamians go in debt for the necessaries of life. Tennesseans, said some one, do the same for the luxuries. I do not know that this is true, but if it is, it should not be so. I have seen enough to be perfectly satisfied, that those who owe men, will seldom pay the Lord. The people that I visited are doing so much better than we do, I am reluctant to make a suggestion. I do think however that our brethren should have a good high-school at every church and all support it. I am no great advocate for colleges and

universities, but say *on* with the high school. More can be learned, more is learned here than in any other school. 'Tis saying but little for a people, when it is told that they cannot agree in this particular.

Educational.

According to recent announcements, made through the public prints of a proposed meeting at Plano, to consider the educational interests of the Disciples in Northern Texas, the same being respectably responded to by brethren from the counties of Lamar, Fannin, Hopkins, Kaufman, Collin, Dallas and Tarrant, the following proceedings were had with a view to the consummation of the objects proposed :

PLANO, TEXAS, Nov. 21, 1873.

The meeting organized at 11 A. M., by electing Prof. Charles Carlton, of Bonham, Chairman, and J. R. Wilmeth, of McKinney, Secretary. The object of the meeting was then briefly stated by the chairman, to be, *The establishment of a First-Class High School in Northern Texas, to be owned and controlled by the Christian Church.* Adjournment then took place till 1 P. M., at which hour business was introduced by Chairman reading the initiatory resolutions adopted last summer.

On motion of Bro. W. N. Bush, a Committee on Territory to be embraced was appointed; but the measure of the report failed of adoption, it being decided better to leave the matter open to all the churches in the State that may feel sufficient interest to take part in the movement.

At the suggestion of Bro. R. M.

Gaño, the following resolutions severally succeeded to unanimous adoption :

Resolved, That two brethren from each place desiring the location of the Collage, be appointed by this meeting, to ascertain the advantages and inducements of their respective localities, and report the same to a meeting of delegates from the churches of Christ hereby called to convene at this place December 30, 1873.

Resolved, That to this convention—to be composed of all the Churches of Christ in the State that shall see cause to put in representation—shall be submitted the question of location with the information furnished by report of committee, and that said delegation then convened shall determine the location of the school according to the merits of the points in nomination.

Resolved. That representation to the convention may be made directly or by proxy, on the basis of one voice to each twenty members, each delegate being required to present written authority from the church or churches by him represented.

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION.

Dr. J. S. Sizemore and J. J. Aiken, Dallas; W. N. Bush, and P. T. Smith, Plano; Thos. H. Murray and J. H. Jenkins, McKinney; A. L. Darnall and T. J. Brown, Sherman; Dr. J. S. Saunders and C. Carlton, Bonham; V. W. Hale and E. L. Dohoney, Paris; J. W. Pate and L. W. Scott, Sulphur Springs; Jas. Dowthett and Dr. Wm. Eddleman, Pilot Point; J. L. Lovejoy and Philip Miner, Denton; H. R. Simonds and Thos. Ready, Greenville; N. H. O. Póly and Eld. Wilkerson

Rockwall; T. H. Turner and J. M. Wilkes, Mt. Vernon.

Any other points desiring the College can appoint their own committee to present their claims.

Resolved, That we request the publication of these minutes in the *American Christian Review*, *GOSPEL ADVOCATE*, *Apostolic Times*, the newspapers of this County, and all others in Northern Texas friendly to the enterprise.

C. CARLTON,
(Chairman.)

J. R. WILMETH, Sec.

NOTE—It is desirable, as a matter of economy and encouragement to confidence, that all be on hand promptly at 11 A. M., of the 30th. The brethren of Plano will be pleased to entertain all who may come from a distance. Arrangements are being made to secure the usual excursion accommodations, or half fare to those convenient to the lines of Rail Road; of which notice will be given as soon as ascertained.

J. R. W.

Obituaries.

Died of consumption October the 10th 1873 Sister Tennessee Anderson, wife of brother T. M. Anderson. Sister Anderson was born September 4th 1816. Sister Anderson leaves a wife and seven children to mourn their loss. One single daughter in care of the family who with kind and careful nursing waited on her mother day after day. Her mother was near and dear to her. She bore her sickness with patience and said she was not afraid to die. She admonished her children to be Christians. She has been a member of the Christian church for many years. She was a kind and affectionate nurse. She went far and near to visit the sick. Many will miss her though, blessed hope,

J. T. JONES,

Mill Creek Hickman Co. Tenn.,

It pains me to record the death of all my dear little children. Little Jama L. Jones, and little Johnny J. Jones, daughter and son of J. T. and Nancy A. Jones. Little Jama died of Diphtheria, was taken Saturday the 27th following, and died the 13th of November 1873. Little Jama was four years one month and 12 days old. Little Johnny was one year nine months and eight days old, both died of Diphtheria. It is hard to have to give up our dear and loving children. They went hand in hand, the older leading the younger. But thanks to God they have gone to a better world than this. Oh may we be prepared to meet them on that great and notable day, and be wafted home with them where parting will be no more. Blessed hope.

Side by side they both do sleep
Their little forms how fair.
I know it is vain for me to weep.
Yet how can I forbear

But few days gone I saw them well
Their cheeks were like the rose
But now they both, tis sad to tell
In death's cold arms repose.
But their sweet dust shall rise again,
And bring a beautiful form
And we will meet them in the air,
Far far from every storm.

J. T. JONES.

Mill Creek Hickman Co. Tenn.

CHURCH NEWS.

Bros. L & S.: We have just closed a meeting at Nevill's Prairie, Houston Co., Texas, with eight additions. The church is very much revived, and the Sunday School interest advanced.

With our beloved bro. Reed, an old veteran in the Cause, and one who is well taught in word and doctrine—aided by bro. Hamilton, and Sister E. D. Glover, we expect much from the church at that place. Sister Glover is an untiring worker in the good cause. One such sister, in every congregation, would work wonders for good. The Lord bless the brethren at Nevill's Prairie.

JNO. T. POE.

Huntsville, Texas, Nov. 24, 1873.

can be disobeyed with impunity; and he has commanded repentance, faith and baptism,

The following rules ought to be learned and followed.

1. I ought to give because it is God's will.

2. Because God is always giving to me.

3. God has attached large promises to giving. I must not forget this.

4. Giving will be promotive of my own happiness.

5. The subjects of necessity are numerous.

6. The opportunity of giving, will soon pass away.

7. These gifts will be remembered in the judgment. How unspeakably desirable is Christ's appeal.

8. Have I not been remiss in times past?

9. Gratitude for the unspeakable gift of God's dear son ought to move me to give.

10. I ought to give "as God has prospered"—that is in proportion to the means placed in my hands. The widow with her two mites is not relieved from the obligation, and the rich are called upon to give according to their abundance.

11. I should give liberally—not to stinted measure.

12. I ought to give cheerfully, not grudgingly.

13. My gifts should be the result of principle—not of mere whim, or under the influence of exciting appeals. I should give in respect to proper objects, and purpose in my heart to give.

14. I ought to give frequently. This is God's plan. "On the first day of the week, let every one of you

lay by him in store as God hath prospered."—*Christian Monitor.*

Vick's Floral Guide.

The January number of this beautiful and abundantly illustrated catalogue, by James Vick, of Rochester New York, is on our table. He presents therein a very extensive variety of garden and flower seeds, and many hints and suggestions in regard to cultivation and management of flowers &c., with many handsome illustrations of flowers and vegetables. The Guide is published quarterly at 25 cts. a year. Flower and vegetable raisers would certainly be profited by a careful perusal of it. You can obtain it by sending twenty-five cents to James Vick, Rochester New York.

E. G. S.

If thou desire the love of God and man, be humble; for the proud heart, as it loves none but itself, so it is beloved of none but itself. The voice of humility is God's music, and the silence of humility is God's rhetoric.—Humility enforces where neither virtue nor strength can prevail, nor reason.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The Franklin Debate.....	24
Jesus' Consolatory discourse to his disciples	29
Future Rewards and punishments.....	34
"Worship God".....	38
Intercession by Spirit.....	39
Away up in Tennessee.....	41
Educational.....	45
Obituaries.....	46
Church News.....	46
Reformation in Catholicism.....	47
Giving.....	47
Vick's Floral Guide.....	48

Reformation in Catholicism.

Some prominent Catholics in Geneva are making some high movements in the way of reform and their efforts are seconded and encouraged by others in different sections of Europe. The principal items in the reformatory movements are, "universal instruction in the Bible. The abolition of the obligatory confession; of perpetual vows, and of forced celibacy; public worship to be in the vernacular tongue of the people; the communion to be administered with bread and wine, and no pay to be received for masses, prayers, funerals, baptisms and kindred services." These are bold and independent movements for the Catholics, and are causing quite a stir in the dominions of the "old mother."

Hyacinthe, a prominent official married a wife last March, and vast numbers of the Catholics in different parts of Europe are approving it, and sustaining him in this step. Geneva, the principal of a former reformation, is now the chief centre of another reformatory struggle. That may be more powerful and extensive in its results than the former one. A reformatory movement of this sort will probably be more extensively felt than to secede entirely from the shackles of the old mother. But how far this reformation may go towards abolishing error and establishing truth, is yet to be decided. The great trouble has generally been in such cases, that while reformers have successfully fought some of the most glaring errors of the old system, they have established new systems, and new denominations, not

much better than the old ones. Witness the result of the work of Luther, and Calvin, and Wesley. While they successfully opposed many existing errors, each one stands at the head of a new denomination, never known to exist before, in some respects at least, as objectionable as the denominations from which they came. Yet it must be admitted that these men, and especially Luther did much in the way of putting the word of God into the hands of the people, and causing many others to advance still further in the elimination of truth from the errors of past ages and generations. Great movements always have to be made slowly. Hence while these reformers and their followers failed to reach the whole truth, they prepared the way for others to reach more of it than they themselves had done, or than others would have done had not these great reformers lived before them, and prepared the way for them. And hence, though the present movement at Geneva may only result in the establishment of another party or denomination, they are advocating some things that will most certainly result in good hereafter, and in other places besides Geneva. We always hail with pleasure the dawning of light, let it come from what quarter it may.

E. G. S.

GIVING.

Some people in becoming members of the church, do not seem to realize that supporting the gospel by their money, is as much a test of Christianity as obedience to the ordinance of baptism. No command of God

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 3

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JAN. 15, 1874.

OUR MOTTO.

“Where God speaks we'll speak, where he is silent let us be silent.” Bro. Sewell, in No. 45, last vol. of the GOSPEL ADVOCATE, you make a suggestion to the writer of an article, headed, “By grace are ye saved” and we are seated this very rainy Lord's day to try, under the guidance of the great head of the church, to answer in our humble and plain manner, as best we can, in the light of the Scriptures. Something near forty years since, we embraced the above motto, with all our heart, thereby obtaining, with the fullest confidence, the hope of eternal life, which we still continue by the grace of God, tenaciously to adhere to; we also fully recognized as substantially true, the old maxim that actions speak louder than words; this we also yet regard as true to the letter. At that time our teaching brethren were few and humble, to what they are now. We had no Bible Colleges nor theological institutions, and not so many big I's and little U's. But more charity, (or love) and our big meetings and social worship were

of a very different character from what they are now. Christian love and union prevailed, and a flow of brotherly love seemed to well up in every bosom, and the tears of affection often to flow down, while extending the hand of fellowship and greeting. We often fervently pray for such seasons of joy and rejoicing in the Lord to return. But alas, those golden days are gone, and the practice of brethren and sisters extending the hand of Christian greeting and fellowship in social worship are only now known as things of the better and bygone past. But, instead thereof, we find at our big meetings it is all maneuvering; Plans, schemes, and inventions of men to extort money from the people of the faithful and credulous; hence the great effort to add many members to the church without any regard to a proper understanding of God's institutions. Paul admonishes the disciples to go on to perfection; Peter exhorts his brethren to grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the the Law of Christ.” Gal. 6-2. Forbearing one

another and forgiving one another, 3-13, we are fearful that these gracious admonitions are fearfully neglected, and the little departures and additions of which we spake in our former article, are fast taking the place of sound teaching.

But in reference to the mode of receiving members from one congregation to another we admit there is no thus saith the Lord in so many words, yet we can certainly have some consistent rule of Practice; for instance, if we require a letter from a member of the Church of Christ, shall we require less from members of other churches? certainly not. But as letters are nowhere taught nor demanded in the Scriptures; let us therefore examine the divine record, and see if there is not a better way. The question reads, "how shall they be received? The Christ in his beautiful sermon on the Mount, lays down a rule that is perfect in all its bearings and on this subject he says; by their fruits ye shall know them" (not by a church letter.) The same idea is again expressed by the blessed teacher in John's testimony 13-35 "by this shall all men know you are my disciples, if you have love one for another;" (not by letter). Again, if we say we have fellowship with him (God) and walk in darkness we do lie and do not the truth 1 John 1, 6, and a letter from a neighboring church cannot make it truth. "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanseth us from all sin;" "we know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren;" John 3-14 once more

from the beloved John; "by this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments; for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous;" so by this unfailling rule of love first taught by the Master and so faithfully impressed on the minds of the disciples by the Apostles, we think we have an unerring rule by which we may recognize each member in full assurance of faith; (without the aid or addition of a church letter.) But oh says one, the church is in great danger of being imposed upon by wicked and designing men. But is it not equally dangerous on the other hand? would it not be quite easy for a wicked or bad man to write a letter, and pass it off as a genuine letter if he so desired? We do not believe that any such pleas are sufficient. If so, the whims, and fables taught by these different parties, are just as good as the Gospel of Christ, which Paul said was "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." And we are wrong in our teaching and they are right. But what saith the Scriptures? the great commission saith, "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved. Mark 16-16. Believes what? why believes the Gospel of course, for that was what the apostles were to preach. Do the denominations believe the gospel? surely not. The gospel nowhere speaks of getting religion at a mourners bench, or by praying or being prayed for; this is evidently what they believe, themselves being witnesses. We contend and think we have fully shown they do not believe the Gospel, therefore their baptism

is of no value. But says one they have been immersed, therefore they have obeyed, whether they either knew or intended it. In this connexion we must say that it is beyond our comprehension of the goodness, justice, love, mercy and truth, of God if he ever pardons or forgives the sins of any person, either Jew or Gentile, because he accidentally performed an act, not knowing why he did it; and if the sects obey in the act of baptism, it is evidently an accident, and not in obedience to the faith. We contend as to the design of baptism, it is just as consistent to receive persons on their baptism that were baptized in infancy as these that were baptized in adult age, for they are both equally without the faith of the Gospel. According to their own showing, they do not believe the great truth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and on this rock they are broken. But we are still requested to give some plain and pointed Scriptural instruction on this subject; this we will try to do in a very plain manner, and in the words of the Spirit's teaching. "And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper coast, came to Ephesus, and finding certain disciples he said unto them, have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed? and they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were you baptized? and they said unto John's baptism; then said Paul: John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance; saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ. When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 19, 1-6. These most assuredly were baptized only with John's baptism, or the baptism of repentance; this was judged by an inspired apostle to be insufficient, and they had to be rebaptized before they were admitted to the privilege and fellowship of the disciples. Modern Baptists are now baptized into the Baptist church not on a confession of the Christ. Are they in any better condition than those ancient Baptists? If so, in what respect, for both have been baptized in error, and if John's baptism were decided by an inspired apostle to be insufficient and rebaptism commanded, when modern Baptists believe our teaching, would it not be more consistent with our motto at least to require the same as did the Apostles? and this would not leave them in doubts and condemnation through life; for the Christ saith, "I am the way, the truth and the life, and no man cometh to the Father but by me." The question then arises, how do we get into Christ? the Scriptures teach that we come into Christ by baptism, not by getting religion, telling an experience of Grace and being baptized into the Baptist church; but by believing, repenting, confessing Christ and being baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit for the remission of sins. If the sects have not done this, we teach that according to the divine will they are out of Christ, out of his kingdom, and if their mind has changed, their acts must correspond with that change by submitting to

the divine will in obedience to faith before they can be regarded as children of the kingdom, for straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leads to life, and few there be that find it; for ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, and as we have received Christ so let us continue to walk in him, with all long suffrance. This we can only do by following the motto at the head of this article which will cut off very many of our little additions added by way of expediency and accommodations; and we will then be able to stand united in the one body and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling, and by the patience of hope and the labor of love, the church will be comparable to a city that is set on a hill which cannot be hid, and be enabled to cause the light and influence of the Gospel to be shed forth to the honor and glory of its great author.

A DISCIPLE.

Our good brother will allow me to suggest that he has certainly misapprehended the point we desired should be made. None of our brethren, so far as known to me, believe that anything will make a Christian, except an humble obedience to the gospel of Christ, as presented in the New Testament. None of us believe that any of the systems of sectarianism as taught by sects and parties will make Christians. But the people in this country all have access to the Bible, and we think it possible for the people to read the Bible for themselves, and understandingly

obey it in spite of their teachers or preachers. The plain simple Gospel of Christ as presented in the preaching of the apostles, is much plainer and far more easily understood than the preaching of any system of modern sectarianism. If the people would only read the preaching of the apostles they could understand the process of becoming a christian as taught by them twice, where they can understand any modern system of conversion once. And we do not doubt but that some do this, and actually become Christians according to the word of God. So plain and simple is the Gospel of Christ as preached by the apostles, that thousands could and did understand from hearing one single discourse, and became Christians the very first day they heard it. Sad indeed would we feel to think that the plan of salvation as revealed in the New Testament is so obscure as to be understood by none who are brought up under the systems of error that abound in our country, and by which we verily believe that the masses of the people are blinded. And in receiving persons that have thus obeyed the gospel into our number and fellowship, we do not wish it to be understood that we in any manner endorse the false systems of the day. All who obey the Gospel of Christ are Christians, no matter where they may do this. And wherever we find such we should call earnestly upon them to come out of Babylon, and stand with the people of God, with his word as their entire guide. Such is the voice of God in Revelation; "Come out of her my people." But our brother refers to the twelve at

Ephesus, who had been baptized to John's baptism by Apollos, whom Paul baptized in the name of the Lord when he had more fully instructed them, as an infallible and invariable example for us to go by, as regards the denominations around us. The cases are not at all parallel. The twelve at Ephesus did not have the New Testament to look to as the people now have. All the twelve knew, was what Apollos taught them, and he knew only the baptism of John, and as he knew nothing else, he could teach nothing else. And wherever the people at the present time are as ignorant of the plan of salvation as the twelve were, then of course treat them as Paul did. But such is not the case with the persons about whom we are writing. The characters about whom we are speaking, are such as hear our preaching before they present themselves to stand with us. They hear us present the gospel in all its fullness. They hear us teach plainly that this gospel must be believed with the heart. They also hear us teach that the believer must also repent, confess the name of Christ and be baptized into him. That upon the doing of these things, he has the promise of the remission of his sins, but that without these things he has no such promise. Then after hearing these things they come forward claiming they have done them already. Now what is to be done in this case? Such persons are wholly unlike the twelve at Ephesus. They had as yet had no chance to understand the Gospel or its obedience, when Paul found them. The people now have the New Testament to go by, and it certainly is in their power to understand it. And where, with these opportunities they claim that they did understand and obey the Gospel as presented by us from the word of the Lord, who has the right to demand them to do these same things again. In the case of the twelve, they did what they had not done before. In such cases as these, they would do again what they had already done, and be nothing benefitted by it. Now we do not pretend to say that all who come to us to stand with us upon the Bible really understood and obeyed the Gospel of Christ, but we do claim that it is possible for them to have done so, and when they claim to have understood and obeyed, we certainly can do nothing but receive them, without making any demand upon them further in these matters. If we do, and they submit to it for the sake of being with us upon the true foundation, it would be submission to us, and not to God, and could do no good. But we want it distinctly understood that we do not believe that anything will make a Christian but an obedience to the Gospel as presented by the apostles. The get religion systems of modern invention, will not make Christians. Neither will any system of infant baptism make Christians. All these systems are entirely unknown in the New Testament, and can have nothing to do with making Christians. But wherever the Gospel of Christ is obeyed, the result is a Christian. These Christians may, and doubtless some of them do take their stand in Babylon, and need to be called out. Now these

are the kinds of persons that we think would not be benefitted by being baptized again. But if they have not thus obeyed the gospel, they should be called upon to do so, just like outside sinners. And we further state, that as regards persons who have only had water sprinkled or poured upon them, we all believe they have not been baptized at all, and none would be troubled for a moment in regard to such cases. We have never yet known one such received. And where we are known at all as a people, it is known that we teach that nothing but immersion is baptism, and the people all know that they could not be received among us without it, and will not try. So no trouble in that matter.

E. G. S.

The Late Brents-Ditzler Bebate.

NOTICE OF DIVERS BOLD ASSERTIONS
AND SINGULAR MISCONCEPTIONS.

It is much to be regretted that in a great debate, involving the investigation of matters of profound interest, like that lately held in Franklin, so much time should have been misspent in predicating what purported to be important arguments, upon mere assertions, which although entirely unsustainable, were yet urged with a pertinacity that necessitated the consumption of much precious time, in rejoinders and sur-rejoinders, that might otherwise have been spent to good purpose in the edification and entertainment of the audience. I allude now to the crude trivialities and nullities so confidently affirmed of the Jordan and kindred matters,

by the renowned champion of affu-sionism.

Finding in his devious up-stream pilgrimage, like the Palmer in days of yore, that

“Jordan am a hard road to travel,” the learned anti-immersionist was compelled, in order to get along at all, to zigzag and talk about fearfully in pursuing his line of argument—a course more tortuous even than the sinuosities of the Jordan it elf—that *crookedest* of all crooked rivers—for it is conceded by geographers that this world-renowned river out-meanders the Meander itself.

It is the object of the remarks here submitted, to pursue this wily, serpentine, Hudibrastic disputant around some of the frantic curves of his erratic course of argumentation on this subject, in the hope that the candid statement I shall make—though it will not fall under *his* observation—may, nevertheless, meet the eyes or reach the ears and consciences of some of those who may have been thus strangely misled, and serve to disabuse their minds of any false impressions they may have imbibed upon the subject. And for effectuating this purpose I crave sufficient space on the pages of the “Advocate” of truth and righteousness.

Let me here disavow the indulgence of anything savoring in the least of any unkind feelings towards Dr. Ditzler—albeit I learn that he has on more than one public occasion, honored my name with rather aspersive, not to say abusive epithets—a kind of aspersion to which aspersionists are not a little addicted as the most effective species of logic to which they can resort, when com-

pletely floored, as, sooner or later they are bound to be.

But, that I am not actuated by animosity, prejudice or any improper feeling or motive whatever must be readily conceded when I candidly affirm that I have no sympathy with those who so strongly impugn his motives and his *modus operandi*; or depreciate his rare acquisitions and splendid abilities. That he is a ripe, if not a polished scholar, a polyglott of no mean attainments, full of oriental lore, and a very library of polemic theology, are facts that must be conceded on all hands. And that he should adroitly dodge an argument, display the *ignis fatuus, non comestabile in swampo*, and take every available short cut, *siccopede*, when contending with a man of such rare biblical attainments and gigantic powers as Dr. Brents, is a species of tactics necessitated by the nature of the case.

As far as the interests of the subjects under discussion are concerned, I can but regard Dr. D. as a blessing to the cause—a blessing in disguise, however. For, all that even the most mooted points of primeval Christianity ask for their acceptance is a simple presentation; and this Dr. D. is pre-eminently instrumental in securing for them. True, he will do us harm, should he be permitted to go about lecturing, without being confronted by some one worthy of his steel to measure arms with him; for he is not the man to be set right by any mere Priscilla or Aquila—yet awhile; however moderated and modified of late. And thus impressed, gladly would I unite with others, in handsomely maintaining our

able, accomplished, conscientious and dignified brother Apollos (Dr. B.) for the purpose of meeting him in debate at all the important points of interest throughout the length and breadth of the land.

But—to the subject about which I took up my pen to write:—not, however, without first appealing to the brotherhood seriously to consider the suggestion just thrown out. We owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Brents, for which no amount of money or of honor that we can bestow upon him would be an equivalent *quid pro quo*. And at the same time I may remark that should our beloved brother be disposed to “tarry by the stuff,” and repose awhile on his laurels, or on any account be constrained to decline the honor, I know of many others, divers of whom were in attendance on the debate—all men of mark, and able disputants—to whose skill we may safely entrust the interests of the good cause. There was in attendance upon the discussion, earnestly engaged in taking notes, that experienced old stager, the erudite Fanning, a mighty heresy-hunter before the Lord, who has planted so many churches in Tennessee and Alabama, as the result of his various discussions and extensive evangelizings. Directly facing the disputants sat also another diligent note-taker—the dauntless, imperturbable and indomitable Sweeny, scarcely yet in his prime, though already the renowned victor on forty fields; who has placed so many able combatants *hors du combat*, without ever receiving a single discomfiture. Likewise “among them taking notes” sat two other able leaders of the people, both in

council and on the field—Lipcomb and Sewell; who, though their special vocation is to ply the pen of the ready writer, have not hesitated a moment to “jeopardize their lives unto death in the high places of the field”—each of whom, not satisfied with laurels won in hard fought pitched-battles on the tented field, are always aggressively skirmishing at the out-posts: Let me also make mention of the Old Virginia evangelist-general, Abel, tried and true, who was also at the debate; and who lately gained such a decisive victory over the Canaanites of the hill country of the Old Dominion. The cause would be safe in the hands of any one of these champions of Truth, and of many more that might be named—Ditzlerism to the contrary notwithstanding, in all its array of false issues, sophistry and special pleadings. Pickens, I am sure, would like to get some more good pickings out of him—to say nothing of Ajax Wilkes and others that have feasted on his savory bill of fare.

Well spake the sage of Monticello—when he remarked that “Error ceases to be dangerous when reason is left free to combat it.” But then again he truly observed that “Error can run all over the land while Truth is putting on his boots.” Let Ditzler therefore be promptly looked after, in his adventures of ecclesiastical knight errantry. 'Tis not the part of policy or honor to sit still while this vaunting Goliath is at one time defying the army of Israel, and at others furtively delivering tirades against us, from Dan to Beersheba, “not ceasing to pervert the right ways of the Lord.” Let him be at once

challenged to the conflict; and should he refuse to take up the gauntlet let him be watched and tracked in his crusade against Truth, wherever he may oppose the Truth.

But once more, to the assertions upon which I propose animadverting. Amongst the groundless assertions to which I have reference—and which so plainly show that Dr. D. has contracted that singular malady yeclapped, in the non-logical nomenclature of ecclesiasticism, “Hydrophobia sectariaua,” are the following: That *John the Baptist could not have baptized the people in the River Jordan, not only because of the depth of the stream and the rapidity of the current, but on account of the low temperature of the water caused by its main tributaries supplied by the melted snow of Lebanon!*

But sorry am I that, having already occupied more space than I intended appropriating to the whole article, I am constrained to restrict myself in refuting the foregoing assertions, to a mere synoptical statement of a few isolated facts, instead of citing copious and numerous extracts from the works of Josephus, Robinson, Kitto, Porter, Stanly, Van de Velde, Lynch, Smith, and other standard authorities.

And 1st.—As to *the depth of the Jordan*: While in some places it may be fifteen or twenty feet deep, and even more; and in others only about two, its average depth at ordinary stages, may be stated at six or seven feet. In breadth it varies from thirty feet to two hundred and fifty, and occasionally expands to three, four, and even five hundred feet. When thus widened out its

depth is usually two or three feet. "There are hundreds of places where one might walk across without wetting his feet" by stepping from rock to rock. It is altogether undeniable that while its average or general depth is some six or seven feet, its exceptional depth in innumerable places is only two, three, or four feet. So much then for the objection on the score of depth! Truly they that are clothed in soft raiment and dwell in kings houses would have no difficulty in finding a suitable, convenient and pleasant place for immersion in such a river as this! What obstacle then was there in the way of "John the Insinker" as Dr. D. Christens the Baptist—a Nazarite who was disciplined to the use of every kind of hardship, out in the waste howling wilderness; whose clothing was a sheet of camels hair cloth bound around him with a girdle and whose food was grass-hoppers and wild honey—the honey-shuck pod of the Caroub tree in all probability.

2nd. In relation to the rapidity of the current. The range is still greater than that of the depth—varying as it does from a horizontal surface to an almost perpendicular fall. While the average calculated descent is about eleven feet per mile, yet,—making due allowance for the greater rate of current at the twenty-seven long descents, and a very large number of shorter precipitous rapids—it would scarcely exceed four or five, to the mile as a general average. Dr. Smith states the rate of stream as varying from two to eight miles per hour; and by some authors it is said to "creep along sluggishly." Of course the velocity of the current

varies with its relative width and depth. The fords of Jordan are numerous; and scores of Arabs—men women and children may be seen crossing, at depths varying from two to four feet. But even during the great "swellings" of the river, when "Jordan overfloweth all his banks; as also at ordinary stages of water, there must needs be numerous eddies and extensive localities, where the occurrence of ledges of rocks, and the alternating in-jutting of rocky promontories that occasion its sinuous meanderings. (Whence *Sinus* a bay; where the water is tranquil.) The 'large number of Islands' too, that exist throughout the entire course of the river, must necessarily break the force of the current both in front and rear.—causing shallow as well as still water. If four miles per hour be assumed as the average rate of flow where neither falls, eddies nor placid water—immersion is not only conveniently practiceable. but such a current is even desirable, inasmuch as it co operates favorably with the administrator in the raising or resurrection of the subject from the liquid grave. But surely when it is to be remembered that thousands of pilgrims, amongst whom are many old women and little girls and boys annually bathe at a locality where the current is even stronger than this, and the water on the opposite shore is more than head-deep, nothing more need be said in order fully to obviate all objection on the score of rapidity of current as opposing the perfect feasibility of immersion and the facility with which the ordinance may be administered.

And now, as to the statement, upon

which Dr. D. insists so strenuously—the low temperature of the water, owing to the large (alleged) contribution of snow-water, from Lebanon; be it known, *imprimis*, that not one single drop of water, that flows from Mount Lebanon, whether supplied by dissolved snow and ice or by natural fountains ever reaches the Jordan!! It is all discharged into the Mediterranean ocean, as any one may perceive on reference to the map of Syria. Neither is the Jordan indebted to Anti-Lebanon, except for a few small streamlets; and these too, not from any snow clad ridges. 'Tis true however, that from the two snowy peaks of Mt. Hermon, sometimes regarded as being a continuation of the Anti Lebanon ridge, a few insignificant rills find their way into Lake Huley, (the Merom of the Scriptures) and after long detention in that shallow lake, and subsequently in the Sea of Tiberias—(where even if they were large streams instead of mere rills, they would be thoroughly warmed in those hot depressions)—they ultimately mingle with the Jordan. Nearly all the Waters of Hermon, however, like those of Anti-Lebanon find their way into the Lakes near Damascus, as is evident upon looking upon any correct map of that region.

But suppose, for argument's sake, that the River Jordan, instead of being formed almost exclusively by the junction of the streams flowing from the three immense fountains of Hasbeiya, Tell el-Kadi and Banaas, actually originated in the melting snows of Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon and Hermon, and were not at all warmed by their long detention in the low, hot region of Merom, Tiberias, and

cauldron of the Ghor or valley of the Jordan, their temperature would still be rendered pleasant, and indeed too warm in many places by the accession of small streams, as for example, near Hieromax, where "copious streams flow from the ten hot Springs that give large accessions to its volume." What now becomes of Dr. D.'s frigid argument.

The hot springs interspersed all along the valley of the Jordan, from Lake Tiberias to the Dead Sea—just let me observe in passing—are to this day as they ever have been, famous places of resort for the recovery of health—a fact that completely upsets the assumption of Dr. D. (originating, no doubt in the fabled unhealthiness of the Deadsea region) that the valley of the Jordan was so unhealthy that neither John the baptist nor the people would risk their lives in its pestilential vapors. What a blunder it is to affirm, in support of the insalubriousness of that region, that there were no considerable towns along the valley of the Jordan, any school boy can perceive on looking at the map of ancient Palestine. It is a fact so notorious that it has passed into an apothegm, that "it takes great men to make great mistakes," and truly Dr. D. is great in making mistakes—mistakes too, that are diametrically opposed to the truth. As for example, his oft repeated declaration that, "rain never falls in the winter in Palestine." Whereas the fact is—and facts are stubborn things—winter is the only season of the year during which it falls; or to speak more accurately, there is no rain from April to November. Equally unfortunate is he

in several other statements of similar matters.

Some palliation however, may be found in the fact that he has adopted too confidently, and yet we may hope unwittingly, the inventions of some very learned and ingenious Doctors of divination, who were evidently very far gone with that most insidious disease, baptismal hydrophobia, superinduced by over-dosing with such nostrums as tincture of tradition and spirit of party. Witness, for example, the oracle uttered by Dr. Robinson, in one of those regular paroxysms of Sectarian Lunacy, as recorded in his Lexicon, under the article *baptidzo*—"There is in Summer no running stream in the vicinity of Jerusalem, except the mere rill of Siloam a few rods in length; and the city is and was supplied with cisterns and public reservoirs. From neither of these sources could a supply have been obtained for the immersion of 8000 persons"!!

Still more astonishing, if possible, is the declaration of the Rev. Ash el Fairfield, in his work on baptism—"There is no river within forty miles of the city!" . . . Dr Barclay thinks he has discovered Enon six miles South East of Jerusalem. The spring he describes ebbs and flows every six minutes. (City of the Great King pp. 569, 570.) . . . There were cisterns underneath many private dwellings; but these could be no more available for immersion than a common well . . . Then though there were large pools or tanks in or near the city, they were not so constructed as to allow a number of persons at the same time to make use of them for the immersion of others. . .

. . . Dr. B. who is a Baptist, seems to have proved that what has heretofore been taken as the pool of Bethesda is nothing more than an immense moat, &c." Now what a very unfair child this sage Doctor of Divination is, plainly appears on the face of any map of Judea, where it is seen that not only the Auoujeh and Rubin Rivers, (streams navigable for small schooners a short distance) are within forty miles of Jerusalem, to say nothing of the River Kelt and other smaller streams, and many sheets of water admirably adapted to the wholesale administration of the ordinance, but the river Jordan itself is within less than half that distance!! But by turning to the City of the Great King; and reading the whole article as referred to by him, it will be observed that this great tergiversating Divination doctor aforesaid is guilty of a still more shameful perversion: for instead of the one fountain which he notices, and that too an intermittent one, Enon consists of six copious and permanent fountains and of many pools—thus answering to both definitions of the "*hudata Polla*"—"much water" and "a place with fountains" as Dr. Robinson defines it. Much allowance must therefore be made for Dr. D's mistakes—relying as he does so implicitly upon such biased testimony.

I was desirous of saying much more about Enon; and also something about the Bethulia fountain, the availability of house cisterns and pools as constructed in the East, as baptisteries; the prophetic clean water sprinkling of Ezekiel 36, etc. But this article having already greatly exceeded its intended limits I must here desist.

J. T. B.

EXTREME VIEWS.

"I cannot close this letter without expressing the opinion that the good cause is somewhat retarded in this State, by some extreme views held by some of the leading brethren. Our good brethren further north, who are so zealous for what they call the "Lord's plan," fall about as far behind some here as they go ahead of some up there. The "plan" here is to hire no preachers—make no contracts with preachers for preaching the gospel, but simply to sustain those who preach. When one is called to preach for a church the brethren simply agree to sustain him—that means that they will give him what is voluntarily contributed by the congregation for his support. Bro. A. thinks \$500 enough to sustain a preacher, and gives accordingly. Bro. B. thinks \$1000 none too much, and contributes accordingly. Bro. C. believes in a free gospel and gives nothing; and the preacher knows he cannot live on what he is getting, and quits preaching and takes up something else to "sustain" himself; and the church drags along at a wretched dying rate for awhile, edifying (?) itself on what is by some zealously contended for as "the Lord's plan," and eventually dies out. These good brethren will not be offended at me for saying that it is my opinion their plan has worked a good many young people, and some not so young, into the ranks of the parties about them not so apostolic in faith but wiser in matters of purely human wisdom and human discretion, than themselves; and so it will continue to work in the future if some improvement is not made. So, at least, it seems to me."

We copy the above from the *Apostolic Times* of Jan. 1st, 1874, from the pen of our good bro. John S. Sweeney, written while he was in our

State attending the Brents and Ditzler debate. He thinks the good cause here in Tennessee is somewhat retarded by extreme views held by some of the leading brethren, but does not state what these extreme views are, nor wherein they retard the cause. We are by no means unwilling to be criticized by our brethren elsewhere, but we in all kindness suggest to brother Sweeney that we think when he accuses the Tennessee brethren of holding extreme views which retard the cause, it would be just and proper for him to state what these views are, and why they are extreme; whether they are extreme as viewed in the light of God's word, or only in the light of man's wisdom. He says, "The 'Plan' here is to hire no preachers—make no contract with preachers for preaching the gospel but simply to sustain these who preach." If this is what our good brother calls "extreme views," we would like him to show their inconsistency with the word of God, if indeed such be the case. If they sustain those who preach, surely that is enough. But we are certainly willing to have our faults, and failings and errors pointed out to us, but we do not wish brethren to publish to the world that we have such faults as he intimates we have, and yet neither tell us what they are, nor what is the Scriptural remedy. We will heartily thank brother S., if he will show us our errors, and then from the word of God show us how to get out of them.

But he says that in Tennessee they "make no contract with preachers." And this statement is made, as representing the general state of

things in Tennessee. In this, bro. Sweeney is, in part at least, mistaken. True, very few preachers in this country spend all their time in preaching, and only a few churches ever employ a preacher's entire time to preach for them. But where they have, they have generally, so far as we know, agreed upon a fixed amount. But there are several churches known to us, that employ preachers to preach for them once a month, where they can do so, that their neighbors may have the opportunity of hearing the gospel preached, while the church itself meets every Lord's day to worship the Lord. And in such cases, there is most generally an understanding between the church and the preacher as to what he is to receive, and this amount is generally paid to the preacher each trip proportionably, to the whole amount. Whether this be right or wrong, we do not say. We only say it exists. Then there are other churches in Tennessee that have preaching occasionally. But when they do send for a preacher, they almost always pay him for his time and labor, and expect nothing else. We do not say that these preachers always get what they ought to have, but we know what we state, to be in general true.

But here is still a darker picture. "When one is called to preach to a church, the brethren simply agree to sustain him—that means that they will give him what is voluntarily contributed by the congregation for his support. Bro. A. thinks \$500 enough to sustain a preacher, and gives accordingly. Bro. B. thinks \$1000 none too much, and gives accordingly. Bro. C. believes in a

free gospel, and gives nothing; and the preacher knows he cannot live on what he is getting, and quits preaching, and takes up something else to sustain himself; and the church drags along at a wretched dying rate for awhile, edifying (?) itself on what is zealously contended for by some as 'the Lord's plan,' and eventually dies out." Taking this as it stands here, it is calculated to make the impression that such is the general state of things in Tenn. What sort of information brother S. received while in this State, we do not know. But that the above language does not represent things as they really are in Tennessee, we are quite certain. Bro. S. visited but two congregations while here; the one in Franklin, and the one in Nashville. Our good brother Fall has been preaching regularly for the church in Nashville for 12 or 14 years. The church in Franklin has had a regular preacher more of the time than almost any other church we know in this country outside of Nashville. So brother Sweeney certainly did not see what he reports. The church at Franklin reported through the Advocate over sixty additions during last year, and they have a flourishing Sunday School. The church at Leipe's Fork, eight miles west of Franklin, only have preaching occasionally, and reported some thirty or forty additions this year. Good reports have been published from a great number of congregations throughout Tennessee this year, of their prosperity and success; but we do not remember reading or hearing of any having died out in the manner spoken of by our good bro. Sweeney. We

highly esteem bro. Sweeney, and do not intend any personal attack upon him at all; but think he has been misinformed about the condition of things in this country, and has stated things that do us injustice; but we do not intimate that he intended to do us any wrong. And these impressions we wish to correct. The cause is neither dead nor dying in Tennessee. Some few congregations have died in Tennessee, from personal strifes or difficulties, or other causes, but not more we presume, than in other sections, in proportion to number. We by no means claim perfection, but we are certainly doing something, and only wish things to be understood as they are. As to bro. Sweeney's "opinion," that "a good many young people, and some not so young," have gone into the parties around us, on account of their superior worldly wisdom, we have but little to say. This may be true, but if so, it is no more than is done elsewhere. We are trying to manage things in the church by the wisdom of God, and not by worldly wisdom, and if men leave the church, or go elsewhere on this account, they would be no benefit to the cause if they were among us. And bro. S. thinks these things will continue to work this way, if some improvement is not made. Now if he or any one else will show us from the word of God, how to make this improvement, we will be glad to make it. We know that some of the parties around us have good human machineries, but we are sure they cannot surpass the wisdom of God, and we are content to try to follow his wisdom, so far as we can. We mention too, that the brethren in

Clarksville, and the counties around there, and Southern Kentucky are co-operating together to spread the gospel among the destitute, and brother A. L. Johnson, and bro. W. F. Todd are working under their direction and support. The Nashville congregation also is aiding in this co-operation. The brethren in Rutherford County are doing something in the same way, and the Church in Murfreesboro has engaged the services of bro. G. W. Abel from Virginia this year. And upon the whole, we do claim that we are doing something in Tennessee, after all. We hope bro. Sweeney will reconsider these matters. We say these things in kindness, and hope they will be received and treated in the same way by brother Sweeney.

E. G. S.

P. S. Bro. Sweeney preached a while, both in Franklin and in Nashville during his trip much to the satisfaction and edification of the brethren, and a few additions.

The Fatal Year of Popery.

Many careful students of prophetic Scripture believe that the 1,260 years allotted by the Word of God to the papal supremacy terminated on or about the year 1866. While this opinion may be erroneous, it is a notable fact that during that year the papacy experienced a calamitous event which resulted in a succession of connected and incurable misfortunes, which, having already involved the total destruction of its "temporal power," is now threatening its spiritual sovereignty with extinction. In midsummer of the prophetic

year 1866, the battle of Sadowa destroyed the equilibrium of European affairs, deprived Catholic Austria of her military prestige, advanced Protestant Prussia to the highest rank among the Great Powers, and wrought important changes in the ideas and circumstances of European nations and their rulers. All these events were productive of good, and the year was one of progress and benefit to all Europe, with the one remarkable exception of the papal hierarchy. To the Romish church alone was Sadowa and 1866 a calamity, (for even Austria found a blessing in her sore defeat,) and upon her it entailed a series of damaging events, resulting:

1. In releasing Venetia from the grasp of Austria and Rome (through the Concordat), and securing to it religious liberty under the enlightened rule of Victor Emmanuel.

2. In abolishing the Austro-Papal Concordat, in rescuing the schools of the empire from priestly control, and in reviving educational interests, and in ordaining religious liberty in all the Austrian dominions,

3. In strengthening the hated Italian government by the addition of Venetia, and emboldening it in its aggressions upon the Romish church, to abolish monasteries and nunneries, to confiscate millions of dollars' worth of papal property, to establish free schools, encourage education by news papers, and to introduce various improvements all greatly to the scandal and injury of Popery.

4. In the Spanish revolution, whereby the Pope's "Favorite Daughter" was dethroned, a free constitution adopted, anti-Bible laws

repealed, religious liberty declared, schools founded and heretical churches protected. All this in "Most Catholic Spain," in the capital of Philip II., the native home of the Inquisition.

5. In the Vatican Council, convened by the Pope to forbid the progress of the nineteenth century, and to declare the blasphemous dogma of papal infallibility. The council exposed to the world the despotic nature of the papacy by its summary suppression of discussion, and its coercive measures with the dissenting bishops; which also created an incurable schism within the church, which is rapidly involving it in the certain fate of a house divided against itself.

6. In the Franco-German war of 1870-71. This war, instigated by papal intrigue to destroy the rising power of the Protestant government of Germany, and to restore its own lost influence and authority, reacted upon its instigators with ruinous effect, resulting in—

A. The dethronement of the Pope's "Favorite Son," and the complete destruction of his army, whose bayonets had long been the sole protection of the papal throne.

B. The elevation of Protestant Germany to the Arbitratorship of Europe, and reducing Catholic France to the fourth rank among the Great Powers.

C. The inauguration of the French republic and the great increase of free speech and religious liberty in France; the distribution in the French army of thousands of Bibles, and in renewed life and activity among the French Protestants.

D. The total loss of the Papal States AND THE CITY OF ROME, and the final destruction of temporal power which the infallible Pius IX. declared to be essential to the Spiritual authority of the Catholic Church.

E. The annexation of Rome and the Papal States to rebellious Italy, and the establishment in them of religious liberty, free schools, Protestant newspapers, "heretical" churches and Bible societies, not one of which had been tolerated during thirteen centuries.

F. The disgrace and expulsion of the Jesuits from Prussia, whose example will be followed by Italy, and probably several other European States.

All this is one rapid and continuous chain of events, beginning in the battle of Sadowa, in the prophetic year 1866. In the heart of Europe, which she had so fearfully desolated, in the midst of a nation whose earlier emperor she had so pitifully humbled, the Romish despotism heard from the cannon's mouth the death-knell of her cruel power. Her rise and progress, her decline and extinction are foretold in the Scripture; and, although in her death-struggle she may display power and inflict injury, her strength is waning and her glory is departed.— *Watchmen and Reflector.*

Bro. Wm. E. Hall.

Whereas our beloved brother and efficient minister of the word, W. E. Hall who has been laboring constantly and successfully in word and doctrine for the Church of Christ in Jackson, Tenn., has declined to ac-

cept the unanimous call of the church for the year 1875 in order to labor as evangelist in holding protracted meetings in the general field:

Therefore we the Church of Christ in Jackson, deem it our duty and pleasure to give to him and the brethren in Christ wherever his lot may be cast, a public expression of our high appreciation of his character and talents as a Christian, and minister of the Gospel.

We heartily commend him as a pious, earnest, eloquent, able minister of the New Testament, sound in the faith and an able defender of truth, capable of presenting the whole truth clearly and forcibly before any audience and without giving ground of offense even to the most fastidious.

One leading feature of his work is to visit every County in West Tenn. and group together into efficient Co-operation a number of weak churches contiguous to each other that they may be able to sustain themselves, and also to plant the gospel in desolate places, and accomplish this work without any ponderous ecclesiastical machinery.

We also take this method of stating to brethren and friends who may be permitted to enjoy his ministrations that Bro. Hall is dependent for a support upon those to whom he preaches, and we trust, brethren, that you will remember that the laborer is worthy of his hire.

We know that our brother is not moved by any sinister motive in entering the general field as an evangelist, for he breaks loose from a comparatively easy position and good salary without the certainty of even scanty support. We trust, brethren

that while bro. Hall is making these sacrifices for your good and the eternal welfare of our race, you will give him that hearty support and encouragement that will enable you to enjoy the Spiritual things you may reap through his ministry.

R. W. ANDREWS,
J. S. CRUTCHFIELD,
J. R. WILKINSON,
Committee.

QUERY.

Brethren L. & S.: Please answer the following: If a congregation request an elder to resign and he refuse, can they declare his office vacant, without preferring charges.

T. E. BRENTS.

White Mound, Grayson Co. Tex. Dec. 2nd, 1873.

We read of no such thing in the New Testament as Elders resigning their offices or declaring an Elder's office vacant. But we do read of Elders or seniors, or older members of congregations, and we read that these elders are required to take the oversight of the flock, or congregation, and that they are to feed the flock of God, over which the Holy Spirit has made them overseers. It is God's order that the elders, or older members, who have certain qualifications prescribed, are to be set forward to do the work of overseeing. Now if such fail to do this work, their office, that is work, is already vacant without being declared such. And in such case, if there be any one who is competent in the congregation, then the competent one or ones, as the case may be should be set to do this

work. And when a competent member has been set forward to do this work, he has no right to resign, that is, to refuse to do the work, unless his situation in life utterly forbids it.

As to charges, they should never be preferred against an elder, or any one else unless deserving; and when they are, should be examined into, no matter what position he may occupy. But the idea of the work to be done by the elders being an office into which they are initiated by a certain process, and then they can resign the same, as men in worldly governments do, is certainly unknown in the New Testament. Nor is it anywhere taught that any class of men are to be recognized as being the officials of a congregation who do not do the work. The cause often suffers by this state of things. Hence elders should be dealt with like other members, according to their behavior and work, and not as having official dignity above other members. Work is what is wanted in the church, and if one member ill not or cannot do the needed work, then put others at the work that will do it. The church needs work, not official dignitaries. And if all the members will do all they are competent to do, the good work will go on. Besides, all members should constantly seek to improve themselves, by an increased knowledge of the will of God, and abound more more in the work of the Lord.

E. G. S.

Personal.

John W. Arnol has removed from Pleasant Home, Owen Co. Ky. to Normal, Illinois.

Church News.

Our congregation here has been organized about 15 months, with about sixty members. We have had very little preaching during the time. Bro. R. B. Trimble preached for us some through the Summer and Fall, but will not be with us during the winter. But we still continue to meet every Lord's Day.

M. R. NANCE.

Columbus Ky.

THE LIMITS OF SCIENCE.

Scientific men sometimes forget that the discovery of law is not an adequate solution of the problem of causes.

When all the motions of the heavenly bodies have been reduced to the dominion of gravitation itself, there still remains an insoluble problem. Why it is that matter attracts matter we do not know—perhaps never shall know. Science can throw much light upon the laws that preside over the development of life; but what life is, and what its ultimate cause, we are utterly unable to say. The mind of man, which can track the course of the comet, and measure the velocity of light, has hitherto proved incapable of explaining the existence of the minutest insect, or the growth of the most humble plant. In grouping phenomena, in ascertaining their sequences, its achievements have been marvelous. In discovering absolute causes, it has absolutely failed.

An impenetrable mystery lies at the foot of every existing thing. The first principle, the dynamic force, the

vivifying power, the efficient cause of those successions which we term natural laws, eludes the utmost efforts of our research. The scalpel of the anatomist and analysis of the chemist are here at fault. The microscope which reveals the traces of all-pervading all-ordaining intelligence in the minutest globule supplies no solution of the problem. We know nothing or next to nothing, of the relations of mind to matter either in our own persons or in the world around us. And to suppose that the professor of natural science eliminate the conception of a first cause from creation, by supplying natural explanation is completely to ignore the sphere to which it is confined—*Lecky's History of Rationalism.*

Marriage.

It is the happiest and most virtuous state of society, in which the husband and wife set out together, make their property together, and with perfect sympathy of soul graduate all their expenses, plans, calculations and desires with reference to their present means, and to their future and common interest. Nothing delights me more than to enter the neat little tenement of the young couple who, within perhaps two or three years, without any resources but their own knowledge or industry, have joined heart and hand, and engage to share together the responsibilities, duties interests, trials and pleasures of life.

The industrious wife is cheerfully employing her own hands in domestic duties, putting her house in order or mending her husband's clothes, or

preparing the dinner, whilst, perhaps the little darling sits prattling upon the floor or lies sleeping in the cradle; and everything seems preparing to welcome the happiest of husbands and the best of fathers when he shall come from his toil to enjoy the sweets of his little paradise.

This is the true domestic pleasure—the “only bliss that survived the fall.” Health, contentment, love, abundance and bright prospects are all here. But it has become a prevalentiment that a man must acquire his fortune before he marries—that the wife must have no sympathy nor share with him in the pursuit of it, in which most of the pleasure truly consists; and the young married people must set out with as large and expensive an establishment as is becoming those who have been wedded for twenty years. This is very unhappy.

It fills the community with bachelors who are waiting to make their fortunes, endangering virtue and promoting vice; it destroys the true economy and of the domestic institution, and it promotes idleness and inefficiency among females, who are expecting to be taken up by a fortune and passively sustained without any care or concern on their part; and thus many a wife becomes, “not a help-mate, but a help-eat”—WINSLOW.

OBITUARIES.

Brethren B & S.: We announce through the Advocate the death of Sister Louisa Hale, a member of the Church of Christ at Sames Creek Chestham Co. Tenn., which occurred Dec. 3rd 1873. Sister Hale and her husband both obeyed the Gospel the same day, under the teaching of Bro. A. L. Johnson, in the Spring of 1871. In less than a year after

which her husband died, leaving four helpless children, the two oldest being dependent on a weakly mother for a support. Slender as that dependence was, they are now deprived of it; Though bereft of father and mother in mere infancy, they are in the care of kind relatives. Sister Hale was born Dec. 3rd, 1838; Though raised up by Methodist parents, from due deliberation, assembled in mature age with the disciples of Christ. After becoming a member she was ever faithful in the discharge of the duties she owed to her Savior. We are acquainted with no sister who was more strict, in attending church, and who enjoyed the association of the brethren and sisters more. She not only talked much of the Lord and his mercies, but showed a confident reliance in his promiser by an orderly, christianly, and pious every day walk. But by consumption was briefly cut down; and we trust gone home to rest, where we hope to meet her on the “beautiful shore,” at the resurrection morn.

Your Bro.

G. F. CULLOM.

Brother Lipscomb: Permit me to record the death of sister Lucinda Jane Smith, who was called to her rest on the evening of the 3rd of September 1873. She died of that terrible disease, consumption, after a lingering illness of many months. She was born in 1840, in Tennessee, and at her death was 33 years 15, days old. In 1862, she became identified with the Church of God, and until her death lived a devoted Christian. It is enough to say that she was truly a Christian.

Also sister Mary G. French departed life in Apr. 1872. She became identified with the Church in 1871 and lived faithfully to the religion she professed, and was enabled to Scripturally claim the promises, and die in the triumphs of a living faith. She was a twin sister of Sister Smith, I had the pleasure of burying them both with their Lord in baptism, and the melancholy duty of the funeral service. They both died of the same disease. Their bodies lie side by side in the grave yard near Donelton Texas. Sister Smith leaves a kind husband three little children and numerous friends and relatives to mourn her loss Sister French was on a visit to her sister when she was taken down with consumption and was never able to return to her home in Burleson County Tex. She came among us as a stranger, but she found a warm-hearted band of brethren and sisters, to cheer and console her in her last hours.

J. C. MATTHEWS.

Bros. L. & S.: Our dear old friend and brother in the Lord, Samuel H. Lauderdale died of Pneumonia, at the house of his son, B. W. Lauderdale, on 16th of Nov. 1873. He

was born in Sumner County Tenn. Feb. 25th 1801, moved to West Tennessee in 1856, was buried at Hickman Ky. where he is sleeping beside five of his children.

Bro. Lauderdale has left a Christian widow, and three Christian sons, beside a large circle of brethren and friends wherever he has lived, to mourn his loss. Though we mourn only as those who have full hope. In May, 1872, Bro. Lauderdale and his wife united with the church of Christ at Union, in Sumner County Tenn., leaving the Cumberland Presbyterians, with whom they had been associated for a few years. Since that time his example to his family, to the church and the world has been steady, valuable and honorable; and will live in the memory of his friends whilst his body is mouldering in the tomb. My first acquaintance with Bro. Samel H. Lauderdale was formed in Sumner County Tenn. in September 1825.

I associated with him a great deal in our young days, and I never knew him condescend to a little thing. We worshipped together for many years in the same Christian Congregation. I found him true and faithful, I have been separated from him for several years, but have always had a good report of his Christian deportment. He had been attending a protracted meeting day and night for a week when he was taken with his last illness, which was probably brought on by riding from meeting in the night. He was sick one week, and expressed himself perfectly resigned to death. May the good Lord bless and comfort his bereaved relations, and enable us all to live as Christians should, and die as Christians do, that we may meet him where there will be no more weeping nor sorrow.

W. C. HUFFMAN.

Enon College Tenn. Dec. 13th 1873.

Teacher Wanted.

I am in want of a teacher for the Scientific department—Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry &c. &c. Combining French if possible. Member of Christian church preferred. Salary about 500 dollars and home.

Address, T. A. CRENSHAW.

Hopkinsville, Ky.

(This item should have appeared sooner, but was overlooked.

Life.

Valleys are very beautiful, with their wealth of vegetation, and their well-like coolness; but I prefer the

hill-tops. I think a valley is like youth, a lovely place to saunter for a while, but where we do not wish to stay, and where we could not stay, even if we would. I don't say we never wish ourselves back again, for many hill-sides are very bare and dreary. But age is like a bower near the summit, whence we can see the path by which we came and from which objects which seemed ugly when we passed them, look beautiful in the distance. And from that resting place we can survey the little bit of journey which lies before us, and we see that it is very easy and very short. I know age is generally called "the descent of the hill." What! go down to rest amidst the darkness and chills and mists that always haunt valleys? No, no!

EDWARD GARRETT.

SEEKING PEACE.—Peace may be sought two ways. One way is as Gideon sought it when he built his altar in Ophrah, naming it "God send peace," yet sought this peace that he loved as he was ordered to seek it, and the peace was sent, in God's way. "The country was in quietness forty years in the days of Gideon." And the other way of seeking peace is as Menahem sought it when he gave the king of Assyria a thousand talents of silver, that "his hand might be with him." That is, you may either win your peace or buy it; win it by resistance to evil. You may buy your peace with silenced consciences; you may buy it with broken vows; buy it with lying words; buy it with base connivance, buy it with the blood of the slain, and the cry of the captive, and the silence of lost souls.—*Ruskin.*

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

HOW TO DRIVE.

I have heard somewhere and some how of a rich gentleman, who purposing to gratify his ease or love of pleasure to a new carriage driver, fell upon the following plan for testing skill or judgment. "Now if right here," marking on the ground, "there was a dangerous precipice, how near to it could you drive without running over it?" The eager candidates for the exalted or to say the least of it, the high position, in turn represented their respective claims to the preference by declaring their ability to go within six, five, four, three and two inches of the dreaded place and one man in his zeal to please, avowed he could go in an inch. "Well, Pat, and how close could you go without endangering my property and family?" enquired the owner of the vehicle. "Indade and I should be afther going as far from it as possible," said this claimant from over the waters. 'Tis not wonderful or astonishing that this man was promoted. This world is full of steep places and there re thousands of adventurous drivers. Our bodies are valuable carriages which may be injured by bad management but they carry precious souls that with them may be destroyed in hell. We are all driving our own conveyances and should steer wisely. Let us take a glance at the outside world, and see if we can, what is going on. Look you-

der at the teamsters thronging in at that door. What are they doing? They are making close drives. They know that near by lies the dangerous cliff of drunkenness over which men are hurled into wretchedness, misery, poverty, want, the prison-house, the work house, murder, abominable filthiness inconceivable, and look how close they drive. Look again; one man is making another drive. This time he goes in an inch of the terrific fall. Ah, now, he has gone over, gone, gone, he is drunk. Some church-members make these perilous drives. Some travel this ground three times a day. Some in jolly company, go a pleasure driving. Here is danger; the team becoming excited, runs away with reason and wisdom, and the man is turned over to the wild fury of the flesh. Still for all this, church men risk so much for so little. They do not surely consider. The world slumbers while passing these dread scenes. Knowing there is danger here, if they had the wisdom of the Irishman they would pull as far from drunkenness and all of its concubinations of evils, as they could. All tampering with drunk-making beverages would be avoided. Listen to a wise man, "Flee youthful lusts." That is, shun danger, run from it. He continues, "Follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart," in other words, to be sure of avoiding the overthrow, go just as far from the danger as possible.

There is another fearful brink from which thousands of our generation have taken a headlong fall, thousands rush rapidly on to the

catastrophe and thousands keep going foolishly near the place where are allurements to the jutting crag that launches the unfortunates into the drowning gulf of destruction and perdition. Still men, though warned, thoughtlessly rush on. Hear Paul describe the rock from whose giddy height the myriads fall. Hear also of the ruin that follows. "They that will be rich *fall* into temptation and a snare and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil, which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. The devil wants all to fall. He has ever been engaged in bringing about the fall of man. He took Christ himself upon an exceeding high mountain and proposed a fall and promised the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them. He failed here but daily he takes untold numbers of our race to the same spot and there they fall, oh, how they go down, down from innocency and purity to the corruption of the rich. Paul said, "O man of God, flee these things" that riches bring upon man, and "follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness, fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." That is as much as to say, "be after driving as far from the danger as passable." Christ said, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. Here is a close drive certainly, but still all are willing to try to make it. All think that notwithstanding there is a great,

very great risk of losing a citizenship in the kingdom, they can be rich and enjoy this blessing. Did you ever hear of a man who refused wealth, or neglected to make it, because he feared he could not enter the kingdom? I never did. All are anxious to make an effort to drive through the eye of the needle. Some theologian deserves the thanks of the rich for squeezing them through such a narrow place. I will tell you how it was done. The eyes of the needle are narrows in the mountains, tunnels along which camels go with great difficulty. But they get through by crawling on their knees and oftentimes scraping severely their panniers and it may be the loss of the same. That is a rich thing for rich men surely. If the rich will come down out of their pride, be converted and become as a little child, let much of their surplus be rubbed off by the wants of the needy, that is be rich in good works, then the case may be changed, since they do not trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God who giveth us all things richly to enjoy. The gambler got his fall, by driving first for fun, then by putting up a little something to make the game interesting and soon he took the tumble. The infatuated pleasure seeker, the confirmed novel reader, the devotee to the fashions of this world have reached their places of ruin by heedless driving. The boundary line between the kingdom of light and darkness is clearly marked out by the Spirit of God. Prudence suggests that we stay as far as possible from the line if we would be safe. 'Tis frontier men who are caught and killed by Indians,

not those of the interior. Strange to say however that men professing godliness, like these daring characters, prefer to haunt along the line of danger. A nobleman for fear of getting on his neighbor's premises keeps where he knows his land extends. 'Tis not the case with the servants of the master for they will go where they know their Lord has no territory. Has Christ any possession in the bar-room? Has he any in the gambling saloon? Has he any in a ball room? None. Then be after going as far away from these and such places as possible.

THE ART OF LOVING.

Some one has said that the hard thing which Christ's religion asks of us is "love people whom we do not like." It seems almost impossible. To be kind in act even to our enemies,—that is difficult, but we see how to do if we will only try hard enough. But how can we *love* what is to us unlovely? How can our hearts go out warmly toward people whose characters repel us, who are coarse, mean false, selfish?

Yet Christ's words and example tell us, and our hearts assent to it, that it is divine to love the unworthy. But how to do it? Real affection does not answer to the call of the will. One can no more make himself fond of another by a simple effort of will than make himself seven feet tall. No; this highest grace comes only by studying a long while in God's school. He has fixed certain ways in the nature of things which we must find out and follow, resting all the while in loving dependence on his help.

We can always be kind in act to those about us, whether or not we feel warmly toward them. That in itself is a great matter. And kind action tends directly to rouse kind feeling in the doer. One can hardly act like a friend to another without beginning to feel like a friend. When you make your neighbor's interest yours, you in some degree make *him* yours, and what you own you will care for! Set out a tree, and carefully tend it; with your own hands dig about the roots, and prune away the superfluous suckers, and at last bring to perfection its earliest fruit—you will care more for that tree than for your neighbor's whole orchard. It is *yours*, and, what is more, made yours by your own labor. So, of a business that a man has built up from the foundation by his own effort and skill and capital; it is more to him than dollars and cents, it is his very own, almost a part of his life. Now, there is here and there a man who has taken large ownership in other men. He has invested in his sick neighbor half a dozen friendly calls; he has six shares of stock there! To that poor woman have gone sundry loads of wood, and small loans without interest, or perhaps without repayment: quite a little property there! That clerk of his went wrong, and took money, and seemed bound for ruin; and he forgave and stood by him, and helped him back to honest manhood; why, he owns that clerk more completely than if he had bought him in the market! So in one place and another he has a great estate, the title-deeds written on human hearts. Do you suppose he feels coldly toward these

possession of his? Be kind to men, do for them as if you loved them, and you will love them.

Then, again, our aversions and dislikes come very largely from not recognizing the real good in people. We are strangely perverse in this. If we sit down to an abundant table, we choose the dishes we like, and let the rest alone. In looking at a landscape, we fix our eyes on what is beautiful. But when it comes to our fellow-men we are, generally, at least as ready to look at their faults as at their merits. Now, it is right to make a just estimate of character; charity does not require us to blind ourselves. But, having once formed our conclusions about a person, why should we let our thoughts dwell on the worst part of him? It is worse than foolish.

The joy of life, the good of life, lies in dwelling on what is beautiful, noble, excellent. This is the lover's happiness, that his sight is wholly fixed on the highest qualities of the woman he loves. It is the sweet method of the true husband, wife, mother, not to be blind to the faults of partner or child, but to rest the heart's gaze on whatever is best in them. If we would carry into the outer world the habit we practice when at our best toward our own dearest ones, of dwelling on the bright side of character, we should see with different eyes; we should detect fragrance and beauty in souls that to an unloving gaze are utterly dry and arid.

But, if at last our charity cannot discover any redeeming traits? If a person seems to us radically worthless,—a mere gnarly mass of crabbed selfishness, or a quicksand of deceit wherein is no footing; if no esteem

or respect be possible, how shall we keep ourselves from simple scorn? Ah, for such unhappy ones as that what pity, what infinite pity, should one feel! That there should be in the soul no generous impulse, no sweet, refreshing waters of sympathy, no manly steadfastness—what sight should move to tears like that! Let devils scorn; but let men who call God "our Father" and for whom Christ died, let them, looking on their lost brethren, be moved to sorrow, in whose depth no drop of bitterness can find room. Such pity is the doorway of love. In compassion we must find the antidote of scorn. When any man repels us by his selfishness, or his animalhood, or his falsity, we have only rightly to imagine how wretched is that one's own state, and we shall be too sorry not to be tender toward him.

To do good to men, as God sends his rain and sunshine alike upon the just and the unjust; to look for what is good in them, as He draws us by our nobler selves and blots out our transgressions; to pity what is bad, as, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us—these are the ways by which we may grow to love one another as He loves us.—*Christian Union.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Our Motto.....	49
Brents and Ditzler debate.....	54
Extreme Views.....	60
The Fatal year of Popery.....	62
Bro. Wm. E. Hal.....	64
Query.....	65
Personal.....	65
The Limits of Science.....	66
Marriage.....	66
Obituaries.....	67
Teacher Wanted.....	68
Life.....	68
FIRESIDE.	
How to Drive.....	69
The Art of Loving.....	71

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 4

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JAN. 22, 1874.

The Franklin Debate.

Mr. D. represents Alford as believing the last chapter of Mark not an inspired production. That is the impression he aims to make, yet, Alford's concluding remark, although he says he thinks it not Mark's composition, is :

"The inference therefore seems to me to be that *it is an authentic fragment, placed as a completion of the Gospel in very early times* : by whom written, must of course remain wholly uncertain ; but coming to us with very weighty sanction, and having strong claims on our reception and reverence."

Yet he through years of debating persistently presents Alford as the main witness against its being an inspiration. Mr. D. read Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, to prove the Jordan so swift that no man could baptize in it. He constantly represented Smith as saying, the Jordan from its fountain to its source, "rushes along, a foaming torrent, through a narrow winding ravine, shut in by high precipitous banks," and hence too swift for a person to immerse an-

other in. Yet only two sentences from this, Smith says, "At its mouth, it is 70 feet wide, a lazy, turbid stream, flowing between low alluvial banks. There are several bars not far from its mouth where it can be forded." He in the same connection says, the current varies from 2 to 8 miles an hour. There are numerous curves and sinuosities in the river so that in going a distance of 60 miles it winds so as to make two hundred. Mr. Ditzler is bound to know that such curves and sinuosities could not exist without eddies. Two miles an hour current, is not an uncommonly swift one. He represents Lynch as giving such an account of the current and cold of the river that either would prohibit immersion. Yet Lynch in this account tells of seeing a disorderly multitude of men, women and children, of various tongues and nations, estimated at eight thousand persons, enter the river, dip themselves three times, and in a few hours disappear, without accident.

He has repeatedly represented from the *old book*, 276 years old, Beza's annotations, that Julianus,

one of the most learned Christian writers of the 4th century maintained that Bap-tidzo meant to sprinkle, and that Augustin approved this statement. Beza says, Augustin condemned (*reprehendens*) the novelty, declared that the Latin so took the word for baptizing from the Greek, that it was only known in the Latin in the sacrament of regeneration." Mr. D. translated *reprehendens* as approving and says Augustin said baptize did not mean sprinkle in classic Greek, but did in the New Testament, not one word of which is true. The only Julianus of whom we have been able to find an account, in that century and against whom Augustin wrote, was the apostate Julian, who was Emperor, who wrote against the Christian religion, never for it. He apostatized at 20 years of age. He persecuted the church, forbade the Christians either to learn or teach Greek literature, expressed a wish and made efforts to utterly destroy all of their books. To one of his officers, he wrote, "I desire to hear of no service of yours so much as that you have expelled that Athanasius out of Egypt, who under my government, has been so audacious as to persuade Greek women to receive baptism."

He ridicules baptism very much as does Mr. D. He says, "Baptism which cannot heal the leprosy, nor the gout, nor the dysentery, nor any other distemper of the body, takes away adulteries, extortions, and all other sins of the soul." "He was intent upon extirpating Christianity with the greatest dispatch," says Lardner. In ridiculing baptism as taught by the Christians of his day,

he says, "having been cleansed and scoured with water which penetrates even to the soul." He it is that says bap-tidzo is interpreted to sprinkle. Mr. D. compliments him as, "a man of profoundest erudition, and thoroughly posted in all these matters. He was a Christian Father of the most careful disposition, calm and learned." Yet Mr. D. boasts he examines thoroughly and never makes mistakes. We have made a very thorough search through all the lists of both profane and ecclesiastical writers of this period as given in the Encyclopedias and Gazetteers, in histories of the early writers of the church, in the lists of writers ecclesiastical and profane as collected by Lardner, Mosheim, the History of Religious Literature, and the Catalogue of all the Religious Writers from the beginning of the Christian church, to the close of the 13th century.

Then a man may deny the truth of the Bible, yet he is a Christian Father of the most careful disposition calm and learned, if he only admits baptism is sprinkling, according to Mr. D. But Mr. D. does not mean this. He only saw this paragraph from Beza, and in his reckless anxiety to magnify everything and everybody that favors sprinkling he makes these encomiums without examination.

Mr. D. represented Wall as defining bap-tidzo to sprinkle. The definition is, "the idea of burial included, to sprinkle (or pour) profusely, followed by the dative of material." That is when material is sprinkled upon a body sufficiently to bury it, it may be said to be baptized. This

gives the true index to all baptism by pouring or sprinkling. When they are sufficiently profuse to produce a burial of the thing sprinkled upon, it may be baptism. When the result of an immersion is produced, by this sprinkling or pouring, as a thorough wetting, it is sometimes called figuratively, baptism. Even this definition given by Wall is a very remote and unusual one—as he gives it under about the ninth and last head, the first eight of his meanings all indicate immerse, plunge, dip, bury, about his ninth (we write from memory) he says, the idea of burial included, it may mean to sprinkle or pour profusely. The word here used for sprinkle or pour is *perfundere*, which means to sprinkle or pour or wet profusely and thoroughly. The burial accomplished by this thorough sprinkling or profuse pouring out, is the baptism. Wall gives as illustrations of this, the pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius. Prof. Binford, a thorough Greek and Latin scholar of Franklin, made an exposure of Mr. D.'s use of this lexicon publicly.

Mr. Ditzler makes his case for sprinkling or pouring in almost every instance by translating the Latin word *tingere*—to wet or moisten. Calvin, Moses Stuart of Andover, Edward Robinson of Andover and the author of a Greek Lexicon, Beza, the author of Mr. Ditzler's *very old and learned work*, all translate *tingere* to immerse or dip. Beza says, in Mr. D.'s "old book," in his comment on Mat. 3: 11, Baptidzo means—*tingere* because the things to

be wet (*tingenda*) are submerged in water. "It is a thing unreasonable that any should dispute concerning the immersion of the whole body in water in baptism." Almost every lexicon in the land puts *tingere* in immediate connection with, *intingere immergere, mergere*, and are translated, to dip, to dip in, to plunge, to immerse.

Every single lexicon defining baptidzo in English gives dip, where those defining in Latin give *tingere*. They show thus plainly that they believe the true and only proper meaning of *tingere* when it represents baptidzo, is to dip. Then when Mr. Ditzler gives wet or moisten as the meaning of baptidzo, or the Syriac *Amad* or *teeva*, Calvin, Luther, Beza, Moses Stuart, George Robinson, and every Greek lexicon in the land, says it should be dip. When he says wet or moisten, put dip or plunge.

By this improper and unusual translation of this word and the word *Madefacere*, which means to make wet, the usual method of which is by immersion or dipping, which he translates also *moisten*, and by using a figurative application of the word, as a literal one, he makes his entire defence of the practice of sprinkling. He runs these mistranslations through a number of languages, and sets at defiance thus the scholarship of the paidobaptist churches.

He persisted at Franklin, in translating the definition of Schleusner, as Dr. Kalisch said no scholar would translate it. Although Mr. D. admitted that Kalisch is one of the most thorough Hebrew and Oriental scholars in the land. He has talked publicly of my refusing to refer our

differences on this definition to a committee of scholars. Says he never received my last letter, but he has seen my published proposition to refer the whole matter to the Faculty of languages in the University of Virginia, all the members of which I learn are sprinklers in theory or association. Yet he makes no response—never will.

As an example of his candor, we relate the following. Once during the debate, while Mr. D. was speaking, Bro. Sweeney passed a note through my hands to Bro. Brents. It was done quietly, without the slightest interruption. Mr. D.'s watchful moderator saw it. It was an opportunity that he could not resist. He immediately, almost bitter in his tone, said he thought it unfair and out of order to be passing notes while the debate was going on. I told them I wished the question of order to be settled. At all debates known to me it was common. I wished to do nothing out of order but if unusual rules were adopted they should be announced. Bro. Sweeney appealed to Mr. Ditzler if he did not know it was customary. He stated on their side it was customary; once or twice my brethren have done such things but I have privately asked them not to do it. Bros. Sweeney and Brents say were they to estimate the number of notes passed Mr. D. at Mayfield during Burgess' speeches, they would say there were a hundred. Yet Mr. D. made the statement and it served a purpose.

The truth is, such things are common, sometimes men are selected for the very purpose of making sugges-

tions. With those desiring the truth, there could be no objection to this. But to men who have no higher appreciation of a discussion than a personal contest or mere party triumph, such things may not be regarded as proper on the other side. When a man has done nothing but go over the matters of discussion for a dozen years as Mr. D. has done, and is perfectly familiar with all the points and authorities there can be but little occasion for suggestion, and hence they become much less common.

We make these comments and remarks upon the manner and spirit of this discussion. The question may be asked, with this record of the debate, why favor them? We never forsake a good principle because it is abused.

We are certain Dr. Brents has never attempted to pervert an author's meaning in any shape or manner. We are certain his brethren would never encourage him to debate again, were they satisfied that he did attempt it. We are certain that in the sober second thought of no religious people in the land, can such a course be sustained. What is needed then, is a persistent discussion of these questions of difference and a thorough and candid exposure of all the improper personalities, and the misrepresentation of authors and facts. The time will come, when men will discuss for the sake of truth, and in any event truth will and must be benefitted.

Then we are decidedly in favor of letting discussions go on until religious men can discuss their differences as Christians and gentlemen. It is a shame, an insult that every

Christian should resent, to be told that, while politicians, lawyers, scientific men, and farmers and mechanics can meet together and discuss their differences as gentlemen, with good feeling. Christians cannot discuss their differences without personal indignity, insulting behavior, and misrepresentation of truth and of authors. We say for the credit of religious men and the Christian religion let discussions go on until the grounds for such charges are wholly removed.

D. L.

The Sinner's Four Steps.

Doubtless you who are unconverted have heard it quoted time and again from the pulpit, that "the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin."

And perhaps you are in trouble to know how and where you are to come in connection with the blood of Christ. And you may have asked yourself the question, "How am I to get to his blood, and where am I to find it?" If so, I propose to assist you in finding the road.

And as there is but one road leading to his precious blood, there is but one place where it may or can be found: and there are only four steps from where you now stand.

These four steps do not differ from each other in their essentiality, but each is equally essential in order to the desired object, which is, "the blood of Christ which cleanseth from all sin." But however, they do differ from each other in their character, and each step is characterized in Scripture. And they must be strictly complied with, and each step must

be taken as it is given in the New Testament. If you take one, two, or three steps, and fail to take the fourth you fail in reaching the desired object

Therefore, it is very important that you know each step, and take each one as presented and taught in Scripture.

The first step to be taken is to "believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And as so much has been said about divine faith, historical faith and a half-dozen other faiths, I wish to tell you what is divine faith. It is a belief of divine testimony, and as the Bible is the Divine will, the testimony contained in it is divine also.

Therefore the belief of its testimony is divine, hence, *divine faith*.

The second step is repentance; that is, a sorrow for sin, and a restitution of all things so far as you are able, everything you have obtained by fraud, theft, or otherwise illegally possessed contrary to the law of God. The third step is a confession of what is believed in the heart, that is, "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." For Paul says, "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

Suppose my dear friends, you had taken these three steps, how far would you be from that precious blood? Just one step, which is to "be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

In this, the fourth step, Paul tells his Roman brethren, Rom. vi. 3, that they were baptized into the death of Christ. It reads, "Know ye not that so many of us as were bap-

tized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" In the death of Christ the blood flowed, and when we get into his death it is by faith we come in connection with his blood in his death. Peter says, "the like figure, even baptism doth now save us."

Here Peter says, that baptism is a figure; that is, it is a figure of the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Paul calls it a "form of doctrine." Rom. vi. 17. He says, "But God be thanked ye were the servants of sin; but you have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." The 18th verse reads thus. "Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness."

The doctrine taught by the Apostles, was, the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, as will be seen by referring to 1 Cor. vi. ch. 3, 4, ver.

Now my dear friends, you may have asked the question, "What is the form of doctrine here mentioned by Paul? I would say that sprinkling and pouring *are not* a form or figure of the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, which was the doctrine taught by the apostles. But immersion is the form of the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. And in obedience to the command "to be baptized," in the very act, we came into the death of Christ where the blood flowed. "Being then made free from sin we became the servants of righteousness." Now, my dear friends, will you take these four steps in order to come in contact with the blood of Christ which cleanseth from all sin. Just take these four steps as they are given in the

New Testament, and just as sure as the word of God is true, you will be made free from sin, that is, your sins will be "blotted out," "washed away," forgiven, remitted.

Do you not see that the condition, or law of pardon is easy? Then, O then, comply with those conditions; become the servants of God, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; place yourselves in the condition to claim the promises, and think not that you can be saved by faith alone. For James says, "faith if it hath not works is dead, being alone." "For as the body without the spirit is dead; so faith without works is dead also." I leave the matter with you and our God.

ELIAS LAND.

Groesbeck, Tex. Jan. 1st 1874.

Away up in Tennessee.

BY J. M. BARNES.

(Continued.)

I left the subject of preaching the Gospel, not because I had nothing more to say on the subject, but I was drawn off by other thoughts. I do not want the brethren to think they are not a live people but I make these suggestions because I think they are. The Methodists were carrying a meeting on all the time I was at Beech Grove. I should have said they carried it on until Thursday, then a Baptist carried it on for them until Saturday, when a kind Cumberland Presbyterian, lent himself out for the work of diverting the attention of as many as possible. They did not draw away enough so that our house would hold the people comfortably all the time. After a

pleasant week's work, I bade the brethren good-bye and moved, Monday morning, for Franklin. I passed by Spring Hill. Here is the mansion occupied a short time ago by Gen. Ewell. With the "lost cause," it appears that he lost his thirst for military glory and gave himself up entirely to agricultural habits. In this new life he succeeded well and proved a useful man in society and very enterprising in his new line of business. But he has gone, and "going" is written upon all things around us. I spent a very rainy day with Brother Thomas Bond. Though he has suffered the loss of his comfortable dwelling, by the fire of an incendiary, he still entertains, with an ease that makes one feel at home. At Thompson's Station there is a good house. From this and some scattered elements, a conclusion might have been drawn that there was a worshipping people here once. But there has been a storm here and there has been a blowing about of things. Map-makers paint the countries bordering on each other in different colors. Were I making a map of churches, I would paint these that let no light shine from them, but cast the dark shadows of fashion, covetousness, anger, hatred—black, significant of their influence. And we stain by wrongdoing, our characters black, and 'tis thus hope is changed into darkness. The venerable David Hamilton lives here. I met him in Marion and Selma in 1851, or 1852. He was then a zealous man and has retained his interest in the greatest matters of life until this day. He built the church at Selma, and was instrumental in starting the cause at that place. But

of the forty-five hundred or five thousand dollars, the cost of the house, he gave all but fifteen hundred and waited a long time for this and lessened it too, I think. This aged man told me that he had withdrawn from the church at Thompson's Station and broke bread with his family in his own house, and owing to the trouble had sold his valuable home. Brother Bond confessed to me, that he would not have sold his farm if the trouble had not jarred his equanimity. Now this will do for children, but how does it sound coming from those who drink at the fountain of that wisdom that is first pure, then peaceable, gentle easy to be entreated (to forgive and be forgiven), full of mercy and good fruits (not thorns and briars of contention) without partiality and hypocrisy. "Fight it out in the Union," is the true way; secession settles no difficulties. I told these brethren I thought their conduct open to some very just criticisms and after some reflection I still am of the same mind. Get up a dust and then all that stirred run out of it. No. If we run from a congregation every time troubles of this sort arise, we will ever be in motion while sojourning in the flesh. What should we think of the crew on board a vessel, that took to skiffs and floats at the approach of every storm or gale? The time Christ needs his sailors most, is when the ship is in danger. The time soldiers are useful is when the country is invaded. Let us not desert. Christ has fixed it, so that if difficulties are not settled, both parties are made to blame.

These are good men, and they must

remember that their light can only shine by doing good, in the church, in Christ, not out of him. Let us not be great nothings. Do you know who these are? You may have the gift of prophecy, understand all mysteries and all knowledge and have all faith so that you can remove mountains and still be a great *nothing*. Why? For the want of that love that is not easily provoked, 'seeketh not her own, is not puffed up, vaunteth not herself, is kind, thinketh no evil." But I must go on to Franklin praying that these dear brethren who have injured themselves and more than all the cause of Christ, may be one for Christ's sake, be at peace among themselves for Paul's sake, love as brethren for their own sakes, my sake and every body's sake.

Tuesday night I preached in Franklin and such was the complaint that my appointment was not known that I agreed to come back and be with them Sunday night. Dr. Hargrove, Methodist was creating some excitement at this place by a series of lectures on baptism. When invited to let the other side be heard, he refused. The ancients worshipped that from which they derived blessing. No wonder modern sects call that behind which so much tradition and error is screened from public attack, the "sacred desk." 'Tis a perfect bomb-proof for errors and those who hold them. If I had some pets like, "infant sprinkling," "The mourner's bench," "altar religion," "grave religion," "justification by faith only" and there were enemies to these things, and I could not ward off attacks, and there was a safe retreat into which I would go with all my fond tenderlings and

out of gunshot of all who would harm. I would certainly honor that city of refugees. The truth is the sects do not expect to meet us unless they can find a schooled quibbler, equivocator, dodger: They will not run before us their hares, stags, or the fleetest antelopes, 'tis only their foxes we can get into the chase. We have the truth, for we have the Bible and nothing else, train well and with the truth well-learned, we can hunt out every error and run it down, leaping as it does from one hiding place to another, and flying for safety into the midst of truth and putting on the appearance of of things that are so.

Early Wednesday morning sister Baugh stopped Beck, that good old mule, on the square. I changed vehicles, and again enjoyed the kindness of Mr. Ben. Brown, who was ready to carry me as far as Hillsboro on my way to South Harpeth. There is one thing I notice when in the company of men of the world. How clearly members of the church write out their characters. Paul said of the Corinthians, ye are my epistles, known and read of all men." 'Tis so men read us, and we should be very particular what we write and what kind of type we use. Here is the way he read out characters for my edification, "That is old sister K.'s, she understands the Bible and loves to talk about it too." "That man you see has a mighty fine wife, and of another woman, "she is smart in the Bible." "That young fellow has been a member but, he is too wild to be in the church." "Ah, that's a good man, no discount on him." "He's a pretty good old fellow but contentious." Thus the

foot-prints in the sands of time can be marked out clearly by those who are traveling toward the grave. 'The people of the country passed under judgment something like bills in the nimble fingers of the teller, counterfeits were marked, stamped and rejected, bills under par had discount levied upon them, those that had lost some of the essential parts condemned.

A pleasant meeting with the brethren at Leiper's Fork, a good dinner with brother and sister Rodgers, closed my career at this place and I mounted the sorrel pony for the next place. Late in the evening I was away over on South Harpeth with Bro. Morris Bond. We went by Smith's Spring and I took a big drink for my stomach's sake, and mine often infirmities. The water here is said to have been very profitable for medicinal properties, and as these possessions have changed owners of late, those who go health-hunting may expect better accommodations there. The Tennesseans are an economical people. They make a road out of the beds of the creeks and live upon the banks and raise geese. I know no prettier stream than South Harpeth. The steep rising bluffs that wall in the beautiful valleys, the wild scenery on the right and left, the springs of fresh, cool water that gush from the Mountain side as if distilled by the vast weight above, the fine farms, the trout, floating at leisure in the clear waters, entertain the stranger and charm him. "There," said brother Bond "is Lover's leap," pointing to a jutting crag that raised to a greater height than usual, but he could not

tell what infatuated swain, by a suicidal leap, thus took revenge upon the world in depriving it of his usefulness, because some obstinate miss would not make herself miserable to make him happy. I enjoyed very much, meeting with brothers Smith, Allen, Hooper, Linton, Allison, bro. Hanies and others, of this number some were young men. The pleasures of this short meeting here was greatly enriched by the presence of Bro. Davis, brother and sister Lipscomb, and quite a number of those I had met at Hillsboro, Beech Grove, and Franklin. Bro. Hooten mapped out the work for Sunday at two hours, but I fell short a quarter, and after breaking bread and shaking hands with the dear brethren, I mounted the horse brother Joe Baugh had waiting for me, and away, away on a twelve miles ride to Franklin, not forgetting however to stop at Bro. Pritchard's for dinner. Dewy eve found us nearing Franklin. All Sister Baugh's good eatables failed to coax my stomach out of the whim into which it got, so supperless I made hastily for the church. Bro Cayce seemed impatiently waiting, but the sight of Beck, that good old mule, gave him relief. This is not the only remarkable animal about Franklin. After having visited the church for twenty two years 'tis no wonder she knows so well how to go to church and stand there till her mistress worships the Lord. But the other, a horse, his master says, when he gets into the buggy, goes directly to the bar-room, but when his wife is to be carried, the faithful equine makes right for the Christian, (so called improperly) Church.

I preached one hour and a half, went home with brother Cayce, complained much of sore throat, dyspepsia, took some drams and drugs, went to bed, had a fine rest, got up next morning much better, thanked Sister Baugh and brother Cayce for the medical attention and the Lord for all his good things, ate some mutton hash, just the thing for my capricious digestion, thought sister Cayce ought to be thanked a little for that.

In turning my mind back to Tennessee, when I come to this place my mind undirected calls up brothers Beech, Lilley, the Mosses, the Caycies and quite a number of pleasant acquaintances. But my time had come to start home, sweet home, and at the depot I stood waiting for the train to come to bear me away to the place where the dear ones stay. The hour 8-40 came and passed on as if all things were right, but no transportation. A dispatch said they are coming. The gathered crowd stood looking up the road and none more anxious than myself I suppose. It came and the horse was sick, for his iron constitution did not save him from ailment, anyhow he had to be swapped off, which was done too soon for me to learn the diagnosis of his disease, whether swinney, fistula, farcy, foot-evil or colic, but we went furiously along trying to gain time. But this cannot be done even by the fleet steam car. "Time once lost is gone forever" is what the copy book said, improve the future is all that can be done when the past has been misused, abused or used to no purpose. This is what the young and old should know, I hear many persons under thirty lamenting misspent time. That

is well enough, but it is adding foolishness to folly, to lose many of the precious moments ahead, sighing and repining. You can mend your ways and the rest of your days be made to count full for themselves, but not for those gone before.

I met brother Zellner, father-in-law to brother Lipscomb in Nashville but just had the opportunity of speaking to him. He was on the train and I had the pleasure of a talk with him down to Columbia, at which place I expected to stop over and be with the brethren holding a meeting there, until the through train came along. As we went up town we met the people going to meeting, which had been appointed for that day in view of my being there. We faced about and were soon at the church, where we met brothers Hardison, Frazier, Dr. Lee, J. H. Morton, Smithson, Sparkman, several brethren from Beech Grove, and a number of the members of the church at this place I had unstrung my instrument to go home, and as I had no reserves for the occasion, I rallied my scattered forces and did the best I could without any excusing or much complaining. A number of us having dined at brother Foster's, we visited brothers Tucker and and McGehee, in the evening, at their business houses and a pleasant talk with brother Kent in the mean time. Bro. Smithson the preacher for the occasion is blind. At fifteen he ran away into the confederate army, took the small-pox, lost his eyes, subsequently he obeyed the gospel, married, and he has, by the assistance of his wife, learned so much of the Bible, that those who have eyes, feel ashamed of their ignorance

in his company. A very large audience seemed chain-bound by his preaching, and I listened to him with delight until ten minutes before eight and left, with brother White, for the depot. Got there just in time and took my seat to change no more until I got to Montgomery. After a thirteen miles ride, brother White left me to my own reflections. I thought of Tennessee, Alabama, home.

Faith, not Works.

Some years ago, two men, a bargeman and a collier, were in a boat above the rapids of a cataract, and found themselves unable to manage it, being carried so swiftly down the current that they must both inevitably be borne down, and dashed to pieces. At last, however, one man was saved by floating a rope to him, which he grasped. The same instant that the rope came into his hand a log floated by the other man. The thoughtless and confused bargeman, instead of seizing the rope, laid hold on the log. It was a fatal mistake; they were both in imminent peril; but the one was drawn to shore, because he had a connection with the people on the land, while the other, clinging to the loose, floating log, was borne irresistibly along, and never heard of afterwards.

Faith has a saving connection with Christ. Christ is on the shore, holding the rope, and, as we lay hold of it with the hand of our confidence, he pulls us to shore; but our good works, having no connection with Christ, are drifted along down the gulf of fell despair. Grapple our

virtues as tightly as we may, even with hooks of steel, they cannot avail us in the least degree; they are the disconnected log which has no hold-fast on the heavenly shore.—*Spurgeon*.

We clip the preceding paragraph from the *Methodist*, credited to Spurgeon. We publish it because it teaches a good lesson and because it manifests how easily a great mind may be misled, led into error. Let us look at the illustration. Two men are in danger of passing over a deadly precipice in the rushing torrent. A rope is thrown from the shore—it connects with the shore, the person on shore, the place of safety. A log floats by at the same time having no connection with the shore or any one on the shore, nor with any place of security. One seizes the rope, which by virtue of its connection with the place of safety, enables him to reach the shore and be saved. Spurgeon calls that *faith*, no works there. The other seizes the log—the log having no connexion with the shore, floats itself down to the whirlpool of ruin, and carries him who clings to it, on only the more rapidly. Spurgeon calls that *works*. But why this distinction? Did not the man who seized the rope work just as faithfully and earnestly with all his power and might as the man who hugged the log merely? I dare say he worked more earnestly. Did not the man who seized the log have as strong faith as he who seized the rope? Most certainly or he would not have seized it. Why then the difference?

The difference consists in the

proper and intelligent direction both of the faith and works present.

The man seizing the log—a faith in the log as a means of safety, his faith was simply misdirected. His faith led him to perform a kind of work that could not benefit. Neither faith nor works misdirected can benefit. Faith directed so as to make us trust to improper means, that is, to work in a wrong direction, to make us fail to use the proper means (that is to prevent us working at all) will hasten our ruin rather than save us. Faith directed to one able to save in such manner as to prompt us energetically to use the true and efficient means provided by him who is able to save, that is, to do energetically and faithfully the work directed of God, alone can save man. A faith in Christ that prompts us to serve Christ in his own appointments alone can save man. This the illustration enforces, nothing more. An illustration never proved any thing, it merely enforces. It is strange that a man of Spurgeon's intellect should so misapprehend the real points of his own illustration. It forcibly enforces the necessity of our intelligently so believing in Christ that we are willing earnestly and faithfully to do the work God has commanded, to accept the provisions he has made, he alone is at once in a place of safety, and is able to save. It illustrates further the danger of any faith which leads us to do any work or rely upon any means for salvation save those ordained and appointed of God. No works save those appointed of God, have any connection with God. Spurgeon's illustration quoted approvingly by the *Methodist*

overthrows his theology and contradicts his chosen heading. So that instead of "Faith, not works;" it should be faith and works. Our good works, that is, good works which we invent or devise, have no connection with Christ. But works devised and ordained by the Son of God, sanctified and sealed by his blood, have some connection with Christ. And in doing them, we receive the benefits of Christ, and our faith, through these, is so made perfect, that is, so finished, completed, that it fully harmonizes our work and walk with the divine will, that the faith is imputed or counted as righteousness.

D. L.

Taking up the Cross

"If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow me." Luke 9, 33.

Such is the language of the Savior to his disciples while here on earth. And the same principle that was applicable then in these matters is applicable now. The general course of this world is away from the purity of the religion of Christ now, as it was then. It is therefore just as necessary now for one to deny himself his fleshly propensities and worldly lusts, as when Jesus spoke on earth in person. He was then laying down principles that will hold good through all time. The flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh as much now, as in former times. And in this highly figurative expression of the Savior more is embraced than could be specifically expressed in many

pages. Many seem to suppose that in this age, there is no self-denial, no sacrifice to make, in order to be Christians. Those who claim to be Christians indulge as many luxuries, and as many worldly pleasures as the people of the world.

As they appear in society, but little difference is seen, and in many instances we have to be told they are members, before we would ever suppose they claimed to be the children of God. The word, cross, in this passage is figurative of suffering of some kind. Christ suffered literally upon the cross. He suffered bodily pain and finally death upon the Roman cross. We must suffer the denial of bodily pleasure that is inconsistent with the religion of Christ; and not only that, but we must ever be ready to sacrifice ease, comfort, or property or labor, that may be necessary for the relief of the poor suffering ones of earth, or for the advancement of the cause and kingdom of our Redeemer. The matter of sacrifice is seldom pleasant at the time, but afterwards, if done in the proper spirit, it yields peaceful fruits. We often suppose we are making sacrifice, when in reality we are not. It is no sacrifice to give surplus means occasionally for the relief of the suffering ones, or to build up the cause of God in our land, be that surplus much or little, while we still enjoy every luxury that we desire; and such things will never be accepted as sacrifices well-pleasing to God. When we have to sacrifice our time, labor, ease or property, that we would desire to devote to our own comfort and wishes, and do it heartily for the sake of Christ and his holy religion, and the

good of suffering humanity, we may then claim that in these things we are making sacrifices to God; may claim that we are taking up our crosses daily to follow Jesus. When we come to compare the little crosses that we take up, and the little sacrifices that we usually make in this life, with the great sacrifices that our Savior made for us, we find them utterly insignificant and worthless. It would do us good as Christians to study daily the life, the sufferings of the Son of God. His life in these regards gives us the example we should study and strive daily and hourly to imitate, that our lives may be like his, holy, harmless, and devoted to the will of the heavenly Father. If we, the people of God were willing to sacrifice for our holy religion, as Jesus sacrificed for us, it would be comparatively easy to advance his cause in the earth. We must listen to the cries of the poor and suffering ones around us, and lend a helping hand. But not alone to bodily suffering and distress, but it is certain that thousands all around us are suffering for the pure bread of life, the gospel of the Son of God. We do not have to go to Africa, nor to the Islands of the sea to find people who do not understand the gospel of the Son of God; we can find them at our own doors, all around us. And we may in vain suppose we are taking up our crosses daily, while such is the case, and we are making no efforts to give them the pure word of God, the bright light of heaven's truth as it shines upon the pages of the New Testament. While we are swimming in our luxuries and enjoying our ease

and piling up money and property around us, and make no effort to sound out the word of life, our claims to be the disciples of Christ, and the actions of our lives are palpably contradictory, and we had about as well cease to make any pretensions at all, as to try to live in that way, and suppose we are on the way to heaven. It certainly is in the power of Christians almost everywhere to do more towards spreading the gospel of Christ than we are doing. It was required of the Jews that they should give the first and best to the Lord; not take first what they wanted and give the surplus, if any, to the Lord. When the harvest time came, it was not their privilege to go and help themselves first, and if any left give that to the Lord, but they had to give the first fruits to the Lord. No matter how much they may have felt the need of it themselves, they had to bring the first as an offering to the Lord. If Christians everywhere would act upon this principle, to give the first fruits, and the tenth of all their annual incomes to the cause of Christ, the gospel banner might soon wave in every nook and corner of our land.

But unfortunately for us, we do not in many instances give the tenth of our surplus above a living; whereas the Jew was required to give a tenth of all, not merely of his surplus, but of all he made. And can it be, that the religion of the Savior is of less importance than that of the Jews was? and shall we give less for its support than did the Jews for their religion? We cannot for a moment think so. But on the other hand we should be more ready to

bestow our goods to spread and sustain the religion of Christ than the Jews were that of Moses. The religion of Christ is as far ahead of the Jews' religion as Christ is ahead of Moses. The apostles, and many others of them sacrificed their goods, their homes, their ease and comfort and many of them their own lives in support of the religion of Jesus. And never in any age has the gospel spread so rapidly, nor in any age has the gospel been so pure, nor individual Christians so humble and devoted. We need more of that self-sacrificing spirit that filled the hearts of Christians in early times. Let us all strive to do more for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ this year, than in former years. And we think as a general thing, our churches are too much inclined to call in the preachers, to preach for them, and do not send them out into the world in new, and destitute fields enough. Often it occurs that churches have preaching till the members depend upon that alone for Spiritual life, and the aliens who attend hear the Gospel till they become hardened under it and half or three fourths of the labor expended by the preacher and the money expended by the church for his support, is worse than wasted, where such is the case.

Churches of course should have preaching enough to give their neighbors a chance to hear the gospel, and to become Christians if they will. But whenever they have had fair trial and opportunity, and still refuse the Savior, then, like the apostles of old, turn to some body else, that will hear. There should be economy used in preaching the gos-

pel of Christ. It is wrong to continue to preach to the same individuals, and thus expend time and labor and money, without accomplishing any good, while there are neighborhoods all around that would hear and embrace the truth, if they had an opportunity. And besides, the very men that are most competent to carry the gospel successfully into new regions are kept preaching for churches all the time, and in a large number of instances where new churches are built up, it is done by preachers who do it at their own charges. And where they are able to do it, this is all right, they ought to do so. But the idea of churches which are able to sustain a preacher, requiring all his time among them, and must have their own ear pleased and gratified, and not deny themselves enough to send the gospel off to the poor and destitute, is wholly inconsistent with the self-sacrificing principles of the religion of Christ. Churches which act thus, are not bearing the cross daily. They are not doing as the master required, in the passage that heads this article. The way that leads to life is truly a narrow one, and the gate is strait, or difficult. We want more work in the churches, both among the preachers, and the other members in order to successfully spread the cause or kingdom of Christ throughout our land. And if we will all live up to the principles enjoined by the Savior in the above language, churches, and individual Christians would be more earnest ones, and the world around us would be rapidly converted to Christ. The Lord then would be honored by his people, and they

would be indeed and in truth, preparing themselves through the tender mercies of God, for an eternal and happy home in heaven, when all the struggles, toils, griefs, and pains of this life are done.

E. G. S.

QUERIES.

A Brother asks if it is proper to take the Lord's Supper in the forenoon.

We know of nothing in the New Testament to confine the partaking of this institution to any particular part of the day. The inspired language is, they came together on the first day of the week to break bread, and certainly any time of the day will fill this language. Regarding the expression "the Lord's Supper," found in tenth of 1st. Cor. the word translated supper, is elsewhere translated feast, and the most literal or primary meaning of the original word is a "meal" in our common acceptation and use of that term.

In some of the Old Greek writers as in Homer, this same Greek word translated supper, was used to signify breakfast, or the first meal in the day. So we think there is nothing in the word supper, to confine to the part of the day in which we usually eat our suppers in modern times.

So this feast is kept on the first day of the week, we think the requirement is obeyed, whether in the forenoon, afternoon, or at night. The main points are that we take it on the first day of the week and with the proper design.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S: Paul's letter to Romans 28 chapter 3 verse, reads, "therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Does the law here referred to mean the Jewish law, if so, then what is the meaning of the 31st verse of the same chapter, it is the law of Christ," what is meant by the expression "deeds of the law?" please answer through the Advocate.

Your Brother

R. F. P.

We doubt not but that in both verses alluded to, the word law refers to the law of Moses. The apostle, in most of this letter to the Romans, is showing God's justice in rejecting the law, and establishing the gospel of Christ. The word faith in these passages is most likely used in the sense of the Gospel plan of salvation, which has to be received and obeyed through faith, so that the whole is represented by the word faith. But in showing that the law was done away, the Jew would be likely to conclude that the law never was of any value if it had to be done away, and hence he propounds that question for the Jew, as we have it in 31st verse. The Jew is represented as asking; "do we then make void the law?" That is, are you going to claim that the law never was of any account? By no means says Paul, we establish the law; that is, the law was good in its time, and accomplished that for which it was designed. But his object in this letter is to show that the law of Moses, however good in its time was done away, and the gospel was established, and that now, all who desire the favor of God

must seek it through the gospel of Christ, and not through the law of Moses. And this is the lesson the apostle was endeavoring to teach in the passage under consideration.

E. G. S.

Meeting of the Colored Brethren at Franklin Tenn.

Brethren from several Christian congregations met according to agreement in Franklin, Tennessee, at 10 o'clock A. M. Dec. 9 1873. Elder D. Wadkins called the meeting to order, and read the 90th Psalm. Prayer by Elder B. Parrish. Elder D. Wadkins then stated the object of the meeting; to select an evangelist to labor in preaching in Middle Tenn. during 1874 at a salary of seven hundred dollars, also to decide on the expediency of publishing a monthly religious paper devoted to apostolic teaching. The Brethren present thought as more brethren were expected, that we had better adjourn the meeting until 9 o'clock the next day, which was done. Dec. 10. The brethren reassembled at 10 o'clock. The chairman read the 91st Psalm, Prayer by Elder Sam Hardison, Before proceeding to select an evangelist, Elder D. Wadkins stated, as he would have to leave on the train for his appointments in Miss. before the selection could be made, they had better choose another moderator. He also stated that he would co-operate with them and concur in all they agreed to that was in harmony with the teaching of the apostles. The Brethren then chose elder Wm. Lawrence Moderator. After a free interchange of

sentiments Elder M. T. Hardison was selected for the work of evangelist. The subject of a periodical was then taken up and maturely considered for some time, and the meeting selected, brethren William Lawrence, Isaac Woods, A. N. C. Williams and J. K. Donnell to make the necessary arrangements for the publication of the paper. The business for which the meeting was held being then accomplished, the Brethren left for their homes, resolved to work more faithfully in the Lord's vineyard. Brethren in attendance, Elder Daniel Wadkins, Thyatira church, Tate County Miss. Elders Bartlett, Parrish, William Lawrence, Isaac Woods, second Christian Church Nashville, James K. Donnell, George Brown, A. N. C. Williams, Franklin, Samuel Hardison, Maury County. Moses T. Hardison, Hickman County, Charles Webster Maury County, Albert Webb, Hickman County. As the Brethren expressed a determination to exert their power and influence in the maintenance of these objects it is hoped that their appeals to other brethren and congregations will not be in vain. Let all try to excel in the good work. All money donated must be sent to Elder William Lawrence, second Christian Church Nashville Tenn.—donations must be specified whether for the support of the evangelist or the paper.

JAMES K. DONNELL, Sec.

Church News.

Bro. Lipscomb: I take great pleasure in reporting through the Gospel Advocate, the result of a meeting held at this place by Bro. W. E.

Hall, of Jackson Tenn., beginning Saturday night before the first Lord's day in this month, and continuing six days. Bro. Hall labored faithfully during the meeting, and succeeded in organizing a congregation of ten persons, who pledged themselves to meet every Lord's day to observe the ordinances of God's house. We trust that much prejudice against the disciples of our blessed Savior, was removed, and that the good seed sowed will spring up, "and bare fruit a hundred fold." Bro. Hall is an evangelist for West Tenn., sent out by the church at Jackson. He is a live preacher, a zealous Christian and a faithful worker in the Lord's vineyard. May the Lord bless him in his good work.

Yours in hope of Heaven.

H. C. BREWER.

Brethren L. & S.: There have been nine additions to the army of the faithful, recently, at this place, under the labors of Bro. Hamblen and myself, aided by the church. The thanks and the praise belong to the Lord.

W. T. BUSH.

Salado, Bell Co. Texas, Sept. 4th 1873.

The New Nightingale.

This little work by A. D. Fillmore is on our table. A Sunday-School and home music book in figure-faced notes, published by Applegate & Co. Cincinnati. It can be had from bro. C. L. Fillmore. Price not given.

"The very time to be helpful and pleasant is when everybody is tired and cross."—*The Well-Spring.*

Pluck out the Right Eye.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb : I do not believe that Mark 5, 18, was designed to teach man to mutilate his body: such an operation could not produce virtue in the heart, and it is "out of the heart that adultery proceeds. Mark 7 : 21.

In Matth. 19 : 10—14. The Savior teaches that a man must not put away his wife except it be for a certain cause. To which the disciples respond. "It is not good to marry." In his reply the Savior teaches that there are three kinds of Eunuchs. And those that are born Eunuchs, certainly differ from those so made by men. The third class who have not married (made themselves eunuchs) for the kingdom of heaven's sake. Christ called Herod a fox, and he here calls the unmarried who so remain, eunuchs, to such he offers the privilege of remaining. But he says all cannot receive this saying. And Paul says, such as cannot, had better "marry than burn." Under the Jewish dispensation the Eunuch could not enter the kingdom of God. And under the Christian dispensation a man must himself overcome lust who would teach others so to do. But if a Eunuch, he is not tempted. If not tempted, he does not overcome, and not having triumphed himself he is a poor example exhorting others to do what he had not the courage to perform, and what he might have performed, if he had not turned unto a fable, instead of trusting God's word and Spirit for strength and direction. But if a man has trampled upon his judgment, stifled his conscience and blunted his sensibility

till he cannot cease from this sin the Gospel makes no more provision for his salvation than for the guilty Sodomites. A man might be less dangerous to society by destroying this faculty but not not one whit more virtuous. But if so, a man may by cutting his throat destroy all his faculties and so become virtuous without the struggle to overcome the world. Whosoever disarms himself to keep from fighting, sins against Scripture, and his own body, to him that overcometh is the promise given and not to him that flies the field.

In conclusion, I will add, that it pains me to have to differ with you upon this subject, nor would I willingly utter one word to reflect upon your usually sound judgment or valuable paper. But I submit the foregoing to your good sense hoping that you, with me, will encourage none in this effort to imitate Origen, and, to cease to persuade wicked men to mutilate their bodies; and preach instead the gospel by which they overcome the world.

In Hope,

J. J. WILLIAMSON.

Center Point Jan 27th 1874.

—

Our brother thinks there is no virtue in the heart, when a man mutilates himself, to enable him to obey the law of the Lord. We think there must be a goodly degree of virtue that causes a man to thus punish and unman himself that he may serve the Lord. The Spirit is often willing but the flesh is weak to do the right, strong to do the wrong. The Savior, Paul, and all inspired teachers certainly recognize this truth. The truth that there is vir-

ture often in the heart, when the flesh is weak to perform the desires of the heart, is the real groundwork on which God in his mercy provides for repentance and forgiveness. But the Savior does not teach men to thus mutilate themselves except in certain cases in which it is essential to the overcoming of sinful passions. Then I believe he gives them the privilege of so doing in preference to their being cast into hell.

Our brother thinks there are three kinds of Eunuchs recognized of the Savior. A Eunuch is one devoid of virile or amatory passions. The Savior says, some are born so. We learn that this class is much more common among the effeminate nations of the East than among the Western nations. The kings and men of power having harems of wives, employed this class of men to perform the duties and labors of the harem, to avoid occasion of infidelity on the part of any of their wives. When a sufficient number of these natural Eunuchs could not be found, the kings made Eunuchs of the children or grown persons that they might be suited for this service. How was it done? by mutilation or by the excision of the part disqualifying for the work. The Savior refers to this as those made eunuchs by men. He then refers to those who make themselves eunuchs. How? By doing for themselves, the same thing that is done unto others by men, that they may serve in the kingdom of God free from temptation to violate the law of God by animal lust. We can see no ground why the language is figurative. If figurative in one of these places it must be in all of them.

The Savior does use a figure in the connection. Cut off the right hand, pluck out the right eye, are figures of this very thing. I never heard of a figure of a figure.

I do not think our brother need have fear of a great many being induced to take this step. Frequently it would be a blessing if these would do it who strive to prostitute youth and destroy virtue to gratify unholy and worldly lusts. Violation of the marriage vow, and the degradation of this sacred relationships so common, are higher crimes before God, than this, as I read the Bible. Men look lightly on preachers even doing that to gratify their lust and degrade the institutions of God.

The Savior certainly has given men the privilege of cutting off the right arm or plucking out the right eye to save the soul. This is figurative of something literal and real. The connection plainly points out what this is. While Christ teaches it. I am content to affirm that teaching and bear the consequences. Exactly where our brother finds that he who disarms himself to keep from fighting, sins against Scripture, I do not find. A man is encouraged to avoid temptation, if disarming himself is not this, I know not what is, or how to do this. Others may seek to brave temptations and have strength to overcome, I will always prefer to have the temptation removed lest I fall. As to what is a sin against reason and ones own body, we feel but little interest, reason and our bodies are usually the embodiment of our passions and lusts.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

GET THE RIGHT PATTERN.

"As obedient children not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance, but as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation." 1 Pet. 1: 14.

The rain pattered on the roof and window pane and those under cover could well look out and rejoice that they were indoors on such a chilly, wetting occasion. I sat enjoying the protection I had, though away from home. While thus pensively engaged or rather unemployed, I caught the words of mother and daughter, who seemed to be considering a weighty matter. Their intense interest begat something of a kindred nature in me, though unobserved I gave my attention. "I think" said the Miss, "it says three." Mamma said something which I failed to hear from no fault of mine as the tone of voice was suppressed, but I judge she said, "be certain about it," for the hand of the young lady reached over to a table as if in obedience to some mandate, and picked up a book. Can you imagine the picture? A beautiful belle sitting behind a book. What was it, a Bible? No. A hymn book? Oh, no. Josephus? No. Eusebius, Mosheim, or Neander? No. Gibbon, Macaulay or some other book of history? No. Some book of poetry? No. "Yes," she said, "'tis three," as she looked

on the pages of the book, *three buttons*. The book said three buttons on the sleeves and it *must* be so. This settled the dispute or argument, and put an end to investigation. No one dared dissent. Now I want it understood that I do not object to thus closely following the book, yet I may not like the book. 'Tis good to follow just what the book says, *provided* it is the *right book*. On another occasion my brain machinery refused to work. The time had nearly come to preach. I sat at a brother's house scratching my head as if ideas were there and could be set to work by stirring them. Several brethren and sisters were present seemingly enjoying the occasion, but I saw few things to laugh at. I rubbed my face rapidly with my hands and said to myself, *I will think*, but 'tis more easily said than done, for the sluggish wheels, gummed, or otherwise clogged, moved not. But no one can tell what will develop itself or *unvelope* itself. A sister sitting rather behind me and unnoticed as she thought, drew from her pocket a *long yellow envelope*. Now how I saw it no one knows, I guess, for it was, as already said, not exactly on my seeing side. But anyhow I managed to find out that Sister No. 1 had sent to Philadelphia for it and contents for Sister No. 2, and there seemed to be great joy at its advent. I had some curiosity to see what manner of thing would be brought forth by such a huge envelope. It was not a love letter, nor did this yellow covering bring a will, a deed, a divorce or any legal paper. It was a kind of a mountain-in-labor case, for it gave birth to nothing but a

mouse of a Yankee-made pattern. Now do not understand that I object to persons being zealous in getting something to follow, or to their spending money to obtain them. Yet I insist on their being particular what they follow. Get the right patterns, then go ahead. But I could have slapped my hands and cried out, "I have found it, I have found it," as did the old philosopher, for my subject hopped into my head and I turned over to Peter and read from his work, his remarks on fashion, then went cheerfully to the meeting house armed and equipped for the work before me. When I think of the conduct of such as the above and see how earnest in the small things of this life, I think of the words of the Lord, "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light, but all the parties mentioned were or *ought* to be and *claim* to be children of light. I have heard often of "giving the devil his due" but 'tis not right to call members of the church or congregation of Jesus our Lord, the children of this world, and here he gets then his due. We are children of light because we comprehend the light, draw light from the sun of Righteousness and let our light, that we get from this great luminary, shine upon the world. The good deeds the Christian does are the most noticeable things about him. They outshine all the trappings that can be put on him. But did you ever notice, Ma and her daughter get lost to all the attention due company in discussing how to fashion the character to please God and godly men? Never, no never.

In our day and time, there must be any number of churches so that every one can have a choice. Again there is great liberty and many fancies allowed to church people and indulged in by them. Man dares to decide what is decent in religion and indecent and rejects such as his ripened sensibilities stamps with disapproval. If the jacket furnished by God's word be too tight, he does not hesitate to clip the thread or even to make a rent. But should Lord God the Pope of fashion coinage say three buttons, it makes no difference what good taste may dictate or forbid; it amounts to nothing. 'Tis decreed. A difference of one button would bring down the frown of displeasure and such disobedience would be marked out rebellion and the unceremonious bull would be issued from headquarters and every devotee would sneer at such an one, and boorish, low-bred, not tasty would be the epithets coming from refined mouths and applied to those who would dare have a mind of their own. But on the contrary, again think with what looseness the word of God is handled. 'Tis a difficult task to convince the same young lady who is a stickler for three buttons, that dancing is reveling. She *can't see* it in that way, she will say and at the same time, sets her judgment up against the plain definition of terms, the judgment of the wise and good. Here she is willing to think and act for herself, a thing she would not dare do if Mr. Frank Leslie or some of his craft speaks. If "put away all anger, wrath, malice, evil speaking," "let not jesting be named among you," "lie no more," "provide

all things honest in the sight of all men," and many other injunctions with the seal of heaven upon them were followed with the nicety manifested upon the rainy day, the church would be looked after more and the style of this world less. This is an expression in Paul's writing, "I will that the women adorn themselves in modest apparel." The next time you go out look how closely this is followed by those who have committed themselves to the work. I saw one poor little fashionable creature last summer, with breast and arms so bare that the small bands around the shoulders looked like a narrow isthmus that joined two large bodies of water. This was modest apparel however. But two thirds of the breast nude is no breach upon modesty. What a world! "With shamefacedness" said the same writer. Should a face painted, powdered, adorned with trinkets, and topped off with a large knot of bark be considered shamefaced? Oh, yes, this license is allowed to man by man when he treats of things God has said. This is not to a T, the dot of an I or to a button in precision however. Did not our mothers wear veils? That was modest, it was shamefaced, but much of the dressing is now advertisements for notice. No one thinks of violating the instruction not to adorn with costly array for only a Rothschild can do this, that is according to the modern way of viewing things. I wonder when the young sisters jingle in chains and bobs and glitter with gold buttons, lockets, bracelets, pins, etc., if their adorning is with gold? Oh no. Now that is the way the

word of God is read in our time. "Adorn with good works." If all would do this, no other ornaments would be necessary. Dressing then would be for use, not to decorate. But even this is not construed properly. It seems from the actions of the religious, that getting up tableaux, fairs, dinners, suppers, and thus providing for the needy are acts of benevolence, but running hands in pockets and drawing therefrom the means of relief is a last act of devotion. We can add to these religious services grand funerals and the wearing of melancholy mourning. How closely the lines of a pattern are followed. Why? For fear the garment will not fit. Yes, and that is the way for us to do when we cut our lives or characters out by the model, or pattern God has given. He will look at us closely, then we should keep close to the line of duty. He likes holiness, then we should strive to appear in his sight in a manner pleasing to him. Patterns of last year are laid aside as out of date, and no more to be used until the mistress of ceremonies gives orders to bring them into vogue again. How strenuously the out-of-dates are shunned by those who would please the eye educated in the last phases of Gody, Harper, Madam Demorest or some other style monger. gives shapes and turas, lengths and lines, shades and hues, and when urged to use them still, they plead statute limitation. Another lesson may be learned from this servile act of the children of this world. Obedient children, Peter says, should not fashion themselves after former lusts, that is, after out-of-date fashions, but take the new

one. This does not come from Paris, Berlin; London, New York, Philadelphia, Boston or Cincinnati, but from heaven. What a triumph for truth and righteousness would be gained, if their friends and servants feared for God and man to see in them, crossness, contrariness, selfishness, anger, envy, dodgings of the truth, avoiding paying debts, pride, desire for worldly glory, greed for other's wealth, extortion, drunkenness, dram drinking, two faces, and all other forbidden things as much as the close liners or three buttoners do to be seen with sleeves, waists, skirts, collars a few days too old, the hair a fraction too high, too low, too small or not frizzed enough. The world has a zeal for these things and it is just according to knowledge and that they may know them, they get books and read them too, do not keep them on the center table as ornaments. They go to the mantua-maker, visit the go-ahead neighbors and find them out somehow, anyhow by all the hows. "It is a good thing to be zealously affected in a good thing." Did you ever notice an intelligent man who had just returned from the city, village or burg and those who sat around listening at the enumeration and description, item by item, of the things that constitute the outfit of church or party visitors of these days? The dog may howl and bark; the children play, hollow, cry and squall, the geese and hens cackle, the cock crow and still the recitation will go on and the demonstration be so clear that the children can understand it. If in an instant the speaker could be changed to reader of the

Bible or a lecturer on morals, then what? Would interest remain the same, or would it fag or be lost, which? Such listeners the Bible reader should have and would often if he or she that reads or teaches would manifest the same interest and life in telling its inestimable truths. Remember Peter says, do not fashion yourselves according to former lusts, that is, after your carnal desires. We should get out of these, get free from them, and be above them. Christ proposes to free us from the tyrannous rule of the animal man or our appetites, and offers himself, instead, as our sovereign. He will control us through our judgment or good senses by the word and not by our feelings or lusts. What is the reward of being conformed or formed according to the will of God; of being fashioned after the model, mold, or pattern God has given? Eternal life and the likeness of Christ. What is gained by following the styles men suggest? Nothing and much lost. Then the heart, the mind, the judgment, the spiritual man, common sense say follow the style of life Christ led. But a question on the matter. How eager should we be? Let none outstrip us. Do not let those in quest of earthly gains and worldly pleasures show more earnestness or determination than those who hope for an incorruptible and an undefiled inheritance. Those trying to catch the eye of man and win his praise should not be allowed to exhibit more zeal than the candidate for the favor of Jehovah. I know women who make it a point to see to the fitting of all the sleeves, skirts, basques, sacques in

the neighborhood and oversee the doing up of all the hair and bark. The sister whom I mentioned sent away off to secure a fit for another sister and paid for it too I expect. Go thou and do likewise my brother and sister, only get the right pattern. Rouse up Christian, the world is wide awake to the interests of the flesh and you slumber. Look around you. Are all young and old dressed properly? Now be particular about it. God is looking on. Have they the right number of buttons? Are they in style? Will the great king receive them when he comes? Will he cast them into outer darkness for the want of the wedding garment? If there is danger, go to fitting, cutting, altering, all the time fashioning after the holiness of God, and taking out all the lusts of flesh from the conduct. Young Christian you see how those seeking the wisdom of this world do, go to the old and faithful, learn of them, read the Bible and learn how many buttons to have. Read the style of Christian garment in Col. iii.

Not Governed That way.

“Come along with us; we’re going to have some fun,” said a boy one day, when seeking to persuade another to go with him. “I can’t,” was the answer, “my father told me not.”
 “Pooh,” said the tempter, what of it? He won’t know.”
 “I don’t care, I’m not going.”
 “You’re afraid!” sneered the young scoundrel; you’re afraid of your pa!”
 “Now, look here,” said the little hero, “I’ve heard all that sort of talk

before, and you needn’t think that you are going to govern me that way,” and he started down the street for home.

About the meanest government we know of is when some little reptile, after coaxing and wheedling an honest boy in vain, changes his tone, and puckering up the corners of his nose into a sneer, says:

“Coward! ’Fraid of yer marm, ain’t you? Before I’d be tied to my mother’s apron strings!”

And many a poor cowardly boy fears this contemptible slang so much that he forgets God, and father, and mother, and is led into some disgraceful scene of sorrow, which gives him pain and shame as long as he lives.

Boys, do not governed that way.—Let scoffers sneer and scorners scorn; trust in the Lord, and you shall be kept in safety to the end.—*Little Christian.*

RECREATION.—Make thy recreation servant to thy business, lest thou become slave to thy recreation; when thou goest up into the mountain, leave this servant in the valley; when thou goest to the city, leave him in the suburbs; and remember the servant must not be greater than his master.—*Quarles.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The Franklin Debate.....	73
The Sinner’s four steps.....	77
Away up in Tennessee.....	78
Faith, not works.....	83
Taking up the cross.....	84
Queries	87
Meeting of the colored brethren in Frank- lin Tenn.....	88
Church News.....	89
Pluck out the Right eye.....	90
Fireside.	
Get the right Pattern.....	92
Not governed that way.....	96

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 5.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JAN. 29, 1874.

SHALL CHRISTIANS ACT AS
JURORS ?

(We hope the brethren will carefully read, and attentively consider the following correspondence. The subject demands most serious consideration. If Christians are to engage actively in building up, and be executors of the laws of the governments of this world, we ought to do it with a will, and zeal, and all work together. But if it be true that Christians belong to a different kingdom, that does not allow its members to participate actively in another kingdom, but simply submit to the governments of this world, as law-abiding people, but spend all their time and energies, and means in upbuilding the kingdom of Christ, and in laboring for the conversion of the world, then we ought to spend our time in so doing. Whenever we all understand this subject aright, we will understand it alike. We insist upon it therefore, that the brethren thoroughly study their duties as contained in the Scriptures on this subject. If brother Ramsey did right, all ought to do the same way, under

like circumstances. But if he did wrong, we all ought to know it, and avoid such difficulties. He has given us some of the reasons why he acted as he did. Now has our good brother misconstrued these Scriptures, and thus involved himself in needless troubles? If so, some one who is competent for the task, ought to show wherein. And if none can show it, let all act likewise.

E. G. S.)

McMINNVILLE, OCT. 1ST, 1873.

Bro. S. McRamsay: My dear Bro.

Your refusal to serve as a juror at our late term of court, has excited some comment and criticism, which induces the writing of this note with a view of calling your attention to some Scriptures that we think may be a little hard to harmonize with your position. If I understand you, you take the position that Christians can take no active part in the affairs of the political governments of this world. Now I will first call your attention to 1st Timothy, ch. 2: 2, to pray for kings, and all rulers. Now are we not bound to work for anything that we pray for? What

would you think of a man praying for bread, and not working for it, or praying for the conversion of sinners, and doing nothing for the spread of the gospel, or praying for the widow and orphan, and contributing nothing for their relief? It strikes me as a little inconsistent to pray for a king, and then refuse to vote for a Christian, or God-fearing man. And again, we have in the Scriptures two courts recognized. One is the church, the other as compared to it (not literally), is the court of the unrighteous. Both are ordained of God. Two of the children of God having a matter that they cannot settle, are not to go to law in the court of the unrighteous, so to speak; but before the church. Suppose a child of God has a matter against one who is not a child: then to what court does he have to go? Not the church; the superior court of God, but the lower court. Both courts are ordained of God, but each have their missions, and for us to refuse to work in the lower court because we belong to the higher one, is like saying, that because we have eaten of the bread of life, that we will never again eat of any other bread. Were not Cornelius, and the Philippian jailor, officers of world governments? And if so, did they ever resign? We next invite your attention to Matthew xxii, and 21st, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Does this not clearly indicate active service to the governments of this world? See Romans, thirteenth, 1st to 6 v. inclusive. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God, the powers

that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a reveuger, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Therefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also, for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." Now in view of such declarations as these, are we not bound to submit to these powers? Can we do otherwise without doing violence to the word of God? And then, suppose all Christians refuse to participate in the selection of our officers, what becomes of the country? If these rulers are God's, and they must be or they would not be ordained of him, does it not follow as a consequence that the governments they serve are also his, and our duty also to assist in selecting good officers?

Your Bro. in Christ,

H. L. WALLING.

MORRISON, TENN., OCT. 10, 1873.
Bro. Walling: Dear Bro: Yours of the 1st has been received, and contents noted. I am well aware of the fact that my course at the late term of Circuit Court excited some criticism, and in some instances a little

severe. This I expected, after the matter had gone so far as to be made public, which I endeavored to avoid, by writing to Judge Hickerson at Altamont, a week before Court, stating to him my reasons for not wanting to serve as a juror in the coming court. I heard nothing from him in reference to it: so on Monday of court, I went to McMinnville, and sought and obtained an interview with him before court convened. He told me in that interview that he could do nothing off the bench, intimating at the same time that he would not release me. But I still hoped he would, as I knew other Judges had released other brethren for the same reason. I waited until court was called, and appeared before him, and asked him to excuse me for reasons previously stated. He then informed me he could not do so. I then felt the only alternative left me, was to withdraw from the courtroom, and submit to whatever the powers that be might impose; and accordingly did so. I felt then and still feel grateful to Judge Hickerson for making the fine (\$25) as light as he did, for I am satisfied that he did what he believed under the circumstances to be right: although I felt otherwise, from the simple fact that others had been released, and I could see no reason why I should not. Had it not been for this, I would have expected nothing else but a fine. And permit me to say with all the lights before me, I would do the same thing again. The points of objection urged by you, will require a little more time for thought and reflection than I can devote at this time, but will as soon as I have the time, (say

about the 1st of January) reply to yours in full, and if you are willing, and the editors of the Advocate are willing to publish the correspondence, would like to have it published so that you with others may know my reasons for acting as I did, inasmuch as a reply to your points of objection will cover all the ground.

Your devoted friend and brother,
SAM. MC RAMSEY.

McMINNVILLE, TENN., OCT. 12.
1873.

Bro. Ramsey: I am anxious the correspondence should be published, if you can remove the objections presented, I and others would like to see it.

Your Bro.
H. L. WALLING.

MORRISON, TENN., JAN. 1ST, 1873.

Bro. H. L. Walling: Dear Bro.

The time for redeeming my pledge has arrived, and I hasten to reply to yours of Oct. the 1st, and will first review your position on Romans 13. as this seems to be regarded as one of the strongest passages of the inspired writings by which to prove that Christian men owe active service to the governments of the world. We believe this to be a perversion of the lesson taught by the apostle to the disciples, and that when his language is properly understood it, absolutely prohibits all active participation in the affairs of human governments. We believe that God ordained these institutions and rulers, and that he ordained them for a specific purpose. But not for the use of his approved subjects. All the institutions ordained of God are good for

those for whom they were ordained. But all the ordinances of God are not for the use of his approved subjects, nor all of his ministers the servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. In proof of this proposition, let us refer to the character of the institutions and rulers at the time of the apostle's writing this letter to the disciples at Rome. The Roman government was engaged at this time in persecuting, imprisoning, and destroying every man and woman in all the land that professed Christianity, who was so unfortunate as to fall into their hands. The apostle himself could bear testimony to this fact for it was his lot to suffer these persecutions and imprisonments.

This letter was also written by the apostle during the reign of Nero. Now of the civil rulers that constituted the ministers of God to which Paul tells his brethren to submit, Nero was the chief and supreme. To say that a Christian can be such a minister of God as is here spoken of, is to say that he was a Nero in place and character of whom it is said that he expressed the wish that humanity had but one neck, that he might sever it at one blow. But Nero was a minister of God, if Paul be true, and others of like character—such as Nebuchadnezzar, and Cyrus, the latter of whom God chose to call his anointed, who was simply a wicked idolatrous heathen. Now these were all God's ministers, and as we stated in the outset, they were ordained for a specific purpose, and that was to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil; a task too great for God to impose upon a gentle, tender-hearted Christian. But these rulers suited

in character the work God ordained them for, and just so long as any considerable number of people refuse to submit to the will of God, just so long will it be necessary for him to ordain rulers to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. But he never trusts this selection to his approved subjects. Yet, at the same time he has thoroughly furnished them unto every good work, and given rules by which they conduct themselves in every relationship of life into which it is lawful, or even possible for a Christian to enter. But he has nowhere in the Bible given one word as to how his servants shall conduct themselves as active participants in a government of human mould. Now if it is lawful for a Christian to enter into this relationship, is it not strange that our heavenly Father failed to give directions in a matter involving the weal or woe of millions, and the peace and quiet of the world? Why is it then that God has given us plain and specific directions as to how we should conduct ourselves as husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant, elder and younger, offender and offended, but not a word as to how a man shall conduct himself as an active participant in a political government. Why this? We conclude a Christian may be a husband, a wife, a servant, a master. A Christian may even sometimes wrong his brother or be wronged, may be a subject of earthly human governments, because the Scriptures thoroughly furnish him with directions for his guidance in these relations, but nowhere furnish him with a single word as to how he shall act as a ruler, and active participant

in a human government. Now Bro. Walling, if it is the duty of Christians to vote, you are bound to admit that it is a Christian duty. Then all Christians ought to vote alike, and act together and this action should be in accordance with the will of God. It is not right for some Christians to go to an election and be on the Lord's side, and some against him, and surely the Lord can't be on both sides. Behold the dilemma into which Bro. Walling casts himself, (as bishop of the congregation at McMinnville just before an exciting election when his brethren are pretty equally divided), in endeavoring to get them all to vote on the Lord's side. As a teacher you are bound to admonish them to do all things in the name of the Lord, that is by his authority, for this is the only way we can do things in his name. Now, where is the authority and what the directions in this important matter? No - Bro. Walling, as you are not thoroughly furnished unto this good work, division will be the inevitable result at this election—some voting on one side, and some on the other (it being hard for brethren to agree at all times as to which is the Lord's side) and may finally culminate in war, (such things have occurred in our own land, and have been brought about just in this way, by political parties.) Could you in such an event shoulder your musket, and call upon your brethren to assist in sustaining your vote? If not, would you not feel a little bad in abandoning your nearest and best friends in a fight you actively assisted in bringing upon them, and just at a time, too, when your services are needed most? Now this is just the condition in which the voting Christian is liable to place himself. He must either employ carnal weapons in the defence of his position, (which is positively forbidden in the Scriptures), or cowardly withdraw from a fight he actively assisted in bringing on himself and friends. You verbally admit in your note the existence of two or more kingdoms on earth, which we will denominate the kingdom of our Lord, and the kingdom of Satan. You might perhaps arrange it differently, and call one the church or heavenly kingdom of the Lord, another, the political kingdom of God, and a third the kingdom of Satan. Now my brother, I am willing to stake the whole matter in controversy upon the one single proposition, that I can prove that these political governments are the kingdoms of Satan. We invite your attention to Matthew iv: 8-9, "Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them and saith unto him, all these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Now here is a clear proposition from the devil to the Savior, to give him all the kingdoms of the world, if he would fall down and worship him. But you are perhaps ready to say, these kingdoms were not the devil's, to give. If not, then the Savior was not tempted, and therefore the Bible is mistaken, for it declares he was tempted. It would be no temptation to you for me to offer to give you the bay horse I sold you for \$150 for a pair of boots, and why? Because you know I have no right

whatever to the horse. And just so in the case of the Savior. If he knew the devil was offering him something he did not possess, it could have been no temptation; and again, the Savior declares emphatically that his kingdom is not of this world, if so his subjects would fight for him.

Now my brother, are you not bound to admit the truth of this proposition? If so, can a man be a citizen according to any law, either human or divine, of two governments at one and the same time? Does he not renounce allegiance to the former the very moment he vows allegiance to the latter? Instead of its being God's will that his subjects shall exert themselves to preserve or reform the principalities and powers of this world, we learn from the great apostle to the Gentiles that, though walking in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not fleshly, but mighty to the pulling down of strong holds, "casting down imagination and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God," 2nd Cor. x: 45. And again, we are commanded to put on the whole armor of God and with our loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness, and our feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, taking the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation, to go forth to battle against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world. Now I think your great error my brother, consists in locating the sovereignty in the people. God gave man dominion over the fowls of

the air, the beasts of the field, and the fishes of the sea. But he never gave him dominion over himself, or his fellow-man. Original sovereignty belongs to God alone. He possesses it by right of that exclusive lordship inherent in him as the Creator of all things.

The following are a few of the many examples to establish the fact that he retained absolute dominion over man, Daniel iv: 17. "The most high ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men. Dan. ii: 21. He removeth kings and setteth up kings. Prov. viii: 15-16. "By me kings reign and princes decree justice." "By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's." Now it will not be my purpose to make any lengthy argument on the occasion where the great Teacher employed the language in question, but simply suggest the point made by him. The Pharisees had considered together as to how they might ensnare him in his talk, and for this purpose sent their disciples with the Herodians to interrogate him. They proceeded to their base work in the hypocritical style usual to political chicanery, and after an introductory adulation calculated to insure confidence, they propounded the question which they conceived would involve him in an inextricable difficulty. "What thinkest thou, Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not?" They evidently thought he would be compelled to answer either affirmatively or nega-

tively. Should he answer yes, they would take advantage of the antipathy of the Jews against Roman rule to excite them against him: and if he answered in the negative, they could hold him amenable to the Roman authorities.

Greatly to their surprise, he avoided both horns of their ingenious dilemma, by demanding of them a coin bearing the image and superscription of Cæsar. After obtaining the public acknowledgment that the image and superscription were Cæsar's, the reason to the question is given; "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's. Now what were the things in the contemplation of the Savior that were Cæsar's? Evidently whatever bore his image and superscription. These were the coins of the country as the standards of commercial value. But what are the things that are God's? Evidently whatever bears his image, and what is that? God created man in his own image, Gen. 27. The answer of the Savior amounts to this: Render unto the civil governments the things upon which they have placed their distinctive inscription, the coins of the country. But render unto God the whole man, with all the energy of soul, body and spirit. All these must be devoted to him, and made to work in his interest. No time left here for angry political discussion. Cornelius and the jailor were certainly officers of the government when they embraced Christianity. But you say it is not stated anywhere in the Scriptures that they ever resigned. This does not prove that either of them retained his office.

Now just let us leave out the requirements of Christianity altogether, and look at the peculiar surroundings at the time they were converted to Christianity. The very government of which they were officers, was persecuting, imprisoning and putting to death all persons who professed Christianity, that happened to fall into their hands. Is it probable, is it possible that that government would have permitted its officers to profess Christianity, and retain their offices?

Did you ever know of a government entrusting the work of reclaiming, arresting, and punishing rebels to an open avowed rebel? We deem this sufficient on this point, as our communication (in spite of our efforts to the contrary) is growing too long. It is certainly our duty to pray for kings and rulers, and as in the case of those praying for bread, we must pray according to the will of our heavenly Father. Now what is his will in this case? Evidently that we must submit to rulers, and those in authority so long as they require nothing contrary to the teaching of the Bible. If we do not, our heavenly father may use them as instruments of his to punish us for disobedience. But after complying with his will on this subject, we may then confidently pray to him, and ask him to so rule their hearts that we may live quietly and peaceably in all godliness and honesty. Now as to Christians going to law before the unconverted, I will only state that inasmuch as the apostle considered it a place entirely unfit for his brethren to settle the smallest matters of difference with each other, he would

certainly regard it as a place unsuited for his brethren to settle their difficulties with the world. Indeed I am firm in the conviction that Christians should not go to law before the unrighteous, for I have never known a lawsuit that did not engender wrath, malice, anger, etc., with all these concomitant evils; all of which the Christian is commanded to put from him. The older I get, the less faith I have in human laws and human tribunals. The Savior himself was arraigned before one of these courts and pronounced guiltless, yet he was put to death. Christians should learn to so manage their affairs as to keep free from these entangling alliances by living quietly and peaceably, and at the same time as remote from the evil influences of the world as possible. But in this important matter, we are happily furnished by the Savior, Matthew v: 39-40. "But I say unto you, resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, and if any man sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, give him thy cloak also." Now Bro. Walling, I have noticed as extensively as my space would allow, all your points, but have not said all I would like to say. But I trust sufficient has been said to cause you to investigate the whole ground. Hoping you will do so according to the light of Divine reason, I remain your devoted friend and brother,

S. MC RAMSEY.

Support of Teachers.

Bro. Barnes says, "The brethren in some places say that he (bro. Lips-

comb) has written so much against stall-feeding preachers, that many take advantage of his teachings and withdraw all help from spreading the gospel." I do not believe that a single man honestly has been kept from giving one cent toward the spread of the gospel from anything I have ever spoken or written. I say this because I have never spoken or written a word discouraging any from giving to spread the gospel. That men who are close, penurious and lacking in an appreciation of the Lord Jesus Christ and the true character of his holy religion, should wrest my words to their own destruction, as some did Paul's in his day, we think possible.

If our words have such effect on the minds of some persons, will they listen to me while I say that no true Christian man seeks excuses to avoid working for God and helping his fellowmen? Or are those people like our friends who go behind the death of the Savior for examples of pardon.—They go to Jesus language to the thief, because it requires nothing to be done, but never go to his words to the rich young man, who was commanded to sell all he had, give to the poor, and come follow Jesus. Now this is certainly as much of an example to us of the conditions of pardon as the thief on the cross. But we never hear it presented. Why? Because the requirements do not suit the taste of the people. The people extract from the Savior's words just what they desire, and leave what they do not desire, unread. I should not be surprised that they treat my writings the same way.

I have written earnestly for the true position of the teacher, and protested against an undue exaltation of his work above the other work of the church. I have done this because I believe his work can never be effective save as the proper harmony and operation of the different parts of the body are preserved. Because I believe his welfare and the welfare of every member of the church will be promoted by the proper work of every part and all the different works of the body being kept in harmonious operation. I have protested against the teacher allowing himself to become dependent, against his putting himself in a position to lose his manhood, forfeit his own self-respect and the respect of the brotherhood, and the world, because I wished to see him worthy to teach the church and the world, and to be blessed of God, honored and supported by the church. No man will ever long be honored and supported, who does not make himself respected and honored by good men.

We have insisted, to this end, he should labor to the extent of his ability in teaching the world the way of salvation. While insisting on this, that the teacher himself may be worthy, without blame, giving no ground of excuse for the church refusing to support him, we have insisted that the individual or the congregation that would see him go at his own charges, that would refuse to fellowship him in his labor, that would fail to aid his family while he was working for the Lord, and thus becoming sharers and partakers in his labor, in the Lord's labor, is utterly unworthy to wear the name Christian. If there is truth in the Bible, God will spew

such out of his mouth, will reject as saying and doing not, as hearing his commands and refusing to do them, as drawing near with their mouths while their heart is far from him, as refusing to become co-workers with him against the evil one, as refusing to hearken when he called. For all these expressions were used with reference to those professing to be servants of God but refusing to do his will.

There is no more obligation on one Christian to give his time and talent to the Lord, than another. No degree of talent, no eminence or age or position or consecration can change this truth. Every other member of the congregation is under just as much obligation to give his time and talent to the Lord as the teacher. Not exactly in the same way. The teacher is under no obligation to give more time to the work of the Lord than any other member is. "It is required of a man according to that he hath, not according to that he hath not." All have not talent alike, nor the same in quantity. They are required to use only the amount and kind of talent they have for the Lord. But all have time alike; hence whatever of talent a man has, he is just as much under obligation to consecrate it to the Lord as is the teacher. He is under obligation to consecrate that talent just as much of his time. If one spends half of his time in preaching as a service to the Lord, another similarly situated who has no preaching talent, but has money-making talent, is under just as much obligation to devote his talent in money-making the same length of time for

the Lord. God will hold the money making Christian just as accountable for the faithful use of his talent, as he will the talking or teaching christian for his. It is just as great a sin not to devote our money to the service of the Lord, as it is not to devote our teaching talent to his service.

We believe this and have continually taught it. We have insisted on the necessity of consecrating our talent, our money, our all to the Lord. We have frequently insisted that God can hold no man guiltless under the Christian dispensation who fails to consecrate at least one tenth of his earnings to the Lord. God required the Jews to do this, with much less reason for their love and service than he has given us. He has shown to us a greater degree of his love, he requires a corresponding increase in our devotion and service.

With fewer blessings to the Jew, with less to move his affection, with less, greatly less to inspire the Jew, he required one tenth of all his earnings. He has given us this example, done infinitely more for us to excite our love and service, and then said I leave it to the impulse of your own heart, to make a free will offering to the Lord, as a response to all his goodness and love to you. It seems to me he reasons badly who thinks God will not spurn as an insult an offering of less than the Jew gave. It seems to me to do less will appear niggardly, and mean toward God, ungrateful and parsimonious. I do not say that all should be given to the teacher, I do not believe it ought to be. The other work of the church must be well and faithfully done or

the body suffers. When one member suffers all suffer with it; the teacher with the rest.

We have continually and persistently urged the brethren and sisters too, to industry, economy, frugality to keep out of debt, that they may have to give to the Lord. No man with a nice sense of honesty feels free to give, even to the Lord, when what he has is justly another's, when he is owing his fellowmen; he properly feels like it is robbing his fellowmen to give to the Lord. He justly feels so. I do not believe the Lord ever accepts from me that of which I have wronged my fellowman. If I owe him and neglect to pay him I wrong him.

When men come to make an offering to the Lord they usually begin to reckon what they owe their fellowmen. They ought to do so. I have no doubt God takes account of what we owe our fellowmen, when we make him an offering. We ought to do so too.

We continually argue this economy, industry, frugality, freedom from debt, that they may be able to give to the Lord and in doing this to sustain the teacher. The church that is willing to let one of its members do all of its work, has a very obtuse sense of honor and honesty.

We have argued that for a congregation to invite an individual to do its work and then let the whole burden fall upon him, exhibits a lack of the common sentiments of honor that obtain among the most depraved men of the world. True Christians always cultivate a nice sense of honor, justice and right. No man of honor is willing to remain in a society, and

fail to bear his just and fair proportion of its burdens, according to his ability. These principles and truths we have continually pressed as lying at the very foundation of manly honor and Christian integrity.

We have insisted that teachers and their families, should live in style not above the medium of those with whom they labor. They and their families should be models of industry, frugality, temperance and charity, both for their own good, temporal and spiritual, for the sake of their influence on their neighbors for true good, and that all ground of refusal to sustain them by their brethren be removed. We have known the idleness and extravagance of teacher's families, made a ground of refusing them a support.

We have insisted with these principles of action, the home teachers should be sustained or helped as much as they needed in their work.

We have opposed churches sending off and importing men to do their work, who are connected with them by no tie save the money that is paid them, when they have good and true men in their own midst, qualified to teach, who need the assistance, and who properly sustained and encouraged, would do more good than any clerical "carpet-bagger," that can be hired for money. We have urged this because, the bringing of this man who is for hire is a discouragement to the home teacher, it is a degrading of him before the church and community, it destroys a proper sense of self-reliance in the congregation. It cultivates a taste for the strange and sensational in the community and dissatisfies them with all

that is not new and strange. It takes usually as much to sustain one of these traveling stars as would sustain two or three teachers with families fixed and settled at home. It neglects the poor, the humble, the out-of-the-way neighborhoods and direct attention to the wealthy and showy.

We have urged the teachers to rely on no promises of churches or individuals. If they do they are certain to be disappointed. If they sustain you, work; when they cease, make your own calculations and do the best you can. I mean by that, this. If you take a subscription to be paid during or at the end of the year and live, make debts and arrangements relying on this subscription, if you are not a disappointed, embarrassed man, then report your case, I will publish it as an exception to the rule. Pay as you go, and make the churches do this. If you are relying upon them for a living, and if they do not do this, quit relying on them the first week they fail, and depend upon yourself.

We have urged these things time and again; our first object is to render the teacher worthy of support, to remove all objections to him so far as his own course and the habits of his family are concerned. Then we have urged that course upon the church that will make them able to sustain a teacher, and making them able, to make them willing by showing them that God expects it, that gratitude to God demands it, that honor, honesty, true pride of character, all insist that every one should bear his part, and that to keep the body in a healthy vigorous and lively condition, every

other work should be diligently engaged in that God requires, otherwise the the body suffers and all the members suffer with it.

If any one knows a better method of securing the support of teachers and all other workers in the vineyard of the Lord than this we would be glad to learn it. These are God's means for securing this work, we know no better way. We do not yet believe, that teachers or teaching ought to usurp the whole work of the church—absorb all of its activity and energy. Teaching has its proper place, so has caring for the poor and the sick. These are as important as that. We have not even done what brother Barnes says we have done, written against "stall-feeding preachers," unless he means by this making them lazy, idle and luxurious.

We have never criticized or found fault with the support of any man as being too great, unless objecting to the proportion of the contributions made through the human societies and plans, (that is expended in salaries and sinecures, before the money reaches the man who labors with the destitute) be considered such. This we did as an objection to the "plans" not the salary being too large for the support of the man. What a man requires for a support depends greatly upon his locality and his habits of life. What is luxury at one period of life is necessity at another. I remember well, when coffee and wheaten bread were luxuries in our family and generally in the community in which I was raised.

I remember when a child to have rejoiced to see a stranger come because we would have wheaten bread

and preserves or honey for supper. I have not yet learned to drink coffee. I have tried living in Nashville a couple of years. We tried to live simply and plainly and comfortably without extravagance of any kind. I found that at best with a family of four grown persons, exercising an ordinary hospitality we could not get along with less than about twelve hundred dollars a year. Others live on less, but, few teachers would live on so little.

Then without fault-finding with any, judging none, we have insisted on a consecration of every individual in his talents, means and time to the Lord. We give no undue prominence or pre-eminence to teaching over other works, no special plea for it above or to the exclusion of other's work but in its proper place in the body, it should be sustained, not parsimoniously, not as a charity eked out to a starveling, but as a duty to God, to be performed cheerfully as a matter of right. The poor are to be aided, cared for, the sick nursed, the orphan nurtured. They are just as much means for the developing the life of the church, commending the religion of Christ, and converting the world as teaching or preaching. They stand upon the same footing as a part of God's service, and he who serves in these is just as much entitled to the fellowship, the aid of the brethren in this work, as is the teacher.

While I say these things, my conscience is perfectly clear that I have never uttered a word that could be fairly construed into a ground of justifying any individual in refusing to fellowship, share his goods with the

teacher who labored in word and doctrine. If any pretender in the church, seeking excuse to avoid doing his duty, wrests my words to his damnation, the fault is his, not mine. I have no hope of writing so that men who are seeking and anxious to find excuses to avoid doing their duty, will not find them, because they find excuses from the language of the Savior himself. I am inclined to believe such ought to be allowed to find excuses that they may manifestly go to their own place. I suppose this complaint came to Bro. Barnes concerning me, from Hillsboro or South Harpeth, or Beech Grove. In response I will only say, for years it has been a wonder to me, that these churches or any one of them, could claim to call themselves churches of Christ, and be content to let a man capable of so great usefulness in the wide and needy fields West of them, as is bro. Davis, be kept at home, engaged in a monthly tread-mill system of preachings to audiences that have been worn out with preaching, to churches capable of worshipping and edifying themselves, or if he goes out to preach in destitute places to go chiefly at his own charges. Brethren, you ought to fellowship him in the work. Aid him; any one of these congregations is able to do the work and God cannot hold you guiltless if you neglect it.

D. L.

Born of the Spirit.

Brethren L. & S: Please examine the conversation of Jesus and Nicodemus again. Christ says to Nicodemus "that which is born of the

Spirit, is spirit," and that we shall hear a sound. Paul says the resurrection shall be attended with a sound and we shall have a Spiritual body. Now I understand Paul and Jesus to agree. The resurrection was the topic so far as that part of the conversation is concerned. Christ in the first part of his argument showing Nicodemus that he was not Abraham's seed according to the promise, and that he had to be made a son in another sense, an heir according to the promise. Just as Paul afterwards shows us how we come in possession of the promise. But the birth of the Spirit was the promise realized.

Nor does Paul say one word about a birth of the Spirit when he shows the Romans, Galatians and Colossians where they were made Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise made to Abraham four hundred years before the law.

Your bro, in Christ,

R. WARDEN.

Jan. 10th 1874.

—

We have occasionally seen the idea advanced, by most excellent and thoughtful brethren, that the resurrection, is the birth of the Spirit. We have as yet failed to see any good reason why it should be called the birth of the Spirit and several why the Savior did not refer to the resurrection in his conversation with Nicodemus.

In the first place the Savior was not speaking of the resurrection, nor did he allude to the resurrection state in the whole conversation. He was revealing a new truth to Nicodemus, something not familiar to him. The resurrection state was an idea famil-

iar to all the Jews, taught by the chief parties of the Jews, rejected only by the Sadducees. There is but one birth spoken of. No fair construction of language can make but one. The birth of the water and the birth of the Spirit are one and the same birth. There can be no birth of the water as taught by the Scriptures, save as produced or brought about through an instrumentality of the Spirit, which caused the same act to be called at once born of water and the Spirit. There is no connection of water with the resurrection that we have ever learned.

This birth brings forth only that which is pure and righteous. There will be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust. Those who are born of the Spirit and of water will all be members of the kingdom of God. In the resurrection, those who are unworthy will be raised to everlasting shame and contempt. Instead of the resurrection bringing all who are subject of it into the kingdom and favor of God, many who are raised will be cast out into outer darkness, where "will be wailing and gnashing of teeth." The birth was to introduce them into the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven was extended to this earth, and men were introduced into it here. Through the outer court, here, the kingdom in this world, individuals should pass to the inner court at the Father's right hand. Service here, qualifies for service and glory there. Christ promised the kingdom, said it was at hand, close by, in their midst, owned that he was a king, illustrated the nature of that kingdom, taught in his personal ministry that his kingdom

was a proper thing for prayer and for seeking after. The apostle Paul says, we receiving, literally, having received a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God with reverence and Godly fear, for our God is a consuming fire." Then the birth of the Spirit does not bring those born of it into the resurrection state, but into the kingdom which the apostles and primitive disciples received, and which alone of the institutions here on earth, is immovable and which will stand forever.

It is true that we shall have a Spiritual body at the resurrection, but there must be a begetting of the Spirit, a birth of Spirit that the growth may produce a Spiritual body prepared for the resurrection. So far as the "sound" is concerned, there was a "sound" at Jerusalem on Pentecost, there was a sound when Saul was smitten down. There have been sounds on divers occasions, some evil, some good. We cannot see any more correspondence or sameness between the sound that is mentioned to Nicodemus and the sound of the trump at the last day than there is between that and the sounds made on sundry other occasions. God's kingdom is here on earth contending for the mastery and dominion of the world. All others shall be shaken, moved, shall come to naught, but this shall stand forever. It cannot be moved.

Paul nor any of the apostles, spoke of a birth of the Spirit when they speak of the resurrection. But Paul 1st Cor. 4. 15. James 18. 1st Peter 1, 25. all speak of our conversion

As the beginning of our Spiritual life as a begetting or birth. The same word in the Greek, is translated into English by both these words. The beginning of our Spiritual life, then is the birth. The Spirit is the source of that life, the beginning of that life is called a birth of the Spirit. Because the water is the instrument through which the individual is introduced into the state where that life abounds and is enjoyed it is called a birth of water and Spirit.

D. L.

QUERIES.

Brethren L. & S.: What ought a congregation of disciples do with brethren who paid their debts according to the "Bankrupt Law," and now own thousands of dollars worth of property, and creditors all around them who claim that said brethren are stumbling blocks? Such is a *de facto* case here, and we are anxious for you to give us some very plain talk on the subject, perhaps it might do good.

Please don't pass this by as unimportant—for it is of vital importance here, and may be elsewhere.

Yours in Christ,

DISCIPLE.

Murfreesboro Tenn. Nov. 23rd 1873.

We have so often spoken so very plainly as to give offense to some, on this subject, we know not what more we can say. Possibly an honest man can take the benefit of the bankrupt law. In my judgment, in doing it, he lays himself under temptations to dishonesty, which but few, very few can resist.

An honest man cannot hold property either in his own name or in the name of another, and refuse to pay his debts. The mere fact that the laws of the land release a man, never yet released a man before his own conscience or in the sight of God from an obligation to pay what he owes to another. Owing of another means simply, I have the property of another. I have what is his, not my own. Or I have taken it and spent it. The refusal to pay is simply a refusal to give up what is not mine, to him to whom it belongs. To borrow a horse and make way with it or refuse to return it, is theft. What differ in this respect a hundred dollars from a horse. Paul, Romans 12. 17, says, "provide things honest in the sight of all men." To provide through a bankrupt law is not following this injunction. 2nd Cor. 8. "Providing things honest, not only in the sight of the Lord, but in the sight of men." 13. 7, he prays "ye should do that which is honest." Phil. 8, he commands them to follow those things which are "honest, true, of good report." Taking the bankrupt law and living with riches—plenty, is not following these things. 1st Pet. 2-12. Having your conversation (behavior) honest among the Gentiles, * * that they may by your good works glorify God in the day of visitation. We do not think many people will glorify God because its servants take the bankrupt law, get able and refuse to pay their debts. If with these Scriptures, a church tolerates conduct as set forth in the foregoing, it would seem they become partakers of the sins of those they countenance. I do not see

what could be a ground of action if it could not be found here.

D. L.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: Thinking that the numerous readers of your excellent paper would be pleased to hear how the cause of our Divine Master is prospering in Central Texas, I have concluded to inform them through your columns, trusting it may prove interesting to the lovers of truth. And first I will say that I have never seen people so anxious to hear the primitive gospel. They have been humbugged by the sectarians with their harangues about the graveyards, until persons of any degree of intellect have become disgusted. They have been imposed on by hearing another gospel, which is not another but a perversion of the true; hence the great demand for proclaimers of the primitive gospel. I started from my home in Robertson County Friday before the 1st Lord'sday in December, 1874, went to Waller Prairie, Limestone County, delivered ten sermons. Our brethren having never preached there but few times, the majority of the citizens being Baptists of the strictest order, hence a difficult matter to obtain a hearing; however there was a spirit of investigation aroused which doubtless will terminate in a proper understanding of the truth. From thence I went to Pursley School-house, in Navarro County, delivered ten sermons, effecting but little good that was visible. This church was if I mistake not, built up by old brothers E. Smith and Harberson, but sad to say ex-

hibits but little sign of divine life; however there are a few noble souls connected with that church. Brethren let us do more preaching to the members than heretofore; it is certainly needed in order to a growth in grace. While here preaching there was an opposition meeting held by one who is engaged in dealing out damnation to his fellow men. May the time soon come when an honest position will be sought after as earnestly as the opposite is now. From here I went to Dawson's School-house, on the head of Battle Creek, about ten miles distant from the above place. At this place our brethren had never preached but little, about four discourses before I went there, those by old Father Smith, these opening the way for an impartial hearing. I preached 12 sermons at this place, 28 confessed their faith in Christ. We suggested the propriety of their forming themselves into an organization. This they did and I pray God they may go on in the discharge of their Christian duties, and that they may be instrumental in influencing many others to come to repentance. That we may all meet in heaven is the desire and prayer of the writer of this article.

B. P. SWEENLY.

Robertson Co., Texas.

Brethren L. & S.: I sent you a report of a meeting held at Neville's Prairie in Houston Co. Texas, in Nov. last. I suppose it was lost.

We had a glorious meeting on that occasion. Eight additions to the good cause—the church revived up. All put to work. I have paid

them one visit since, and find them still in earnest in the good work. These meetings were gotten up, mainly through the efforts of one sister living at that place. She labors constantly in behalf of the cross of Christ. The church at this place is having some additions. And we hope much prosperity for the church everywhere this year.

Yours in Christ

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville, Texas Jan. 10th. 1873

Unequally Yoked.

B o. Lipscomb: Is the command to be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers as in 2nd Cor. 6. 14, applicable to partnership in business and to joining human societies as well as in religious matters? Does the word unequally imply that we may be equally yoked with unbelievers? Does the word unbeliever in the sense there used include all disobedient or only those who believe there is no God? If it includes all disobedient, can Christians consistently unite with sectarians in a society? Please give us your views in full on these questions and oblige your brother in search of truth.

J. T. J. WATSON.

Fatima, Wilcox Co. Ala.

The word translated "unequally yoked," literally means to be yoked with one of another kind. Liddell and Scott say to be yoked with an animal of another kind and to be yoked unevenly. Then a believer cannot be yoked equally with an unbeliever.

The word unbeliever as used in the epistles and in reference to Chris-

tians is simply the drawing of the contrast between them and the disobedient. All disobedient in that sense are unbelievers. No person can be equally yoked with one who is not his equal. I think the Scripture intends to forbid Christians to enter into any relationship with unbelievers by which they are under obligation or liable to be influenced in their course of life by the unbelievers. I do not know any necessity for Christians entering into societies of any kind save the church of God. That is the pillar and support of the truth. I do not understand the feeling that prompts a Christian to desire to enter any other society. Christ ordained that society—is head over it, he made its rules, and laws, and he promises the rewards. He thoroughly furnishes, in it, his servants every good work. I cannot see why another society should be sought or desired by one who believes in Christ.

D. L.

The Appearance of Evil.

Bros. L. & S: If you think it worth notice, please say in the Advocate—has a preacher of the Gospel any right to visit a horse-race, as a looker-on? and if you say he has none then say whether any member of the Christian Church has the right—although said member does nothing but look on and laugh and be merry with the racers &c.?

And if you say they have the right—what does Paul mean when he says,—Abstain from all appearance of evil? Thess. 5: 22.

It is useless for me to say more here, you have the idea. Believe me an humble Christian Bro.

T. A. J. WADE.

Molino, Miss. November 3rd. 1873.

The preacher has precisely the same right that any other Christian has to visit such places. He is to be an example to the flock. But the flock are just as much under obligation to follow the good example as he is to set it. If they can go there we would not know where to say they could not go. We think there is as much sin in encouraging such things by presence and countenance as by participating more fully in them.

D. L.

Mars Hill Academy.

We call the attention of our readers to the advertisement of the above named Academy, of which Bro. T. B. Larimore is principal. This school is in a flourishing condition, and is represented as a very good school. Those wishing to send to school, are asked to look at the propositions offered.

E. G. S.

Agassiz and Children.

Says a writer in one of the newspaper sketches of Agassiz: He was a great lover of children. He was constantly speaking to them in the street and caressing them, not from affectation or a desire to be popular, but because he could not help it. A friend tells me of an instance which well illustrates his tenderness for children. Once, while conducting

some scientific experiments, it became necessary to have some water immediately. Agassiz seized a pitcher, and ran out to a pump near by. He went out quickly, but was slow in coming back. They waited twice as long for the water as would have sufficed to bring it, and then went out to see what was the matter. There sat Agassiz, down by the pump, his legs crossed, and a little child, which he was fondly soothing and caressing, nestled in between them. In his haste at the pump, he had accidentally struck the child standing near by. Though the blow was of little account, the exigences of science seemed to him the less important, and he had to put down his pitcher and open his heart. When deeply engaged in scientific investigation, he would leave his work to seize and fondle a child that had strayed into his room, and the interrupted mental process seemed to be resumed without difficulty.

Enjoy the Present.

It conduces much to our content if we pass by those things which happen to our trouble, and consider what is pleasing and prosperous, that by the representation of the better, the worse may be blotted out. If I be overthrown in my suit at law, yet my house is left me still and my land, or I have a virtuous wife, or hopeful children, or kind friends or good hopes. If I have lost one child, it may be I have two or three still left me. Enjoy the present, whatsoever it may be, and be not solicitous for the future; for if you take your foot from the present stand-

ing, and thrust it forward towards to-morrow's events, you are in a restless condition; it is like refusing to quench your present thirst by fearing you shall want drink the next day. If to-morrow you should want, your sorrow would come soon enough, though you do not hasten it; let your trouble tarry till its own day comes. Enjoy the blessings of this day, if God sends them, and the evils of it bear patiently and sweetly, for this day only is ours. We are dead to yesterday, and not yet born to the morrow.—*Jeremy Taylor.*

McMinnville School.

The readers will please notice the advertisement of Waters and Walling College in our paper. The brethren at McMinnville are making noble efforts to build up a good school. Hope the brethren and friends of education will remember them.

Murfreesboro Female Institute.

See also the advertisement of this school. Bro. J. E. Scobey is making energetic and commendable efforts to build a good school here, and needs patronage. Will the brethren give it?

E. G. S.

Obituaries.

Brethren L. & S: It is with sorrow that I write you the death of a "little one," Sabra Jane Stahl youngest child of sister M. A. Stahl and Bro. C. A. Stahl, near Wadesburg, Mo. She was born Aug. 27th 1870. She lived an innocent life and was admired as the "pet" of the family. She fell asleep in Jesus about 10 o'clock Friday morning Dec. 26 1873; being three years, six months and twenty-nine days. She died of Croup and throat disease, after an

illness of five days. We miss her at play and in the family circle. May God bless brethren and friends who are sorrowing for her, and may their precious souls rest in hope of the day when immortality shall be theirs.

But we thank our Father that the pure and precious bud has been snapped in its beauty, and is now in the arms of Jesus, who has said suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Though sweet little Jane can never return to us, we can shortly go to her. Then, for this hope let us strive that we may all meet in the "Garden of God." We cannot better say of our little Jane:

"Like the brightest buds of Summer,
And has fallen with the stem;
Yet, oh it is a lovely death,
To die like one of them!"

Yours in Christ.

A. SPARKS.

Wadesburg Cass Co. Mo. Dec. 27, 1873.

Bros L. & S: It becomes our sad duty to record the death of our aged and highly esteemed brother T. J. Thompson. He died at his residence in Lebanon, Wilson Co. Tenn. August 13th 1873. Was born in Williamson Co. Tenn. Dec. 24th 1807 made the good confession and was immersed by Bro. R. M. Gano at Lebanon, May 25th 1870.

He was a devoted and consistent Christian from that day forward until he departed to be with Christ, which for him is far better, tho he has left a kind wife and seven children, six daughters and one Christian son besides many warm friends to weep over him. But their loss is his gain. He lived in obedience to the commandments of God and died in hope of a blessed immortality beyond the grave. O that his bereaved widow and daughters may follow the example he has set in obedience to the Gospel, that they too may have a right to the tree of life, when the great judgment day shall come.

Blessed are the dead, that die in the Lord, they cease from their labors and their works do follow them.

W. C. HUFFMAN.

Enon College Tenn. Dec. 31 1873.

Died, Jan. 24th, 1874, Little Hattie Bell, daughter of E. G. and Lucy Sewell, at the residence of her parents in Edgefield Tenn. aged fifteen months and ten days. Her disease was chiefly Pneumonia. Little Hattie was a sweet interesting child. Just old enough to begin to talk, and make herself most dear, and to wind herself like tendrils around the affections of her parents and brothers and sisters. But she is gone to the land of rest. Leaving the world thus early she has missed its troubles and corrupting influences. So Farewell dear sweet little babe, till the glorious resurrection morn,

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

The Cob House.

BY KATE PUTNAM OSGOOD.

Willy and Charley, eight and ten
Were under the porch in the noonday heat,
I could hear and see the little men,
Unseen, myself, in the window seat.

Will on a cob-house was hard at work,
With a zeal that was funny enough to me,
At eight one hardly has learned to shirk:
That comes later—as you will see!

For Charley, by virtue of riper age,
Did nothing but stand and criticize.
His hands in pockets, stage by stage,
He watched the tottering castle rise.

"And now after all your fuss," says he,
"S'posing it tumbles down again?"
"Oh," Will answers as cool as could be,
"Of course I should build it better then."

Charley shook sagely his curly head,
Opened his eyes of dancing brown,
And then, for a final poser said:
"But s'posing it *always* kept tumbling
down?"

Will, however, was not of the stuff
At a loss to be taken so:
"Why then," he answered, ready enough,
"I should keep on building it better, you
know."

And seeing the wise world's hardest knot
Cut at a stroke with such simple skill,
Older people than Charley I thought,
Might learn a lesson of Master Will!

SINGING AND WORKING.

In some sections and some localities the music of the piano accompanied by the human voice is not an unusual sound. The guitar is often found in the same company whilst the organ grows in grace from being fashionable. The lute and lyre have lost favor and the poor old Scotch bagpipe is a slander upon instrumen-

tal music. In fact I heard one once and it seemed to me the gentleman in plaid was trying to mock some that did make music. It was a good burlesque, or so it sounded. The harp has been hanged upon a willow tree or somewhere else, and has given way to the more popular instruments; but the violin, familiarly known as the fiddle, holds its place and yields a greater income of sweet sounds to the money invested than any music-maker known to me. I heard something once in the distance that was none of these, yet the human voice mingled its clear notes with the strange sound. "Shall we gather at the river, the beautiful, the beautiful river?" rang through wood and o'er hills as clear as a bell, and "Yes, we'll gather at the river," was the answer, just as distinct, and by the same voice. As I neared the neat little log cabin home with nice fixings in it, on the road side, "On the margin of the river," "On the bosom of the river," "Ere we reach the shining river," "At the smiling of the river," "Soon we'll reach the shining river," resounded through the forest and made the welkin ring. All the time the echo seemed to bring back, "Yes, we'll gather at the river," as a reply. There was an accompaniment that went as near as I can describe it, oo—oo—oo——oo. I recognized the sound, heard it often when I was young, though innovations and inventions have almost brought it into disuse. Its true name is "Spinning Wheel." I have had the pleasure of hearing it again and can say as an accompaniment to singing or the voice of a young lady as an accompaniment to the wheel there is

no superior and few equals. If girls of our time, like mammas of old would sing songs to the hum of the revolutionary organ, then papas would not be in debt for calico, finery, rouge, "bloom of youth" and other extravagances.

Old time folks of a few years back, were wont to spin, weave, dye, sew, cook, wash, iron, milk, churn, pick the geese, and nurse babies, *ad infinitum*. Then the land prospered, Now the calico tax is great and 'tis all go out, whilst the sewing machine goes clicker, clicker and still the women are always busy. What is the matter? Were the women then smarter than now? Oh no we are a wiser people. We study to live by our heads, our wits, whilst the people of those days educated their hands and therefore could do more, but we can out think them; 'Tis a common saying that it is cheaper to buy cloth than to make it. Be that as it may 'tis better to wear homespun, than to clothe your back with cloth for which you go in debt. But to return to my music. I was travelling a lonely road, alone. It seemed to give life to everything around. I will not say that Dolly pricked up her ears, and mended her gait, but any way we journeyed along very cheerily. There was but one thing to disturb the interest and pleasure I found in the whole scene and the sweet sounds. Just as I passed the door where I could see the musician and be seen by her, she vanished from sight like vapor before the breeze. Did she run because I caught her at work? Was she ashamed to be seen spinning? 'Tis the ruin of family or nation when work is in disrepute and

industrious folks under par. I once passed a house where a young lady was washing, and she hid her face whilst I was going by. It may be she thought if I could not see her face, mamma would be charged with this disgraceful piece of behavior. It is a weakness, and a very great one at that, when a species of pride causes persons to shun being seen doing anything useful and honest. The truth is, the stain fastens itself to the foul spirit whilst industry in profitable pursuits is ennobling and elevating. If I kept a grocery, a city bar, or sold whiskey in any way I should be ashamed to be seen. I would not like for it to be known if I was the proprietor of a billiard saloon, a faro-bank, a roulette, keno, (I do not know that the word is spelled correctly) or lottery establishment. Further—if I belonged to a Jockey Club, kept race horses or raised them for the purpose, I would like to hide my face when clean people come along. But the honest sweat that starts from splitting rails, hauling wood, making fence, plowing, hoeing and such like would never move me I think, and if it came my turn to cook, wash, milk, weave, spin, I trust not a nerve would tend to withdraw me from the gaze of the most refined. I knew a little boy once who was working with his father on the edge of a town, or rather a small city with great pretensions. He raised many objections to the business without arousing suspicion as to what was the real trouble. At last he told his father if he would work any how let them get off the street out of sight. He was a little proud coward. He was afraid to be seen

by his proud comrades, disgraced by working. There are legions of that same kind in the world now. We had better go back to days of spinning wheels, plenty and no debts. Let me say that rail-splitters and rail-splitting, plowing and plowmen, hoers and hoemen, reaping and reapers, planters and planting, ditching and ditcher's work, and workmen, never brought about hard times and the distress that attends the money panic. A youngster prizes his bleached cheeks, his tender smooth, speckless hands, and his position behind the counter, in an office or such a place. The modest plow boy at his plow or elsewhere forgets that he is his country's nobleman and his calling gives him a prominence that but few appreciate. The girls who can bravely face the very mouth of a dinner or washpot have made their mark heretofore and will do it again. These are to be the mothers of the great men of the future. The sickly, sentimental piano tremmer—or idle headed, idle handed, and idle hearted novel readers will wilt in the storms of time without sound healthy fruit. I try never to slight these little ones, I do not know what they will do in time and eternity. Last Spring I visited Camden. There I fell in with the young gentlemen of the place preparing for a strawberry supper. Silence among rangers is oppressive and I broke it in learning names and callings. There were two scions of Coke and Blackstone, some clerks, but one of the number when asked, pulled off a glove and said his hands might speak for him. I have heard of eyes speaking but upon this occasion fingers and thumbs said clearly they followed the plow. That was a good ring. There was genuine metal about that boy. He will be something some of the days to come. That is the way, first choose a business that exalts you, then honor it. Some dirty callings drag men down to their level and they can in no wise rise above them. There is a great flight in our time from the hot sun of the field; the soot and smut of the black smith's forge; the toil of the plane, mallet and chisel and such useful, yes essential, occupations. Such desertion does not betoken good to a country. Evidently the following them well, will never do any harm, and there is no possibility of having too many farmers. Every other business can be overstocked. Did you ever notice what airs some town boys and clerks put on around country boys—farmer boys. One was with me in Montgomery last Summer. He went into a hardware store to get some candy for my little boy (just like them), he was sent from that place to a drug store and the knowing ones of this establishment handed him over to the sharpers at the clothiers, thence they passed him around to a dry goods house and then to the grocer's and at last to a confectionery. He was directed by some one whose real pleasure in doing others a kindness overbalanced the desire for fun at others expense. Some one laughed at Ben Franklin and his ginger cakes; who was it? Was it not the same who afterwards appreciated his favor? Take care, if it is not the case with farmer boys and girls, for if they are not like the negro's rabbit, good for everything, then they are

counterfeits upon the planter's bank. Understand me, boys and girls raised to work at anything useful, with the proper principles will be good members of society or from them the ranks of the useful are to be filled in time to come. 'Tis an unwise love for the child that prompts the parent to bring it up in idleness. If rich as Croesus, the fathers and mothers of our time should train those given in to their care to business or rather to work. The girls should be so schooled that they would know how to shift for themselves if thrown upon their own resources. The trees of the rich bottoms grow tall we are told by reason of being crowded by supporting company. They are stately and comely. But take all the surrounding protection from them what then? They fall a prey to the storms, whilst the sturdy scrub oak of the hills, having stood alone for years "takes deeper root in the ground the more shaken by the winds." All this can well be applied to man. Those surrounded by affluence and influence grow up more pretentious and beautiful to vitiated tastes, but the fibre is not there, these are not rooted and grounded in common sense matters and therefore are entrapped easily. If the hands are not educated in the school of industry the preparation for life lacks one third of completion. When the heart is not trained to love its fellowmen, to have a due regard for their interests and a fellow feeling for their woes and distresses, with a love, a devotion and fear of Jehovah, there is the same deficit in a thorough furniture, and the same is true when the head fails to think, reason and plan for the

hands to do. "Idle heads and idle hands will conceive mischief" parents should remember.

My singing spinner ran away. I lost sight of her and a second time it seems I have done the same. I love to hear the sweeping housewife, the milkmaid, the merry cook, the washerwoman, the seamstress, mother with baby bunting in her arms, the plow-boy, the busy at anything good, sing as they work. I know they cannot scold, fret, quarrel, swear, lie, say bad words, or tell filthy yarns while they are thus employed. I do not think they can have bad thoughts while singing good songs. Who could plot his neighbor's injury whilst singing.

"When each can feel his brother's sigh,
And with him bear a part.
When sorrow flows from eye to eye,
And joy from heart to heart."

Could slander or other bad spirits stain the heart when the lips were fruitful in such offerings as :

"When free from envy, scorn and pride,
Our wishes all above,
Each can his brother's failing hide
And show a brother's love.
"Arm me with jealous care,
As in thy sight to live;
And O, thy servant, Lord, prepare,
A strict account to give,"

is enough to keep us from forgetting the judgment and our mortality, whilst humility and dependence upon our Heavenly Father are inculcated by such songs as

"Help me to watch and pray,
And on thyself rely,
Assured if I my trust betray,
I shall forever die."

I was once crossing the hills; I heard "Majestic sweetness sits enthroned upon the Savior's brow" away ahead of me. Oh, how it rang. The whole neighborhood seemed enlivened by the clear notes of praise to the Lamb of God. Who could

have the blues while such clear, such heavenly sentiments, such glory, such gratitude, sounded and resounded, echoed and re-echoed from over, around and throughout these hills. One drinks of the spirit of the singer involuntarily, and unconsciously, just as he breathes the atmosphere. Such a song teaches, admonishes and furnishes good, strong, healthy food for the soul. Do you know Zerar? The woman was over a regular old-fashioned wash-board and the scrubbing kept time with the music. Can't you almost see her? How much better to pass the blue wash day thus than to be pouting all the time because you are alive and not rich, to wish you were dead, to box the children's ears as a kind of scape pipe for your pent up anger, and thus keep up divers squallings; to look off and frown when the head of the family wants to be friendly, and be three or four days being reconstructed. This actress upon the world's stage did not care a cent for passers by, for

'Since from thy bounties she received
Such proofs of love divine,
Had she a thousand hearts to give,
Lord they should all be thine.'

The little bird in the tree, the cricket in its hiding place, the "Katy did" at night, the frisky squirrel, all, all seem to try to help man drive away dull care. Away with it then. We are indebted to them for every noise that breaks in upon the deep stillness around. Oh, the children, the merry children, don't stop them when they make a noise. They give life to things. They are little God given happy-makers. Let them shout. We owe it to all around us to make life as pleasant as possible. Men should catch the spirit of the

rest of God's creation and cheer, comfort, strengthen and give life. Earth could be robbed of most of its woes and troubles if all, small and great, would do all that is possible to comfort, content, strengthen, build up those around. There is on earth but one unselfish institution, which looks after the interests of all, high, low, rich, poor, black and white, and that is *the Church of God.*

Heavenly Joy.

"There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repents." Heaven has an interest in man's salvation. Indeed it is no wonder. Man has cost heaven more than any other object. God gave his only begotten Son to save man. Angels rejoiced at his birth, and announced the good news on the plains of Bethlehem. They still rejoice in the triumph of his mission. Every returning prodigal adds to the joy of the angelic choir.

J. C. I.

—Missionary.

Have a sincere and childlike dependence upon God as a sure provider for your spiritual necessities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Shall Christians act as Jurors?.....	97
Support of Teachers.....	104
Porn of the Spirit.....	109
Queries.....	111
Church News.....	112
Unequally yoked.....	113
The appearance of evil.....	113
Mars Hill Academy.....	114
Agazziz and children.....	114
Enjoy the present.....	14
McMinnville School.....	115
Murfreesboro Female Institute.....	115
Obituaries.....	115
Fireside.	
The Cob-House.....	116
Singing and working.....	116

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 6.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, FEB. 5, 1874.

DITZLERISMS.

We have spoken of a number of Mr. Ditzler's quotations, and perversions of authors and lexicographers. We mentioned that he even praised the apostate Julian, who trained in childhood as a Christian, at the age of twenty apostatized and labored to destroy the church and the Christian religion, as a most learned and calm father of the church. Mr. D. represented him as saying baptize means to sprinkle, and Augustine approved it. We showed that Augustine condemned it as a novelty. But even Julian did not say it means to sprinkle. He, after ridiculing the idea of immersion as we instanced, said it is interpreted to sprinkle all over profusely. He merely said some of the church were coming to interpret it thus. He did not say it was correct.

But there are some other matters to which we wish to call attention. In a debate in Warrensburg, Mo. a few years since, with Bro. Sweeney, he took the position that the waters of the Jordan, were so foetid and poisonous that it would have killed a man to be baptized in it. In the

debates with Wilkes and Burgess he took the position that the Jordan was so swift that a man could not stand in it to baptize. He quoted Smith's Bible Dictionary, leaving out the declaration of Smith, that near its mouth, where it is claimed the baptizing was done, it was a lazy sluggish river. He quoted "Lynch's expedition to the Dead Sea and Jordan" to prove it was both too swift and too cold for baptizing. It will be recollected how often he stated that the spray from the water so chilled the men as to make it almost impossible for them to stand in it. He read from the 255th page of Lynch's work, suppressing all reference to its being in the night, and read as though it was the common result of sailing in the day. It was on Monday, April, 1847. They had travelled all day, had passed down rapids, in which they were thoroughly wet, were tired and hungry, but were threatened with hostile bands of Arabs on the river bank; so in this condition they pursued their journey in their boats into the night. He says, page 254: "The sun went down and night gradually closed upon us, and the rush of the riv-

er seemed more impetuous as the light decreased. We twice passed down rapids, taking care each time to hug the boldest shore. Besides the transition from light to darkness, we had exchanged a heated and stifling, for a chilly atmosphere; and while the men more fortunate kept their blood in circulation by pulling gently with the oars, the sitters in the stern-sheets fairly shivered with cold." This would certainly be nothing uncommon, in the month of April when the nights were cool, although the days hot, for men wet and hungry, on a river at night, to shiver with cold. (It was the air, not the water that was cool.) They would do it in the Cumberland the warmest period of the year. Would do it at New Orleans in April. Mr. Ditzler in reading this passage suppresses all reference to its being night. Mr. Lynch says further on page 255: "Under other circumstances it would have been prudent to lie by until morning; but we were all wet, had neither food, nor a change of clothing, and apart from danger of attack in a neighborhood represented as peculiarly bad, sickness would have been the inevitable consequence of a night spent in hunger, cold and watchfulness." That is the case from which Mr. D. makes it too cold to baptize. That is the way he deals with his authors to make them sustain him. But he relies on Lynch on the point of the temperature of the Jordan. On page 629, Wilkes-Ditzler Debate he says, Lieut. Lynch who traveled the entire course of the Jordan and whose statements none can question, gives us an account of his descent in iron boats, "one of

which was destroyed by the violent current dashing it to pieces against obstacles." His metallic boats, one iron, the other copper were neither destroyed.

A poorly-built wooden boat which they purchased on Lake Tiberias was destroyed by being dashed down one of the rapids on rocks.

In reference to this destruction Lieut. Lynch, Page 188 says, "Built of wood, she was less elastic than our metallic boats, and the thumps upon the rocks which only indented the last, shattered her."

But there were many rapids in the river. The descent from Lake Tiberias commenced April the 10th; they reached within a few miles of the mouth of the Jordan, April the 17th after dark, 9. 30 o'clock. "The river is in the latter stage of a freshet." "We plunged down twenty-seven threatening rapids, besides a great number of lesser magnitude."

Although the party has been very much exposed, those in the boats especially, from being constantly wet, we are perfectly well."

They were wet day and night in this wonderfully cold Jordan—this length of time, and were perfectly well. Yet, according to Mr. D., the person could neither go in to baptize or be baptized, without "animal heat being overcome." But Lynch tells us more than this. On page 253, he says after this long journey, and his arrival at the place at which the Savior is said to have been baptized, "My first act was to bathe in the consecrated stream." On the next morning after their arrival at this spot, Tuesday, April 15th at 5 o'clock A. M., he says, "In all the wild haste of a

disorderly rout, were Copts, Russians, Polea, Armenians, Greeks and Syrians from all parts of Asia, from Europe, from Africa, and from far distant America, on they came, men, women and children, of every age and hue, and in every condition of costume, talking, screaming, shouting, in almost every known language under the Sun. * * * With their eyes strained toward the river, heedless of all intervening obstacles, they hurried eagerly forward, and dismounting in haste, and disrobing with precipitation, rushed down the banks and threw themselves into the stream. * * * Each one plunged himself, or was dipped by another, three times, below the surface, in honor of the Trinity; and then filled a bottle or some other utensil, from the river. * * * An immense crowd of human beings, said to be eight thousand, but I thought not so many, had passed and repassed before our tents, and left not a vestige behind them. Every one bathed, a few Franks excepted; the greater number, in a quiet and reverential manner, but some, I am sorry to say, displayed an ill-timed levity." This disorderly multitude which he says, reminded him of fugitives from a routed army, men, women and children in confusion like this, dipped themselves three times in the Jordan, yet a grown man, strong, cool, deliberate, cannot baptize a person in it!

But he says, The water is so cold, the current so swift and so deep, that it is impossible to baptize in it. He appeals to Lynch to confirm these things. We will see what Lynch does say on these subjects. He was eight days in making the descent. He was a scientific man, making observations

of the river for report to the government. He did it with exactness. It was April when there, yet cool. The river was just falling from a flood. It was colder and swifter and deeper than at its customary stage. Each day he reports, several times the swiftness of current, temperature of the water, the depth of the river.

Mr. D. says it comes from the mountain regions covered with snow, and hence gets warmer as it flows onward and downward. On leaving the sea of Tiberias, the head of the Jordan we speak of, April 10th, page 172, he reports temperature of the air 82°, of the water 70°, 56° to 66°—a pleasant temperature; a room above 66 or 70, becomes unpleasantly warm. The water of Jordan here at its highest point of observation was 70. At 2:30 o'clock the current was 2 miles per hour. They passed some falls and moored in an eddy below them the first night, page 174.

2nd day—river 25 to 30 yards wide, current two and a half miles per hour, water clear and sweet. The current increased during the day until it rushes down rapids, for three hundred yards. Spent four hours in getting down these rapids. At five o'clock, current four miles per hour. At 6.15—3½ miles per hour, see page 180. It is marked as varying during the day from two to 12 miles per hour, rated at times from two to four feet deep.

The greater part of third day was spent in descending a series of rapids, yet at 4.20 o'clock he notes. Forty yards wide, moderate current, closing with an average current of eight miles per hour.

Thursday, 13th at 2 P. M. thirty-five yards wide, six feet deep, gravelly bottom, current five miles per hour at 2.41, 5 feet deep. For the day the river averaged forty-five yards wide, four feet deep, five miles per hour, current. Friday, April 4th. The width of the river was seventy yards with two miles current, and narrowed again to thirty yards with six miles current, the depth ranging from two to ten feet.

Saturday, April 15th at 8.34 A. M. Air 75° water 71. At 11.30 the air was 82° the river one foot below surface 74°. The air at 82 was exceedingly oppressive, the water within 8 degrees of it could not be disagreeably cold. Page 226-7. The velocity of the current ranged from two to eight miles per hour, the average about 3½ miles—showing that for a greater portion of the distance it was slow. He also speaks on same page 238.

Sunday 16th at 11,30 A. M. Temperature of air 92 of water 72.

Monday 17th 6.25 A. M. River forty yards wide, seven feet deep, six miles per hour. At 5 A. M. passed the mouth of a small stream, water, clear and sweet, temperature 76 degrees. This night they reached the place of pilgrims bathing already referred to, Next morning saw them bathe. Next morning he repeats, current 3 miles per hour. page 267. "there were twenty-seven considerable rapids passed with a number of smaller ones.

But the current of the river between the rapids ranges from two to eight miles per hour. This greatest velocity is no hindrance whatever to immersion. Three miles and under

is a lazy sluggish rate as Lynch calls it. The depth ranges from two to ten feet deep, in the deepest part. The deepest portions graduate to shallow depth at the edge. The temperature is at no time or place found to be under seventy degrees, 12 inches beneath the surface. This too is in April at the close of a rise in the river and of the rainy season. It was then falling at the rate of two feet per day. The water until within a few miles of the Dead Sea was sweet and pure.

It was then neither so poisonous, as to produce death, from baptizing in it, as Mr. D. contended at Warrensburg Mo. It was not too deep or swift as he contended with Wilkes at Louisville and Brents in his three discussions in this State. It was not too cold as he contended at these latter debates for baptizing in. On the other hand, if in April, with the waters of the freshet not yet down, it was this slow and shallow and warm—if there was any trouble on the score of baptizing in the hot, dry months of June, July, August, September and October, it was that the water was low, and sluggish and too warm for comfort. But the Jordan never ceased to flow and places could always be found suited to baptizing. Mr. Ditzler furthermore stated the shortest day in the year, when the youth struck his foot against the Tortoise was in the dry season, when no rain falls for several months at a time, although it hails. But Lynch speaks of the wet season as closing in April.

We give these as Lynch's reports on the condition of the river. It is from these Mr. D. professes to draw his conclusions. By the manner in

which he quotes these matters, suppressing portions so as to change the whole meaning of the report, he makes something of an impression on those who have not studied and do not think much. We therefore think it our duty to present the truth on these matters. As to the morality, the veracity, the honesty in thus perverting and garbling authors and making a false impression as to their meaning, we will leave to each to draw his own conclusions. This is the style in which Mr. D. treats authors that can be had written in language that we understand; what reliance can be placed upon his reading of Syriac and Arabic authors whom we have not and whose language we do not understand? All travellers to the Jordan agree with Lynch save as they represent it at different seasons. In the wet season, the river is a more rapid and swollen and turbulent stream than in the dry season. In reporting from Lynch we have changed the term "knot" to mile. He in common, with all naval men, calls a mile a knot, we have changed it to the land term.

D. L.

The Treasury and Other Things.

Bro. Lipscomb or Sewell: A few of us here are endeavoring to worship God according to the teachings of the Scriptures, coming together upon the first day of the week, to break bread, to exhort one another, for prayers, to study the word, desiring to be guided by it in all we do and say. We have now before us the subject of contribution for investigation and would be pleased if you

could assist us a little as to the Scriptural way of carrying it on. We are impressed with the idea that the ancient churches had no such thing as a treasury. into which they cast their mites upon every first day of the week. Some have thought they did, taking the last chapter of 1st Cor. as proof. But it says "lay by him," we understand by himself, at home: nor is there anything in the entire connection that conveys to us the idea that they contributed every first day. Again, we understand that the "Lord hath ordained that they that preach the gospel shall live of the gospel" but where will we find that ministers are to make contracts with the churches either expressed or understood for so much? We deem it as much the duty of the churches to minister to the temporal wants of her preacher as it is his to minister to their spiritual wants, but does a failure upon the part of one to perform their duty make the obligation less binding upon the other? Will not a true gospel minister preach all he can even if the church should never give him anything, and will not a true church worship God and do all the good they can though they should never have a preacher?

Where a minister visits a church and he has much of this world's goods and there are poor and needy ones in the church, which way ought her contributions to go? Is it right for those of a church who are more needy than their minister to give to him and would he knowing the fact do right to receive it? (A little aside from the subject) Ought preachers who wear gold watches, chains and breast pins make a Bible discourse

upon dress? Ought a church to solicit a brother to preach who will not preach without a contract expressed or implied for so much, or ought they to bid him God speed in preaching at all? Is not the whole church one band of brothers and sisters in the Lord making common cause against the common enemy of souls, bound by the highest claims ever presented to mortals to assist and love each other, ministering, supporting and encouraging each other in all the trials, necessities and afflictions of life. We are persuaded that charity is of inestimable worth to the Christian, but covetousness will destroy spiritual life.

Yours in love,

J. K. P. WILKINSON.

Pelham, Grundy Co., Tenn., Jan.
10, 1874.

We are not sure that our brother is right in his construction of 1st Cor. 16: 1-4. We nevertheless have always believed, if a person could not get to the meeting house, he ought as a sacred duty he or she owed to God, solemnly enter into an account with himself on the first day of the week and set apart a portion of his earnings to the Lord.

In the first place, the expression on the first day used without any limiting clauses does mean, every first day. Just as the command, Remember to keep the Sabbath day meant, every Sabbath day. When we say we meet on the first day, we mean every first day. When we say we rest on the first day from labor we mean every first day. The law prohibits work done on Sunday, it means every Sunday. We repeat,

when the term, the first day of the week is used, without any qualifying clauses, it cannot mean otherwise than every first day. The Greek expresses the idea much more fully than the common English version. The Bible Union Version says, "On each first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store according as he is prospered, that there may be no gatherings when I come." The translation published by A. Campbell in this country reads, "On the first day of every week, let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may be prospered, putting it into the treasury; that when I come, there may be then no collections." This idea is certainly conveyed in the language of Paul, both that it was to be done on each, or every first day of the week, and it must be put into the treasury.

But just taking it as it stands in the common version, I think the idea of a treasury is necessarily involved. The idea of a treasury was common in the Jewish service and easily transferred to the Christian institution. It was certainly in the first Jerusalem church. The collection of funds of money together would constitute the treasury. This was done in the first church. All was cast into the treasury. Because Ananias and Sapphira pretended to do it and did not, they were smitten dead. The treasury idea, or the gathering together of the contributions of the members, that they might be distributed to those in need, was kept up in all the churches. Then here it was to be done on the first day of the week. That is the day the disciples met together. The day that

would suit for casting into the treasury. In the next place, the object was to make collections or get the means together, "that there be no gatherings when I come." I cannot see how Paul's object would be accomplished, were they only to put it by each in his own treasury. There would of necessity be gatherings then when Paul came. The laying by was to be in such a collection that all would be together when Paul came. This weekly gathering the mites together constituted the treasury.

Again, if a man keeps it in his own possession, there is constant temptation to use it in his business. He never feels it is not his, it is fully the Lord's, until he passes it out of his possession into the possession of the church. These reasons we think satisfactorily indicate, the apostle meant the church treasury. Yet we have never thought it necessary that every member should go through the form of contributing every first day. If a man has made nothing, he can contribute nothing. We are persuaded God despises mere forms. When he makes, let him honestly cast into the treasury on the first day of the week, every week that he makes or realizes any thing. A man frequently has property but is needy. We judge wrongly when we think because a man has lands he is not needy. He is as frequently without available means as those who do not own property.

The preacher who wears gold and jewelry, ought to preach on the subject, until he converts his own heart and head to the Bible teaching and practice.

D. L.

THE DITZLER DEBATE.

Bro. Lipscomb: Mr. Ditzler has been in the community a few days. He lays the responsibility of closing the debate upon Dr. Brents. At the conclusion of his discourse yesterday, he made about these remarks about you: "When the Methodist church tolerates a paper that publishes such an article as this man has I will leave the church. He has published falsehoods about the debate. He makes out that he left there on account of business, when the facts are he got so badly whipped over a little matter that he would not stay. His own brethren said he had lied; and was caught in it, and they were glad of it. He got mad and said he was going right home. He would not stay where his brethren would not stand up to him. Some of them commenced pulling and hauling at him to keep him from going, but he said, "No, I am going right home, you won't stand up to me."

This he represented as having occurred in the meeting-house. In his discourse yesterday there were some new positions, which perhaps I will write about in a few days.

Your Bro.,

J. D. FLOYD.

Flat Creek, Tenn., Jan. 19, 1874.

We will not say we are indifferent to what Mr. Ditzler says about us. We are not. We would much prefer every one should speak well of us. And if we can get them to do it without a sacrifice of self-respect we always try to get it. But if we must be spoken ill of, we know of no one we would prefer to do it,

to Mr. D. Especially as we feel sure it is done from no other cause than because we have exposed his misrepresentations and perversions of authors and of truth. This we felt it our duty to do. This we shall still do as circumstances may seem to demand, let Mr. D. abuse us as he will. The reason we prefer Mr. D.'s doing it to others, is because of his now well-known aptitude for being mistaken. Mr. D. spoke just as bitterly of Alexander Campbell because he said John Wesley said, that Paul to Romans, 6th chapter, referred to the ancient mode of baptizing by *immersion*. We have been told that he held the book up before a large audience and avowed he had "*lied*." He stated that Mr. Campbell and Dr. Conant had misrepresented Schleusner, Stokius and other authors with the evidence of their falsehood before them. Dr. Bretns showed him Campbell was right; he, in the first case, said he had written correcting it. His correction has never appeared. He fails now, after agreeing to it once, to refer the other points to a committee of scholars. He represents Smith and Lynch, as representing the Jordan too swift and cold and deep for baptizing. When Mr. Lynch said, the night air on one occasion was so cold it made them shiver, he made the mistake to quote him as saying the water is so cold, and referred it to the day. When Beza quotes Augustin as condemning the novelty of copious or thorough sprinklings being baptism; Mr. D. mistakes him, so as to say, he approved the idea. His aptitude for mistakes, together with a conviction that we have not mis-

represented or misstated facts, takes away much of the regret of Mr. D.'s denunciation

The main matter of Mr. D.'s complaint of my article is, doubtless, my treatment of his claim, that the placing of Bloomfield, and others in the list of condemners of the authenticity of the last verses of Mark. We are certain such a repetition of names like these, in this one connection, cannot possibly be a typographical error. We expressed a willingness to leave the matter to Dr. Summers and the printing experts of the Methodist Book Concern. If he felt conscious he was right, why not agree to this reference? It would be much more manly and gentlemanly. I cannot be mistaken as to his quoting Bloomfield at Flat-Creek on that side. I have not had a word of communication with Pres't Carnes since the debate, on any subject; but am sure he noted it. We never had examined Bloomfield on the subject until we did it in his book, at Flat Creek. Pres't Fanning says he noted his statement. Now there is no use in Mr. D.'s getting wrathful and making reckless assertions and using abusive epithets. They will never relieve him from these difficulties. No thoughtful persons will ever be influenced by statements so reckless as his. How does he know anything about my business? whether it called me away from the debate or not? I was absent from the debate, a longer time before the circumstance occurred, than I was after it did. I was there all the next day after it occurred.

It is strange that my brethren should be glad I was proved a liar,

and still beg and pull me to stay. I never opened my mouth about my brethren not standing up to me, nor did I ever hear of one speaking a word of disapproval; only some thought I ought to have spoken again, in defiance of the decision of the Moderators. Some of the older and more prudent, among them Dr. J. T. Barclay, thanked me for what I did. I was indignant at the decision of the moderators in permitting Mr. D. to go through his denunciation without calling him to order, and then deciding it out of order, and not permitting me to respond. I did speak of going home on account of this indignation. I did not go until called by other business. During the latter week of debate I married, according to previous arrangement, three couples.

I wish to say to Mr. D. and his friends, I think just as highly of Mr. D. as any of my brethren who have examined closely his course. Sweeney, Brents, Fanning and every man, even to his own brother Miller, who examines his use of authorities, is compelled to see he frequently misrepresents and perverts them. His brother Miller last year in St. Louis *Christian Advocate* exposed him for the misrepresentation of the same word in the same Lexicon that Prof. Binford exposed in Franklin.

I have no doubt were such articles as I publish in the *Advocate* published in the Methodist papers, that he would leave the church. Some of his leading brethren now lack faith in his correctness. I have a much higher degree of respect for the piety of the Methodist church, than to believe it would

retain a man in its bosom that it knew willfully perverts truth even in defence of its own doctrines.

We think it nothing but just to publish the following extract from a letter received from Dr. Brents, the same day that I received these others. It was doubtless a private letter, and probably he will not be pleased at my publishing; it is expressed in probably plainer language than if he had written for the public. But, as an expression of indignation at a dishonorable violation of implied faith and at a misrepresentation of one, Mr. D. so frequently complimented as the fairest and most honorable man he ever debated with, we think it ought to be given. Dr. Brents says:

"As to Mr. Ditzler's course at Franklin, it is simply an outrage on every principle of honor; and had I known he would have pursued such a policy, the debate would not have ended when it did. If he insinuated that the debate was closed by my request, he simply lies. I had no more idea of closing the debate when I entered the pulpit after dinner on Monday than you had in Nashville. Not a bit. I went from my room with the firm conviction that I would perfectly demolish him that evening on that question, as he had taken positions which could not be otherwise than fatal to him. Why I should have wanted the debate stopped is more than I can see. I regret much that it did close, seeing the strategy he used to get to debate the questions *ex parte*. I confess I did not think him capable of such a thing.

He made a more vigorous effort on the action than he ever made before,

and I think I made a better one myself. We are not always competent to judge of our own labor, however; but I felt that I more thoroughly exposed his method of argumentation than ever before, whether I gave satisfaction to my brethren or not.

Yours truly,

T. W. BRENTS.

Now I say, once for all I am willing to undertake to satisfy any man, Methodist or otherwise—that he has dealt unfairly with, and perverted the meaning of quite a number of authors whom he quotes, that he does it intentionally and we challenge him to the test. Since the debate his hurry to move to Mo. has wonderfully subsided.

D. L.

Memoirs of Jesus.

JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES COMPARED TO A VINE WITH ITS BRANCHES.

It is, perhaps impossible to determine positively, where the teacher delivered that last long discourse, begun in the fourteenth, continued through the fifteenth and sixteenth, and closing with the prayer of Jesus in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel by John.

After supper, Matthew says, "they sang a hymn, and went out." But John seems to represent Jesus as continuing his remarks right on, at the house, till the close of the 14th chap. when Jesus says: "arise and let us go from here." Now, whether they had gone out from the supper table to Olive Mountain, and sitting down, engaged in conversation; or whether this was the point of departure from

the house, we cannot now certainly know. We can therefore only conjecture, that, as they were slowly and solemnly wending their way towards the Mountain, they encountered a vineyard, whose branching vines suggested the following remarks:

"I am the True Vine," said Jesus. "and my Father is the Vine-Dresser. Every branch in me that bears no fruit, he takes away; but every branch that yields fruit, he prunes, in order that it may yield more fruit. Now you are pure through the word that I have spoken to you. Continue in me, and I shall remain in you. As the branch cannot produce fruit from itself, unless it remains on the vine; so you cannot, except you remain, in [or, "attached to"] me.

I am the vine; you are the branches. He that continues in me, while I continue in him, [that is, "while we closely adhere to one another,"] will produce abundance of fruit; for, apart from me, you can do nothing.

If any one does not continue in me, he will be thrown away, like a withered branch; and such will be gathered and thrown into the fire and consumed.

If you continue in me, and my words remain in you, you may ask what you wish, and it will be done for you.

My Father is honored in this; that you produce much fruit; thus you will be my disciples.

As the Father has loved me, so I have loved you. Continue in my love.—If you observe my commands, you will remain in my love; even as I have observed the commands of my Father, and remain in his love. I have spoken these things in order that my joy in you

may continue, and that your joy be complete.

This is my command, that you love one another, as I have loved you. No man has greater love than this: that one should lay down his life for his friends. You are my friends if you do whatever I command you. I no longer call you servants, for the servant does not know what his master does. But I have called you friends, for everything which I have heard from my Father, I have communicated to you.

You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and appointed you, that you may go and produce fruit, and that your fruit may remain; so that whatever you ask from the Father in my Name, He may give you. This I command you that you love one another.

If the world hates you, you know that it hated me before it hated you. If you were of the world, the world would love its own. But because you are not of the world, I having chosen you out from the world, therefore the world hates you.

Remember the word that I spoke to you: "The servant is not greater than his master;" if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have observed my word, they will observe yours too. But all these things they will do to you on account of my name, because they do not know him who sent me. If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have [been guilty of the] sin [of rejecting me.] But now they have no excuse for their sin.

He who hates me, hates my Father too. If I had not performed acts among them which no other one (ever)

performed, they would not have had sin: but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father. But this is so, that the word might be verified that is written in their Law: "They hated me without a cause." (Ps. lxxix. 4.)

But when the Advocate is come whom I shall send you from the Father,—the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father,—he will testify, because you have been with me from the commencement.

I have said these things to you in order that you may not become discouraged. They will expel you from the Synagogues; in fact, the time is coming, when he that kills you will think that he is doing service for God. And they will do these things to you, because they do not know the Father nor me. But I have told you these things [now] so that when the time comes [for them to take place,] you may remember that I told you. I did not, indeed, tell these things to you at the commencement, because I was with you. But now I am going away to him who sent me; and yet none of you asks me, "where art thou going?" But because I have said these things, your minds are filled with grief. However, I tell you the truth: It is for your good that I am going away: for if I do not go away, the Advocate will not come to you. But if I go away, I will send him to you. And when he has come, he will convict the world concerning sin, concerning justice, and concerning judgment: concerning sin, because they do not believe on me; concerning justice, because I am going to my Father, and you

will see me no more; concerning judgment, because the ruler of this world is judged. I have many things still to tell you; but you cannot bear them now. But when the Spirit of truth has come, he will guide you into all truth; for he will not speak from himself, but whatever he shall hear, he will utter; and he will show you things to come. He will honor me; for he will take from [what is] mine, and communicate it to you.

All things that the Father has, are mine. For this reason I said that he will take from mine, and communicate it to you.

[For] a little while, you will not see me; again, [after] a little while, you will see me.'

Then some of his disciples said to one another:

'What is this that he is saying to us,—“For a little while, you will not see me; again, after a little while, you will see me;” and, “because I am going to the Father?” They said, therefore: “What is this that he is saying; “A little while”?’ We do not understand what he is saying.'

Then Jesus perceived that they were desirous to ask him; and he said to them:

'Are you inquiring of one another concerning this that I said,—“For a little while, you will not see me; again, after a little while you will see me.”? Truly, truly I say to you, that you will weep and lament, while the world will rejoice: you will be sorrowful, but your sorrow will be turned into joy. A woman, when she is in labor, is filled with anguish, because her hour has come. But when the child is born, she no longer re-

members the anguish, for joy, that a man has been born into the world.

You, therefore are sorrowful now; but I shall see you again, and your hearts will be made joyful; and no one will deprive you of your enjoyment. In that day, you will request anything of me. I tell you truly, that whatever you shall ask of the Father in my name, I will give you. Up to this time you have requested anything in my name. Ask, and receive that your enjoyment may be complete.

These things things I have spoken to you figuratively. The time is coming when I shall no more speak to you figuratively, but shall teach you plainly concerning the Father. In that day you will pray in my name; and I do not say to you that I will entreat the Father on your behalf: for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me, and have believed that I came from God. I came from the Father, and have come into the world. Again I [shall] leave the world, and go to the Father.'

His disciples said to him:

'See! now thou art speaking plainly and not figuratively. Now we are convinced that thou knowest all things and hast no need that any one should question thee. By this we believe that thou camest out from God.'

Jesus answered them:

'Do you now believe; See here; an hour is coming—has now come—in which you will be dispersed, every one to his own [place] and will leave me and yet I am not alone; for the Father is with me.

These things I have spoken to you that in me you may have peace. In

the world you will have trouble; but be cheerful I have overcome the world."

What more, or what better things could the living master have spoken to his disciples? Who can read the affectionate farewell of the Pastor to his Flock without being deeply impressed by his words of truthfulness, tender compassion and love? How kind! how condescending! how wonderfully solicitous for the welfare of his followers, whom he calls no longer "servants," but "friends!" But he does not stop with talking to them to console them. He prays for them. And O, what a prayer! Can any one who reads that prayer, and observes its simplicity, earnestness, and peculiar appropriateness, doubt that it is the prayer of the Son of God.

In another chapter, we shall take that prayer for a lesson, and study its beautiful import. Respecting that part of the Savior's discourse which has been quoted, we may remark:

That, having sung a hymn after supper, and perhaps talked awhile, Jesus and eleven would be-faithful disciples appear to have started to Olive Mountain, east of Jerusalem and beyond the Brook Kedron. Judas had gone to fulfill his infamous contract with the Jewish officials, and it was now sometime after dark. It was the time of the full moon, it is true; for the Passover Festival occurred at that time in the month; but we have some reason to believe it was cloudy, that night; for the crowd who accompanied Judas carried "lamps and torches." (John xviii. 3.) On the way Jesus says to his disciples:

'All of you will stumble at me to-night; for it is on record: "I will strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock will be dispersed.'" (Zech. xiii. 7.) But after I have arisen, I shall go before you into Galilee.'

Peter, replying, said to him.

'Though all stumble at thee, yet I will never turn against thee.'

How rash Peter was to say this! But he was honest, self-confident, sanguine. Jesus knows him better than he knows himself, and says to him:

"I tell you, truly. This night before the cock crows twice, you will renounce me three times."

Peter said to him:

'Though I should have to die with thee, I will not renounce thee.'

In the same manner, all the [other] disciples spoke."

How bold men are, sometimes, when they do not see danger near! These men did not realize, at that moment, the imminence of their danger, or the weakness of their human natures.

Matthew says: "Jesus came with them to a place, called Gethesmane." But John writes: "He went out with his disciples beyond the Brook Kedron, where there was a Garden."

Here we shall leave them, for the present. It was on the way to this garden we have supposed that Jesus said so many things to his disciples, to console them. While we have been reading those precious utterances, a good impression was being made on our minds. But, by dwelling on some of the more striking sentences, we may derive additional benefit by having them permanently fixed in our minds.

I. Going back to where Jesus

compares himself and his disciples to a vine with its branches, we wish to inquire: who are the branches? There is no doubt that the Apostles were branches. But this is the extent of the Savior's meaning? In these days when men are speaking of denominations as "branches of the church," earnest disciples, doubting the correctness of this popular phrase, are wont to say: "Christians, and not Churches, are branches of Christ, the vine." Are all Christians branches, then? But a peculiar construction has been put upon this figure, to which attention may be invited. The position has been taken, that Jesus is the vine; the apostles are the principal branches; and those who believe through the apostles, are the secondary branches, on which hang the clusters of fruit.

This is beautiful in theory; but we cannot but regard it as a fanciful interpretation, which attempts to picture Christ as the vine; the apostles as the Primary braches; and Christians as secondary branches, on which hang the clusters of grapes. Would not we Christians, then, be branches of branches? And what is meant by the clusters of grapes, hanging on the outer branches? Is it clusters of converts, or congregations of believers, the fruits of evangelical labor?

But whatever may be thought of the above interpretation, it is true that all Spiritual nourishment is derived from Christ through the apostles. Without them, we are cut off from the only source of the "sincere milk of the word," by which alone Christians grow and become fruitful.

II. Jesus calls the disciples his "friends." It appears that from this

circumstance, a religious society has arrogated to itself the distinctive title of "the society of friends." "Friends of Jesus" might be considered a very proper name for a society of Christians, who are diligently engaged in "doing whatever Jesus has commanded."

But as a denominational name, it may perhaps, be as properly applied to other associations as the Quaker Fraternity. Does it not even appear inconsistent for a people to call themselves "friends of Christ," who are noted for *not doing* the commands of Christ? Can those who refuse to be immersed, to commemorate the Lord's death by partaking of the Bread and wine; and so praise God by singing claim to be specially, the "friends of Jesus? Was not Abraham the Friend of God, because he was faithful in obeying him to the letter?

Silence is indeed better than such singing as is sometimes done by professing Christians. And an empty profession, and formal observance of the communion, are very wickedness. But to avoid formality, is it necessary to do nothing? Canot a pure spiritual worship consist with vocal music and sensible symbols, and outward acts? Assuredly, if we do whatever we do, to the honor and "glory of God," we shall not only avoid formalism and vain-worship, but we shall be entitled to the appellation of "Friends of Jesus," in the true and proper sense of that phrase.

III. If, as Jesus says, Christians can do nothing apart from him," how do imposters sometimes succeed so well in proselying, or "winning souls to Christ," as they express it? Is

if the power of the truth, which even an imposter can utter, which converts the sinner? or does the Holy Spirit "accompany the word," even an imposter can utter, which converts when spoken by bad men? This appears to be a popular theory, which has evidently been invented to explain effects, not otherwise so easily accounted for. But it is more reasonable to suppose that the truth, no matter by whom uttered, produces its natural and legitimate effect on the mind and heart, than to imagine that the Holy Spirit goes along with the word from the impure mouth of an imposter to the unsanctified heart of the sinner.

IV. John writes more about LOVE than any other apostle. And why not? He was the "beloved disciple," and had no doubt, a kind and affectionate disposition. Paul, indeed, wrote the charity chapter on Love, (1 Cor. xiii. c.) But John, besides recording the many expression of love, occurring in Jesus' discourse, has filled his three loving epistles, near the end of the New Covenant with this same delightful subject. How affectionately he writes to his brethren in the first letter! "Beloved let us love one another, for love is of God: and every one who loves, has been begotten of God, and knows God. He that does not love, does not know God, for God is love. In this the love of God was manifest toward us, that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. In this is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his son to be the expiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us we ought to love one another." (John, Letter I. iv. 7-11.)

And his second and third letters are in the truest sense of the phrase, "love letters," full of an overflowing spiritual affection for those addressed.

But we must, however reluctantly, lay down our pen for the present and leave the reader to further meditations on the meaningful and impressive language of our Savior.

WM. PINKERTON.

Waynesfield O. Jan. 17, 1874.

A Card from the Moderators.

Elder D. Lipscomb: Dear Sir:— We notice in the number of your paper, "The Gospel Advocate," dated January 8, an article upon the discussion recently had at this place, by Dr. Ditzler and Dr. Brents, upon certain religious propositions, in which, we, for the most part, acted as Moderators. We think the tenor of your article is such, as to reflect disparagingly, in one way or another, upon some, if not upon each one of us. Now we desire to make this statement. Although we all were without experience in, and had but little knowledge of, such discussions; yet, upon every point of order raised, our rulings were promptly made, and that, with entire unanimity; and upon most of the points raised, the decisions of the Board were written, read out in open session, and seemingly met the approval of the debaters, and of a large majority of the audience. In our judgment, no occasion arose for any member of the Board of Moderators to exercise any undue influence upon the other members in making their decision; nor was any attempt made by any one of them,

unduly to control the action of the Board. The decision of the Board of Moderators upon the point raised by yourself, and to which you specially refer in your article, was first expressed by H. H. Cook, and then concurred in by the President of the Board, J. M. Gault, and then expressed by A. Thomas, and by him announced, as requested, by the other members of the Board. Hoping in justice to us you will publish this,

We are most respectfully,

J. M. GAULT, Pres.

H. H. COOK,

A. THOMAS,

Moderators.

Franklin, Tenn., Jan. 22, 1874.

I stated the exact truth as near as I was able in reference to the matters, if that reflects upon the Moderators, it is not my fault. I did not object to the decision of the Moderators on any point of order I raised. For I only raised two during the meeting. They sustained both. One was, Is it improper to pass a note to a debatable during the debate? which had been objected to by Mr. Thomas. The other, "Is it in order for one of the debatable to denounce the personal character of any individual present or absent?" Both points of order were sustained in the written decisions of the Moderators; one against Mr. Ditzler, the other against his Moderator. But while this was done, Mr. Ditzler was permitted to make a denunciation of Bro. Pickens and myself; charging us both virtually with falsehood. He read garbled extracts from an article of mine. I requested that the whole article

allowed to reply. They did not stop him, but after he was through, decided he was out of order, but that no "retort" (the word used,) should be made.

In all deliberative and parliamentary bodies, when a person's character is attacked or maligned, he or his friends, in his absence, have the privilege of reply. And that right takes precedence of all other business. It is called "a question of privilege." All bodies known to me have recognized this right as sacred. This board of Moderators for the first time, reversed this rule, and allowed a man's character to be attacked before the world and refused to allow a defence or an explanation to be made. It matters not who suggested or made the decision; it was contrary to all parliamentary usage, worked great injustice to me and Bro. Pickens. Hearers have rights as well as speakers. I was there as more than a hearer. I had represented one of the debatable in arranging terms of debate and in selecting the first presiding Moderator. Was there at a great sacrifice to my private affairs, at his very urgent request, and had the right of respectful treatment both for myself and friends. As to the promptness in making decisions, I will state the facts. On Thursday afternoon, during Mr. D.'s first speech, the attack on Pickens was made. I raised the point of order, then the attack on me followed. If any decision was made I did not hear it. Because I did not learn any was made, I called the matter up again at the close in the evening. After some parleying and a further denunciation of myself was made by Mr.

Ditzler, then it was decided his attack was out of order, but no "retort" should be made. That may be promptness in the estimation of our moderators, but I should say, if so, their blood circulates slowly.

Mr. Thomas was the only one of the Moderators that I heard raise a point of order during debate. He was quick to do it when there was the least shadow of an occasion or opportunity for reproving us on the other side. It was so offensively done that Bro. Sweeney went to him privately and protested against his course. But Mr. D. was permitted to violate all order and gentlemanly propriety and pursue a course, which, if it had been met in the spirit it was given would have turned the meeting into a common brawl and row. It is the tolerance of these things that brings opprobrium upon debates.

D. L.

DEATH.

What is death? Many learned things have been written on death. But about all that can be known of it, is what is seen and observed as phenomena. As to what death really is no mortal knows. We know that when death has taken place the Spirit is gone from the body, and all that makes our friends dear to us gone from them, and all that remains is merely a cold motionless, lifeless form subject to immediate decay. Sometimes this something called death comes in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye and the life all goes at a breath. Again death comes by the slow process of what is called disease, and life clings most tenaciously to this

mortal frame. But about all that we can know about it is, that the Spirit, the Soul, the bright lustre of the eye, the life-glowing countenance all desert the body, and a cold, lifeless, inanimate lump of clay, ready for the dark tomb, only remains. Such was the case with our own dear babe of fifteen months, as was announced in the Advocate of last week. Her Spirit, her life departed about daylight on the morning of the 24th of January, after ten days of severe illness, and twenty hours of as intense suffering we are sure, as it has ever been our lot to witness in a child. But she is forever relieved from suffering and is at rest. But O! how we miss her sweet voice, in the precious little words of Papa, mamma, baby, &c., which she was able to utter distinctly. We miss the light pit-a-pat of her little feet as she walked to and fro about the house. We miss her at the table; we miss her around the fire. We miss her in the morning, at noon, and at night. We miss her on lying down and rising up. We miss her by day and by night. We miss her sweet merry little laugh when the children are at play, and we miss her almost constant prattle, and her busy little feet and hands. We miss her cries when in trouble, and her many little expressions of want. But 'twere vain 'twere wrong to grieve after the dear little ones that are taken from us, and thus forever relieved from suffering and pain. But the tear and full heart of sympathy we cannot restrain, nor is it desirable that we should. It is all right that we should deeply feel these things, that we may be made better by them. That we

may the more forcibly be reminded of the uncertainty of life and of all things earthly, that we may place our affections more on things above, and less on things of earth. When we are prospered in all things, we are so liable to become forgetful of the great source whence all our blessings flow. We often forget how frail, how weak, how dependent we are upon God for "life and breath, and all things we enjoy." We need therefore to deeply feel such things. But another question of deep interest is, what becomes of the Spirits of the innocent and the righteous, when they leave the body; where do they remain from death till the resurrection? While not a great many things are said directly on this subject, there are some things that are calculated to give great consolation to the Christian heart.

Paul says, in his second letter to the Corinthians, he would rather be absent from the body and be present with the Lord. The implication here is that so soon as his Spirit were free from the body it would be present with the Lord. Now in what sense the spirits of the innocent and righteous are present with the Lord, we cannot tell; but to be assured that they are with him in any sense, is consolation enough. Again, in Thessalonians, he speaks of the righteous dead as sleeping in Jesus. This certainly indicates a state of glorious rest. Jesus, in speaking of the rich man and Lazarus, represents Lazarus as in Abraham's bosom.

This again indicates a happy, a joyful existence, between death and

the final judgment. But our curious minds will be asking, how do the spirits of our departed friends get to their places of abode when they leave the body? Jesus himself said, in speaking of Lazarus, that when he died, "he was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Carried by the angels! what a precious thought; that when we have watched over the innocent and just till life departs; till the last breath has flown, the last pang suffered, and we have performed our last kind offices of affection for them on earth, that the angels are present in readiness to bear their spirits home to rest. We shall forever thank the Lord for these precious words. How they often and relieve our hearts from the distress of parting with our dear little child. While we sustain so great a loss in being deprived of her precious company, she makes the great gain of being forever relieved from all suffering and pain. Such doubtless are the feelings of every parent at the loss of a child. Were it not for such consolations, there would be many dark, and almost insupportable clouds of grief in this life. But with the precious promises of God, we can bear all these trials and afflictions, and hope for a time when such afflictions will be forever ended. But other questions arise in our minds; such as, shall we, if faithful until death, meet and recognize our friends who have gone on before, and shall we appreciate them as such, in as much higher degree as heaven and its society are above earth? And will the little ones cheer and brighten our existence there as they do here?

Could we be well assured of this, it seems as if we might well afford to give some of them up in their innocence and purity here, that we may enjoy their dear presence, and be refreshed by their sweet prattling tongues in that heavenly home forever. And while we do not wish to speculate, we love to enjoy the thought that such will be the case. It comforts and cheers us in our sad trials of affliction here. And again the thought that one tender lamb has passed over the dark river and is with the Lord, breaks loose one more tie from this poor uncertain world, and fixes another tie beyond the flood; another help to break loose from the allurements of the world, and to press forward toward the mark for the eternal prize. As parents, we have determined to be made more humble by our sad bereavement, and to take our affections more from the world, and to appreciate more highly the precious promises of God, and to consecrate our lives more earnestly to his service, that we may be prepared to meet God in peace, and dwell with him and the loved ones of heaven forevermore.

E. G. S.

Correspondence.

Brethren L. & S: I write that you and your readers may hear some things from this portion of our Lord's vineyard. The cause is prospering well in this part of Ky. considering that the laborers are few and the hard times in financial circles. I am engaged to labor steadily at the following points, Milburn Ballard Co. 1st

Lord's Day in each month; Blandville 2nd Lord's day. City of Cairo Ill. 3rd and 4th Lord's days in each month. Cairo is quite a city of about 14000 inhabitants. There is a small band of as true disciples there as can be found any where. The prospect for doing much good is indeed flattering. They have a very neat and commodious church in use. What they need now, is faithful pastoral labor. I enter into the work there in the confidence of much good being accomplished. The cause has been greatly hindered and injured in time past by an oversight in the brethren in employing an unfaithful man to labor for them in the word and doctrine. But amid all their troubles there are a few who are true and firm and they are now at peace and full of zeal.

I pray the good Lord to greatly bless and multiply their numbers.

Bro. F. H. Davis is under promise to spend the month of June with me in my field of labor, and I anticipate much pleasure in his company, and much good to result to the cause of our Master. I pray earnestly that heaven's favor may rest upon you my brethren in your self sacrificing labor of love.

R. B. TRIMBLE.

Mayfield Ky. Jan. 30th 1873.

In general every evil to which we do not succumb is a benefactor. As the Sandwich Islander believes that the strength and valor of the enemy he kills passes into himself, so we gain strength of the temptation we resist.—*Arthur Helps.*

The glory of God and the salvation of souls should be the teacher's aim.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

JOHN JONES'S NEW LEAF.

BY ROSELLA RICE.

It was a dreary kitchen—the walls were dirty and smoky, the breakfast dishes stood on the table in the middle of the floor, the cooking stove was open, with kettles and pans on it, and cold ashes on its hearth, its sooty plates awry, a pot of dishwater standing on top of the stove, and the broom, and poker and tongs lay just where the little riders had left them when they were called to prepare for school. Johnny had gone off crying, and his whine could even be heard coming up the hollow, in the direction of the school-house. The milk had not been strained, and the flies were buzzing about it as they sat on the edges of the two brimming pails, sipping and rubbing their hands together in a satisfied way. The baby was teething and cross, and the one pair of hands that could have brought order out of this disorder were busy trying to soothe it.

Is it any wonder that tears were in the mother's eyes, as she cuddled her baby to her bosom, and walked across the floor trying to still its cries?

"Oh, dear, what a life!—what a life!" said she; "I try to be patient and make the best of it, but it does seem so hard." Just as the babe was growing quiet, and its little blue hands had fallen listlessly upon its bosom, a shadow fell across the door-

way, and the husband entered, saying, "Jane, can you tell me what the children did with the hatchet yesterday?"

"It was out on the rock, behind Johnny's wagon, last night," said she, speaking low, and gently laying the baby down in a bed that had not been made up yet.

"Seems to me you're a good while gettin' your chores done; you havn't the knack of gittin' along like Mrs. Leavondyke—her work is done up long ago, an' she's busy in the garden'. Tell you, she's a nice garden', don't look much like our'n; you don't put the time in our'n that she does in her'n."

"Oh, John," said the little woman, slipping back her sleeves, and tying on a big apron, and trying to keep her face turned away to hide the gathering tears, "with four little children, and the baby sick, and three cows to milk, and calves to feed, and hands to cook for, and all the other work to do, I only wonder that I get half my chores done in a whole day."

"Well, I'm sure I don't see how it is," said he: "my mother had ten living children and she managed to get along first rate, and do all her own weaving, besides taking in weaving for the neighbors. You have more room than she had, and you don't have to carry water forty rods like she did—bere it is right at the foot of the hill; and you never have to cut your own fire-wood, unless it is in the midst of harvest, and I think you should'nt complain. If there is anything I hate to hear, it is a growling, whining wife. Now, I have to be out o' doors all the time, no matter

how hot the sun shines, or how cold the wind blows, while you are in the shade and comfortable—if you only knew it; so, cheer up. I married you for a helpmate, don't you know? The girls will be big enough in three or four years to help you, and then you can take times easier, and maybe by that time the bottom farm will be paid for, and we'll be able to ride in carriage, like the Leavondykes do.

"How long since you brought in this water?" said he, as he took a drink from the tin dipper, and finding it not fresh, squirted it out coolly right on the floor among some pans that had slipped down off a shelf.

As he took the hatchet, and started out to the wagon to fix the hay-riggings on it, he said, "Jane, if you can as well as not, s'posin' you have some o' them new beans that grow in that fur lot for dinner"

"Well, I'll try," said she, hopelessly, as she slipped her shoes off, so she might step softly and with more comfort. All we working women know what a task it is to put a disordered kitchen into neatness, especially when little children have been about. First she strained the milk, saving one quart with which to mix the bread, for the yeast was set the night before, and had been bubbling for two hours: she mixed it and set it in the warm sunshine, and then started a fire and made feed of skim milk and meal for the noisy, frolicksome calves that ran in the door-yard. Then she swept and picked up playthings after the children, hung up their coats and aprons, and set their old shoes away, and moved their sleds, and wagons, and hoops from about the doors.

While the dishwater was heating she hurried up stairs and made the beds, then washed the dishes, and went down cellar and skimmed the milk. There was cream enough for a churning, the churn was scalded, and then left with a pail of cold water standing in it, so as to be fresh and ready. By this time the baby woke and cried, and the tired little mother was compelled to sit down and take him in her sheltering arms.

In half an hour or so he was ready to sit down on the floor on a quilt, and she left him long enough to carry three or four pails of the skimmed milk to the pigs—two pailful at a time, and she went on the run. She always fed the pigs; when she asked her husband once to carry the milk to the pen, on his way out to his work, he said, "That belongs to a woman's work; a man whose name is out for commissioner shouldn't be asked to slop the pigs—that's a little too steep."

It was no trifling job to feed those pigs; the pen had been made out of some old house logs, and the opening through which the pails had to be lifted before they could be emptied, was so high up that it just came even with her neck, and was only wide enough to admit the pail with the bail lying down. Twice, when she was dressed up clean, had the unsteadily poised pail tipped back and poured the contents upon her—from her neck even down to her little feet, drenched as by a waterspout.

Withal, the little mother was quite patient, and almost every day could her untrained voice be heard even down to the lower field and the school house, singing: "A charge to

keep I have;" or "God moves in a mysterious way."

But before another year a change came. The strong, hard man, her husband, was stricken down with Typhoid fever, and for long, weary weeks he lay balancing between life and death. His recovery was very slow, and his confinement irksome; no prison walls could have been gloomier than were the home walls that held him a prisoner. Day after day the patter of his wife's patient little feet fell upon his ear; he could hear them up stairs and down, now here, now there, her voice always kind and tender, her hand ever ready to minister to her dear ones, her words full of consolation, and love, and cheer.

John Jones was not wholly unimpressible; slowly the scales fell from his eyes, the light came, and he was as one born into a higher and a better life. He drew his bony hands across his eyes, often the sobs made him catch his breath suspiciously, and he marvelled much that he had walked beside this little woman for four years and not known he was mated with an "angel unawares." His voice grew softer, tenderer, his great talony hands touched her forehead and her hair lovingly, as would a woman's—touched her as though he was afraid she would fade away into a white mist.

Weeks afterwards, when he was able to ride out, the old whimsical buggy that had done good service in the days of his church going parents, was made comfortable by a soft woolen blanket and an armful of sweet-smelling oat straw. John didn't tell where he was going, but he looked

wise, and his mouth had a perky look about the corners that seemed to say: "Just le' me alone, I know what I'm about!"

It was evening when he came home. He was still as wise as when he went away. His cup of tea was waiting, and his toast, and the tender little pullet fried nice and brown. He seemed really happy—jolly. He trotted the "baby" on his foot that night, and he called his wife "Jenny," as in the days when he won her, and there was such a contented, rich-man expression on his face that his wife couldn't help wondering what had made such a change in him.

The next morning the crazy old rig was called out again, and the soft blanket was spread in it, and John Jones took the lines in his emaciated hands and drove off in the same direction as he did the day before.

When he returned, he was accompanied by a broad-shouldered, good-looking German girl, whom he introduced to his wife as "our girl."

She looked with amazement upon "our girl," and then stared at John. —He soon explained things to her satisfaction.

"The upshot o' the matter is, Jane, that I've 'bused you long enough; the Lord helpin' me, I'll never see you make a drudge o' yourself ag'in. It's a burnin' shame for any great lout like me to expect a frail little body like you to be a man, an' boy, an' dog, an' wife, an' mother, an' rigger, an' me a savin' and a hoardin' up money and means to leave to the Lord only knows who. I beg your pardon, Jane; and now you'll tell this girl, Barbara Groetz, how you want things done, and let her take

your place an' work in your stid, and you'll live hereafter, like a human man's wife ort to."

By the time the speech was made the poor, weak fellow was blubbering like a whale.

Poor little surprised wife! she flew to his neck and laid her head on his bosom, and cried like a baby, and she said: "John Jones! you old darling!"

"No, not a bit of a darliu'; just an old bear, a regular old heathen, to sacrifice the best little woman under the sun, inch by inch, this way that's been a'goin' on for years and years," snuffed he, as he fumbled over her face in an aimless loving way.

Then "our girl," Barbara, went into Jane Jone's harness, and it fitted her to a fraction.

"Now we've turned over a new leaf, go and dress up, Jenny, bless you!" said the new convert.

So, with the memory of lang syne warming her heart, Jane unearthed her wedding dress in the afternoon, and put it on with a pretty, old-fashioned collar, and brushed out her nut-brown hair that once upon a time curled beautifully. Perhaps she felt foolish and girlish and out of sphere but she looked sweet enough to make up for all discrepances.

She sat sewing, putting a new band on Ruby's new skirt, when the children came from school. Her back was toward the door. Tom came to a dead halt as he stopped on the sill, and then ran around to the lean-to to find his mother. No mother there, but the smiling, pinky-faced German girl, who was paring potatoes to bake for supper.

Tom bawled out: "Is mether dead? Oh, I want my mother!" and circled around the house and peeped in shyly with wet eyes.

Was that lady in a soft gray merino dress, wearing an embroidered collar and gold ear-drops, his mother? That pretty woman? Surely it was, for Nettie was feeling her face, and was sparkling all over and saying: "Is this you mother? Why, where have you been?"

"Oh, ma!" said Tom, holding her around the neck as though he thought she would flit away the next minute; "why where did you go, and when did you come back!"

Poor little ones, how proud they were of the household drudge in her new and beautiful transformation!

But this is not all. Before the cold blasts of winter came, steps were taken to lighten the labors of the farmer's household. An addition was built to the house, new siding was put on and painted white. New windows were added, and green blinds and spouting, and a big cistern close to the door, and a wide, long, roomy porch.—Closets were put in all the rooms; the old verminy bedsteads split up and used for kindlings; new chairs were bought including a new rocking and sewing chair for mother; a new sewing machine, that was a love of a friend; the door-yard was paved in, and the calves and colts kept where they belonged; and evergreen trees, and flowering shrubbery, and rose-bushes, made beautiful the new yard. An easy chain-pump took the place of the old moss covered bucket that held as much as a churn.—it was packed off to the barn to put

clover seed in, and the heavy windlass was borne away forever from the little arms that had tugged at its ponderous weight with a sick weariness many a year. The big well-rope made a nice swing out under the oaks for Tom and Belle and chubby Harry.

Now that she no longer enslaved mother has leisure to mingle with her growing children as teacher and companion, and friend, they grow more lovable and intelligent, and they cling to her like vines. They see so much in her to admire and emulate.

And John Jones? That spell of fever was the Aaron's rod that smote the rock of his soul and opened it for out-gushing of love, and sympathy and charity, and all the virtues, and charms and graces of the human heart; and to-day, growing broader, and ruddier, and riper and better, there lives no happier farmer than dear old, renovated John Jones.—*Arthur's Home Magazine.*

Conformity to God's Will.

Unless I make religion my great and engrossing concern, I shall be a stranger to all peace and enjoyment. I have at times caught a glimpse of the comfort it yields to the Spirit, when I merge my will—when I resolve to have no will of my own separate from God. I feel quite assured that this renunciation of self, and entire devotion to God's service, would give a simplicity and grandeur to my existence—would throw an unclouded sunshine over all my ways—would raise me above the cares and provocations of life—would enhance even

my sensible gratifications of a higher order, which constitute the main and essential blessings of heaven. O my God, may it be thus with me! Call me out of nature's darkness into thine own marvelous light. Give me to aspire after the graces, and hold forth to acquaintances, and, above all, to my children, the example of righteousness! Conform me to the gospel economy under which I sit, that as Christ died for my sin, I may die to it; that as he rose again, I may rise to a newness of life, and feel that it is my meat and drink to do thy will—*Chalmers.*

One living, earnest Christian, who can offer the prayers of faith, be he ever so poor, is worth more to the cause of Christ than a thousand worldly-minded and carnal professors, be they very rich.

The only way to meet affliction is to pass through it solemnly, slowly, with humanity and faith, as the Israelites passed through the sea. Then its very waves of misery will divide, and become to us a wall on the right side and on the left, until the gulf narrows before our eyes, and we land safe on the opposite shore.—*Miss Mulock.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Ditzlerisms.....	122
The treasury and other things.....	125
The Ditzler debate.....	127
Memoirs of Jesus.....	130
A card from the moderator.....	135
Death.....	137
Correspondence.....	139
Fireside.	
John Jones's new Leaf.....	140
Conformity to God's will.....	143

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 7

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, FEB. 12, 1874.

Why so Few are Saved. No. 1.

“Straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” Matthew 7. 14.

It does not require a profound acquaintance with the history of the world to convince us that this startling declaration of the Savior has been true of every generation of men up to the present time.

However when we consider the nature of man; it astonishes us to see that it is and has always been so.

We will submit a few positions taken in regard to the nature of man; which are admitted to be true. It is admitted by all that he is an intelligent being; and generally admitted that he has the ability to choose between good and evil. It is admitted that he is a worshipping being, and that his disposition to worship is so strong that he will worship something. It is admitted that he is an imitative being, and that he will become like the company he keeps or the object he worships. It is admitted by all that the utmost desire of man is for happiness.

Then we conclude that if this intelligent being, possessing the ability to choose between misery and happiness; this worshipping being whose whole soul reaches out after happiness has failed to obtain it; it must be from the fact that he has been miserably deceived. We cannot for a moment believe that a being, constituted as man is, would knowingly and willingly turn a deaf ear to the solemn warnings of his Creator, and turn his back upon his kind invitations, and promises of eternal joy and walk with eyes wide open into the gulf of everlasting misery. Certainly he has been fearfully deceived by some powerful spirit which has ever been at work on earth. It is astonishing to see the many ways in which the Devil has deceived and ruined many, and to see with what mad zeal, undying energy, and untiring industry, man labors to uphold the very traps that are set to drag him down to hell. Then if we fear eternal misery and desire eternal happiness, it is important that we learn something of the manner in which he has deceived the human race.

Satan knows man better than he

knows himself. He knows that man will become assimilated to what he worships. He knows too that man has a capacious heart, and that it requires some grand object to fill it. Consequently it has ever been his plan, to find some earthly object to place between him and his Creator, and to persuade him that happiness consists in the possession of these things. This done man is corrupted, the fear and thought of God are crowded out of his mind, and he is ruined.

The fall in Eden, the history of the Antediluvians, and the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, are demonstrations of this.

The history of the Jews is full of demonstrations.

At the coming of Christ, the Gentiles were without God, and without hope in the world, and were corrupt and abominable in the sight of God. How did they become so? By substituting their idols for the true God and by conforming their lives to their idea of those corrupt gods, which were nothing more than creatures of their own corrupted imaginations. In a word, by following after their own feelings and the things of this world. All know that the devil strove for centuries to get Israel to adopt these idols, and reject God, and that they suffered much tribulation on account of it. After many sore punishments, they learned to despise dumb idols, and to be zealous for one God. Then it was that he succeeded in utterly corrupting and making them ripe for destruction. How? By causing them to fall desperately in love with riches, and worldly glory; and by persuading them to

put human philosophy, and the doctrines and commandments of men above the law of God; in a word, to reject the law of the Lord and legislate for themselves. With these things the devil filled their minds, and made them so blind, that they could not believe the most powerful demonstrations of truth. Then their doom was sealed.

The devil pursues the same course with enlightened nations now, that he did with the Jews, in the latter part of their dispensation. The time has come when they "will not endure sound doctrine," but have "heaped to themselves teachers," to suit their vitiated taste. These teachers instead of standing on the walls of Zion and "crying aloud and sparing not; instead of lifting up their voices like trumpets, and showing the people their transgressions," rebuke sin at a great distance, and "teach for doctrines, the commandments of men."

Instead of proclaiming the word of the Lord and teaching the people to read, fear and adore it, they feed on chaff and teach them to adore themselves.

They build a house and pretend to dedicate it to God, and then give it to vanity for a show-house and become themselves her most zealous devotees. Men are taught that they can follow the meek and lowly Jesus and at the same time be good servants of Cæsar; that they can worship mammon and profess Christianity. That they can join the wicked in drenching the world in blood and shrouding it in mourning, and at the same time belong to that peaceable kingdom whose subjects "beat their swords into plough-shares and spears into pruning-hooks."

With these things Satan is to-day deceiving the children of men. As an evidence that earthly objects, are the means he uses in ruining men; see what a great bid he made for Christ when he was tempted.

It is self-evident that a child will labor with all the power of body and mind it possesses, to obtain whatever it is taught to believe will make it happy, to the neglect of everything else however important.

Fathers and mothers, would you have your sons and daughters, to go more in high circles, and to associate with the grand and great of this life? We can tell you how to accomplish it. "Give your days, months and years to the acquisition of wealth; and your moments to God." Associate yourselves with the proud and mighty and pay them the highest respect, in the presence of your children. Though you know them to be ungodly, teach your children to "rise up and call them blessed." Though you know they have obtained their positions and wealth by fraud and unchristian conduct, praise them often before your children; and set them up as models, for their imitation.

Instruct them well, in the etiquette of fashionable society, and let them hide a black and bitter heart, under a polished exterior. If you will do this and do not succeed in causing your children to drink long and deep into the Spirit of the world; if they do not wrap themselves up thick in the vanities of this wicked generation, forget their Creator, and lose their souls, they will be strange children! It will not be your fault; for they will see you spending your time

for nothing else, and hear you speak but little of any thing else. They will suck the spirit of the world from their mother's breast, and be well schooled to it by a kind and loving father. "But remember, for this God will bring you into judgment;" and remember that it is said, "whosoever, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God," "and they that will be rich fall into temptations, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition." And that they are commanded to "love not the world nor the things of the world; and that Jesus says "you cannot worship God and mammon; and remember one thing more—"God cannot lie."

Would you have that promising son to climb the pinnacle of fame, and have his name sounded through the nations, as one of the great heroes of the time. Then place the biographies of the Alexanders Cæsars and the Bonapartes, in his hands and poets who sing their praise. Excite him to read them diligently, extol them to the sky yourself and be careful that you never preach to him "peace on earth, good will to men, but preach to him "victory to the brave and glory to the victor."

Do this and you will succeed in planting a mad passion in the breast of that gifted boy, that must be gratified and will be gratified, if he has to wade through rivers of blood, climb over mountains of dead, and do it at the expense of flaming cities, desolate Continents, widows' groans and orphans' tears.

But remember that Christ says except you "have his spirit you are

none of his," and that the children of light don't fight with carnal weapons or seek earthly glory.

Would you have your children enter in through the gates and walk the streets of the New Jerusalem, and to eat fruit from the tree of life—would you have them become sons and daughters of God and live forever? Would you have them possess inexhaustible riches, everlasting honors, imperishable crowns, and complete and never-ending happiness?"—Then teach them the precepts of Christ diligently. "Talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up." Begin with them young and teach them to imitate him in his humility, in his great love for man; in his willingness to suffer for the truth, and in his spirit of forgiveness, and be yourself a living example of what you teach—and you will succeed. Without pursuing this course, you have no good reason to hope, that you or your children will be saved.

POOR CALL.

December, 1873.

Correspondence.

Brethren L. & S.: Having in the providence of God, been placed in your midst, I feel, and desire to feel a lively interest in the welfare of the good cause, in which we have all embarked, and for the promotion of which we have pledged our all.

I was very much interested, in reading brother S.'s notice of brother Sweeney's letter, published in the *Apostolic Times*. Nor do I refer to

these communications, for the purpose of espousing or opposing any issue raised by these brethren, both of whom in my estimation, are true and faithful; but, rather, to make a few respectful suggestions, relative to matters in my adopted State, Tennessee. I would, however, by way of apology, if it be needed, for brother Sweeney's friendly stricture, just hint, that those strictures were made I presume, more from general impressions, which he had found respecting the position of the brethren in Tennessee, in regard to the spread of the gospel among us, than from anything that he actually observed or learned during his visit to our State.

There has been an impression upon the minds of many, that the good brethren, of these parts are rather impracticable; abstractionists; so fearful of doing something contrary to God's plan, that they have failed to do their whole duty;—so fearful of doing *wrong* that they would not really do *right*; and, that thereby their energies have, to a great degree been paralyzed,—and, I must confess, that from representations, or rather *misrepresentations*, I had, to some degree, been laboring under the same impressions in regard to these good brethren. But I am likewise happy to confess, that upon coming among them, and becoming better acquainted with them, I have had my mind relieved from these false and erroneous impressions. If I stand correctly posted in regard to the position of the Tennessee brethren, upon the subject of evangelizing, it is this: they feel the importance, as far as their means and opportunity will

allow them, of having the gospel proclaimed as extensively as they can and of acting in harmony with the spirit of the commission of Christ, 'go teach all nations,' 'go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.'" But they claim the right and they certainly have it; to do this work, according to their own convictions of God's will; that no man, or convention of men, has the right to dictate to them, or prescribe plans, by which they shall discharge their duties.

But while we may not be accomplishing as much as they are, in other States, where they are more numerous, more popular, more learned, more wealthy, more talented, more influential, have more of the elements of success, than in this; yet as brother Sewell very unpretendingly remarks; we, too, by the grace of God, are doing something.

Since November, some thirty odd have come forward at this point, Murfreesboro, and declared themselves in favor of the unadulterated word of God. Our Sunday School numbers about 80, still increasing, with a superintendent of the first order, and an excellent corps of teachers; a Bible Class, numbering near 50, composed, not only of disciples, but members of other churches, as well as from the world; an interesting prayer-meeting, the assemblies of the first day well attended, and increasing; the sisters having a working society (not *out of* but *in*, the church) with treasury of their own.

Besides these good works at home, we have an evangelist, brother Denton, in the full confidence of the brethren, peregrinating the surround-

ing country, and to the result of whose labors, under the blessing of the Lord, we look forward with joyful anticipations. We hope also, by the opening of Spring, to have our 'blind preacher,' brother Smithson, associated with brother Denton in the good work, and by another year, God willing, we desire to double their number again. I was pleased to see from the same communication, there was a like co-operative effort being made by Nashville, Clarksville, the surrounding Counties, and Southern Kentucky. That's right, brethren: God speed you, let the work go on, in the strength and might of the Lord. Let the churches everywhere do their duty, do it faithfully; contribute their means liberally every first day of the week. Select faithful, discreet, prudent, zealous evangelists; send them out, to sound forth the words of eternal life. Let it be a part of the duty of these evangelists to obtain subscribers for the GOSPEL ADVOCATE and the *Historian*; and let the brethren by pen and by tongue advocate the cause of primitive Christianity; let us meet together from the different Counties and districts; confer together, in regard to the first interests of the cause; co-operate together, according to God's plan, for the extension of his cause, nor give rest to ourselves, until all Middle Tennessee, shall be blazing with the light and burning with the heat of heaven's own divine, spiritual, celestial sun; Let our Brethren of East and West Tenn. catch the same Spirit and be enthused with the same zeal, and meeting upon the verdant banks of the pearly waters of the Tennessee on the West, and the base

of her noble Cumberland ridge on the East, and shaking hands across the mirrored bosom of the one, and on the rugged summit of the other, and in the name of the God of hosts, with a congratulatory peal, rending the very heavens themselves, we will wipe off this eternal stigma resting upon us; take front rank in the sisterhood of States, and convince our good, talented, eloquent brother Sweeney, and all others that neither Christ nor his cause is dead or dying in Tennessee.—And when they pay their visits among us, and make their reports concerning us, they shall be constrained to acknowledge, that we have, in deed and in truth, been with Christ, learned of him, imbibed his Spirit, and are walking in his steps.

Brethren, that this may be the result is the sincere prayer of your humble, stranger brother and co-laborer.

G. W. ABELL.

Murfreesboro, Jan. 21st, 1874.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: I in days past have written often and have sent you a good many subscribers, but of late years have done comparatively nothing in that way. And you doubtless have thought a little strange of my course. I sold out in Clayton County near Jonesboro, and moved to this County, have been here near fourteen months, and have not heard of a church of disciples in the County. After being here six months I heard of two sisters in Walker County about six miles off. I went to see them, and preached at their house through the Summer and part of the Fall months—with some success. I built a bush arbour and fixed slab

seats near my house, and invited my neighbors and fellow citizens, and they came out so that I had good hearings. Many of them had never heard any of our brethren preach. If I had a meeting house, I think I could raise up a church here. I had no idea of the mortification I would experience in being isolated away from my old fields of labor and my old brethren and friends with whom I have labored, mixed and mingled over forty years.

But so it is I am here, old and afflicted with rheumatism, and have to labor daily to support my family. Still I preach as I have opportunity, as I have through life. When sustained give my whole time and when not sustained I work and preach. I know that this course is not the popular one of this day. I have been a kind of pioneer and am now one they call an "old fogy."

I don't want to live out my last days without a church in my neighborhood for myself and family to worship. I would build a house if I was able.

I love my Masters cause, I love my brethren, and I am trying daily to live more and more in obedience to the commands of the Lord. May his blessings be with all his saints.

Yours affectionately

NATHAN W. SMITH.

Near Ringgold Ga. Jan. 7th 1874.

Having left Kentucky recently and being well acquainted with many of the readers of the ADVOCATE I will give a few items of my journey and of matters here. Stopping at Nashville nearly twenty-four hours I had the pleasure of meeting Bro. P. S.

Fall, who, though old and well-stricken in years, works almost constantly for his blessed Master. May he be spared many years to bless the church and the world, finally triumph over the last enemy and receive an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom on high. I was pleased also to see Bro. Fanning, though he is growing old yet he is still strong physically, mentally and spiritually, and wields a two-edged sword with double sharpness, keen. At night I heard bro. J. S. Sweeney preach one of his best sermons

Arriving here I found everything astir preparing for the opening of the fourth session of that successful and excellent school, Mars Hill Academy under the care of Bro. T. B. Lari more.

THE COURSE OF STUDY

Embraces a thorough Academic course.

I am glad to say there are about a dozen intelligent and excellent young men in the preachers' department (or as Bro. Lipscomb would call it, teachers' department) qualifying themselves for proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation, ere long their power will be felt throughout this portion of the country, and many a soul will be made happy in a Savior's love through their instrumentality.

W. Y. TAYLOR.

Near Florence, Ala. Jan. 15th 18 4.

Away up in Tennessee.

BY J. M. BARNES.

(Continued.)

I had seen and heard many things during my absence. My eyes refused sleep, though the night wore away.

There were many whom I had met, that did not obey the gospel. Some seemed almost persuaded to be Christians, yet not altogether. Christ abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances and took out of the way the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us and contrary to us, so that nothing stands in the way of man's salvation but his own stubborn refusal to submit to the will of heaven. Notwithstanding this and much more, men so far from hurrying to accept of the offered terms of mercy spend their time in making mountain obstacles out of their mole-hill excuses and so stand justified in their own judgment in their rebellious, do-nothing position. There are, however, some things not noticed by churches, which have magnitude, and the neglect of them brings reproach upon the cause of our Redeemer. 'Tis not a misfortune that the world expects something good and pure from the people of God and requires at their hand, lives distinguished from themselves, by holiness. Their censure is brought down upon the pretension of those professing to stand in high places. Said an outsider, as they are called, "Here's a man in full fellowship in the church. He borrowed money and another party stood his security, when the money came due, the principal had a good number of stock. Security was pressed for the money and was regarded the only one from whom it could be obtained, so he sent to the church-man who had contracted the debt, saying to him, if he would let the stock go he could make things easy until other arrangements

could be made to meet further demands. Come in the morning and I will give an answer, was the response; but ere the morning sun was beaming, the stock were in the market far away and security had to meet the storm as best he could, while this servant of righteousness could lie down and slumber without disturbance from creditors' clamor, or threats from the officers who sternly demand when it comes into their hands. I simply told complainer that I was no apologist for those who could and would not pay their debts. He asked me if I thought he could take hold of the hand of that man and kindred kinds, in the family of the Lord Jesus? I told him Christ called just such men as he—brave soldiers are needed in the government of the great Captain, those who will dare to do the right and exact of others to do it. The church of God should not be avoided because bad men creep in, but lovers of truth and holiness should hasten to deliver it from all manifest evil. What must be thought of one who professes to love a thing and sees it abused, and stands by without an effort at relief? Is he not a Pharisaic pretender or too cowardly to enter the contest and by a determined effort rescue a good thing from censure or injury? But when fault-finding, we should remember the sun has spots on it. At the same time I am satisfied that brethren fail to do their duty in looking after the purity of the church. Unbelief was charged against the Hebrew Christians and 'tis quite probable that this was the sin that so easily beset them, but debt may be justly brought against the Christians of our day and time and 'tis the ruin of church and country. Can I make it more emphatic by repeating, "Churches should see to it, that members pay if they can, and not add their own neglect of such serious matters as these to the grave disorder that proves a stumbling block in the way of those hunting for the purity that belongs properly to the people of God." They should go further. Debtors should be stirred up to an effort to meet their obligations. Another matter came into my mind. Inquiry was made at a place I visited, how many members held family worship. A. shook his head. B.'s poll followed in the same action. The noddle of C. caught the spirit of the occasion and so the shakes went the entire round. Well, said a brother, I think I can find *one* who does. One, said I, and was so anxious to see the jewel. Who is he? 'Tis brother Hasn't come. By and by I learned to my sorrow that even he had quit it about three months before. This one used to do it. That one did too, and so it went round with a sort of pious whine to it. I told them that some children were larger when born than ever after. They became dwindlers and finally ran down. Grow in grace and the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is the apostolic injunction. If we once did more good things than we now do, we are not growing, unless it be like a candle. We had better pass ourselves under examination every day and frequently have a general review, say every Lord's day. But think of it, in a church of one hundred and fifty members, all claiming a right to the tree

of life, and not one among the number whose children ever see them around the hearthstone on their knees before Jehovah's awful throne. Do not complain if your children are slow in coming into the family of which you are a member! Again, prayer just before going to bed does not harmonize with the fretting, scolding, boisterous, blustering crabbedness so common in some families about daylight, coming too from the male and female heads of the family. Watch therefore as well as pray. I wish all who read this would spend a little time reflecting upon this subject. How many churches are there that could not rake and scrape up a Lot who daily worships God in his house and there lets the light of a godly walk begin by illuminating home itself? The Tennesseans have good homes and should be a contented, happy people, especially those who have the one thing needful. The brethren whom I visited seemed to be such. Raising as they do, the necessaries of life, there is no occasion to go in debt but for the luxuries, and this they should not do. But I thought of what my Ma said when I started, "Go, my son, and tell me when you come back, if they do not wear too many humps, bumps and knots, I'll go with you next time." I must needs begin to sum up my report to make to her. I saw five preachers' wives and I thought their dresses adorned well themselves, their professions and their husbands. I think a jet cross, tipped with gold a very neat, simple, plain ornament for earrings and pins, but the propriety of wearing them always seemed to me of the doubtful gender. If

for nothing else, on account of weak Rome and those who lean Romeward in this generation. There are some and the number may be increasing. There may be some excuse, and is, for wearing a pin, since there is use in it, but none for the heathenish practice of boring holes in the ears and hanging jingling bobs thereto. If Christ required this, what a sacrifice it would be considered, but as it is an act of devotion to the goddess fashion, 'tis done without a murmur, and what is saddest of all Christian, parents are often parties in bringing their tender lambs up to this torture. The wooden, gutta percha, jet, glass, and gold crosses are Roman Catholic ornaments but the cross of Christ is the Christian's jewel to bear, not to wear. This is not a physical, material, man-made thing, but 'tis found in bearing all necessary things with meekness, patience, long-suffering, forbearance; in marching heavenward in the path Christ has left, for us to observe. The cross, Christ himself upon it, should be engraven, or rather daguerretyped upon our hearts and I doubt the propriety of having images of anything heavenly except those that are by faith fixed here. I made some pungent remarks about dress once, and I was very quickly told if I were to visit Kentucky, where our brethren are rich, I would be awe-stricken with the display there. I had only to say that Kentuckians had long since ceased to be my beautiful of true representatives of the simple religion of the Savior. After such an intimidating array of characters as this, I was glad indeed to see the old sisters in Tennessee dressed nice and genteel with no extrava-

gance and I felt much at home, but sorry to see some of the younger sisters would condescend to follow the mushroom, shoddy, snobby fashions of N. Y. I insist it is a letting down in dignity. I have often troubled my brain to ascertain whence came all this wild extravagance and outrageous bedecking so manifest since the war. Some man, thanks be to him, has settled the difficulty by letting the world know that it is a fungus growth upon diseased society. In a race between Aristocrat, Shoddy, and Snobby, the nags all get over-excited and run furiously into unknown regions of fashionable dress. Who could expect to see anything less than the absurd and ridiculous picture presented by fashionable women, when the three parties above had a hand in making it. I saw the picture of a bald-head Shoddy the other day. I would not be surprised much to see heads nude soon, 'tis but little more out of reason than present style. I have already found one that cut off her hair so as to stick on the false better. Things like camels have been quite common in the land; as the next change in the scenes I suggest that Shoddy stick on a pair of long ears and I think he will strike the level for himself and his followers, who stupidly do what he and his competitors, for notice, dictate. I thought myself out of Tennessee and lay down to sleep past the coal pits, mountains, iron-works, lime kilns, and so forth. As we neared Montgomery yellow-fever talk became more common. Every little station on the road thronged with the business men of the city, who having fled for the

night, dared face the tawny monster through the day. The grand old Capitol sat in her magnificent beauty on her lofty seat but sadness was upon the face of everything and every body. I thought of the great day of God's wrath, when men in terror shall call upon rocks and mountains to hide them from the face of the mighty one. How men fear death, how they flee his loathsome haunts! How little they care for the only city of refuge on earth. God offers an asylum but they heed not his overtures. Yet they fly in dismay at the approach of unerring death, they know not where. Death reigns in the valley. He is known on the mountain. He makes ravages by land and finds his victims on sea. Ask of the winged winds that round our pathways roar, if they know some happy spot on this sin-cursed earth, where death reigns no more and they answer no, no, no. But the Son of God comes from heaven and declares a ransom from the grave. Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will to men. He saves, saves from sin, from death, from the grave, from torment. We should keep up our race from death all through life, not stop when the prospect of an immediate dissolution is withdrawn. We know it is coming. There is but one way of escaping this enemy of man. 'Tis as fearful and awful and dreadful at the distance of fifty years as at two, or two minutes. Then flee to the mountains? Oh no, Death is there. Away to the valleys? Oh no; its breath reaches there. Haste to the isles of the ocean? Oh no. There too they die. Then oh! then what? Let us run with patience the

race that is set before us. Press on to the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us run for immortality. We can not run by, around or over death to gain the prize, win the crown or obtain eternal life. All must be gained by passing through the dark valley and the shadow of death. We cannot conceal ourselves from death, 'tis only in Christ who brought life and immortality to light, that we can hide. Our old deeds should be hidden and Christ be seen in all we do and say. Then when Christ who is our life shall appear, we shall appear with him in glory. Though death with its weapons of war lay us low and the grave overwhelm us in a prison house, we can thank God for the promised deliverance from all these and look for the victory through Jesus Christ, on the shores of eternal redemption. Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. Oh, how he chastens now these Southern people, with pestilence. Oh, how he scourges with want. Does this chastisement prove profitable to us, then we are the gainers.

For days and days the fever plucked from the citizens without respect to rank or condition. In some places the reaper played upon his scythe and numbers fell victims to the s.roke. All who could fled, the country people kept at home and the city was turned over to the ravages of the contagion. Here we are with hundreds of negroes without the necessaries of life. They have been free eight years and are now petitioning Congress for support. Here is the picture for philanthropy to look

at. I believe it is in the heart of the Southern people to assist them but *they* have become poor, too, trying to work the negro. "Home again, Home again." Five weeks have passed since I stood upon these grounds. I cannot tell how I felt, when I entered my own home with my own dear one in it. The little one had kept his impatient eyes awake to see papa. Wearied, I lay me down under my own roof to rest. I thanked the giver of all good and perfect gifts through Christ our Lord for taking care of me and mine during the past, and thought after the pilgrimage of life, how weary—then to rest in the everlasting home.

"Oh land of rest for thee I sigh,
When will the moment come,
When I shall lay my armor by,
And dwell in peace at home?"

DANCING CHRISTIANS.

We have been asked to write an article on dancing, which we now propose to do. Those who claim the right to dance, do so upon the principle that there is no harm, nothing wrong in dancing. We have never yet read, or heard of any one claiming it to be the Christian duty of any one to dance. But they say, there is no wrong in it—the Scriptures nowhere say you shall not dance; and simply upon this process of reasoning, they engage in it; that is, so far as they reason about it at all. Most of those who dance, do so because they want to, because they are fond of it, and they do not stop to think much about the right or wrong of it. We propose to show from the Scriptures that it is wrong, and that those who engage in it do wrong, in

more respects than one. In the first place: *It is a mere work or gratification of the flesh.* No one ever danced, for the sake of becoming more devoted to God, more humble, or more spiritually-minded. No one ever danced to make him love God more, nor to make him more deeply interested in the true prosperity of his cause. But going to parties, and balls, and dancing is always for the gratification of the fleshly desires. But Paul says, "They that are Christ's have crucified (the flesh, with the affections and lusts." Gal. 5: 24. In becoming Christians, we die to sin; we die to the flesh, and are made alive in Christ, to a new life; a life of holiness and virtue. Jesus himself said, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." So then; in the very commencement of our service to God, we are called upon to deny ourselves, to yield up our own wills, our own preferences, or feelings, or impulses and fleshly desires, and make the will of God, not our own desires, our entire guide in all we say and do. We cannot serve God, and the desires of the flesh at the same time. Paul says, "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the Sons of God." Rom. 8: 13-14. No one can claim for dancing, that it is not a work of the flesh. Neither can any one claim that it is following after the Spirit. Now since only those who walk after the Spirit are recognized as the children of God, those who follow dancing, which is a work of the flesh, show to that extent, that they are not the children of God, but that they are following the flesh, which leads to death. For they that live after the flesh shall die. Dancing then, in the frolicsome, fleshly way in which it is usually done, is wrong, and is dishonoring to the cause of God on earth. Again says Paul, "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5; 19-21. Now we ask our readers to examine this catalogue of the works of the flesh carefully. There are many ways of walking after the flesh, besides dancing. And it is important that we all guard against walking after the flesh in every respect. But as we are on the subject of dancing, we ask special attention to the word *revelling*. Webster defines 'Revelling,' as a "feasting with noisy merriment." This certainly is a pretty good definition of the fashionable dancing of modern times; and Paul declares that those guilty of revelling shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Certainly then a practice that deprives one of the privileges of the kingdom of heaven is wrong. And we may further say, that while public dancing is an injury to the cause of Christ, it is a much greater, deeper, and more serious injury to the one who engages in it. For he is in danger of losing his own soul. And a man had better lose the universe beside,

than to lose his own soul. But we also ask attention to the Greek, of this word revelling. It is the word *koomos*. This word is but about three times used in the New Testament; twice rendered revelling, and once rioting. Donegan defines the word thus: "a jovial assembly of friends, who meet at an entertainment, or to celebrate a festival with music, dancing, and singing hymns and odes" &c. No one can fail to see that the common public dancing of our country is fully embraced in this definition. They certainly constitute a jovial assembly of friends, and we know that music and dancing are the chief employments. But it may be asked, what about the singing of hymns, and odes, mentioned by Donegan in his definition? They refer not to sacred hymns, in any sense, but hymns of a sensual, fleshly character, that correspond with the character of their feasts of revelry. They would, in my judgment, embrace all those foolish, "Old Sister Phebe" songs that are sometimes sung in kissing-plays. Hence we regard all these public singing, kissing plays that young people get up, as embraced under the head revelling, and all dishonoring to God, and degrading to the Christian character. Such things in nowise comport with that requisition of Paul, which is, "That, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world." The two things are wholly unlike, and both characters cannot be worn by the same person at the same time. No one can both deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and cultivate them at the same time. Just as well think

of the same fountain sending forth both salt water and fresh at the same time, or of the same candle spreading both light and darkness at the same time, and in the same room. But there can be no mistake, both according to Donegan and Webster, the one defining the original Greek, and the other the English, of the word revelling, but that the common public dancing at balls and parties is embraced in, and is a good definition of that word *revelling*, in the passage in fifth of Galatians. And now[!] kind reader, think seriously of Paul's declaration, that such shall not inherit the kingdom of God. It is certainly a serious matter. One well worth your consideration. And remember Paul not only speaks specifically of the things he names, but after finishing his long dark catalogue of these works of the flesh, he then adds, "and such like." So that all practices that are in their character like these, must be avoided, or we cannot maintain a position in the house of God. So then we maintain that according to this passage in fifth of Galatians, dancing on the part of Christians is positively wrong. But we will present it in still another light before leaving this passage. Immediately following the catalogue of the works of the flesh, we are presented also with a list of the fruits of the Spirit, which are "Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, (fidelity), meekness, temperance; against such there is no law." Will any one contend that dancing is embraced in any one of the fruits of the Spirit? No one can so contend for one moment. So then if not among the fruits of the Spirit, dancing must fall

among the works of the flesh, and the word of the Lord requires that the works of the flesh must be crucified; must be denied. Therefore the word of the Lord requires that the Christian deny himself of the fleshly practice of dancing. Again Paul says, "abstain from all appearance of evil." Who will say that there is no appearance of evil in dancing? Can any child of God say so? Most certainly not. It is next to impossible for a young lady to engage in dancing and not be thrown in immediate contact, and sometimes into the arms of the drunken, the dissolute, and the profane; young men with whom they would not associate in the parlor at home, for the world. These are facts that cannot be denied. And will any one still say there is no appearance of evil in the gay and whirling dance? We again repeat no child of God, with the word of God before him, can say so. Then the language of inspiration is abstain from all such practices.

But we argue against dancing from another standpoint. Paul says, "Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them. Rom. 16, 17. Every one who will think for a moment, knows that dancing is an offense to the church of God, to the masses of Christians. And we have already shown that dancing is contrary to the doctrine, or teaching, which we have learned from the apostles. Therefore those that do these things contrary to the word of God, are to be marked by the church, and if they cannot be reformed, they must

be avoided. But again; Paul is still more definite if possible. "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor the Gentiles, nor to the church of God." and in persisting in it, violate this positive command of God. And only those who do his commandments have the promise of entering in through the gates into the eternal city. Then as the apostle says, "let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." Rom. 14. 19.

In Philippians we have a beautiful list of good things laid down as follows; "finally brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever are pure, whatsoever are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things." Phil. 4, 8. Dancing is not specially pure, and we may safely say, that whether you ask the church or the world, in general they will tell you that dancing is not of very good report. The world never has much confidence in the religion of dancing Christians (?) Though they may place the temptation before the Christians, they lose confidence in their Christian integrity the very moment they yield. If the world ever falls in love with the religion of the Savior, it will never be through the influence of these worldly, fleshly-minded professors of Christianity, who do like the world does, who conform their lives and habits to the world; nay verily. It will be by the lives of those who deny the flesh with its affections and lusts; who manifest in their lives the fruits of the Spirit; who show in their whole

course of life, something better, something purer, something nobler, something more elevating than anything they have among themselves. Something that will call away their minds from things that are low, and fleshly and grovelling, to things that are pure, true, lovely, honest and virtuous in all respects. Members who cannot be induced to refrain from dancing, have no proper supreme love for God and the Savior, and no proper regard for the church of God; for if they have, whenever they find that the practice is inconsistent with the word of God, contrary to our holy religion, and offensive to the church of God, they will refrain from that time forward, and forever. These are some of our reasons for regarding public, frolicsome dancing, as inconsistent with the word of God, and the Christian character we are required to form. But say some, it is better to be engaged in dancing than in the foolish talking, jesting, and falsifying so commonly engaged in when young people are together. This argument is based upon the principle that they must necessarily do the one or the other. This however is not the case. Christians are not allowed to indulge in either one. Christ says, that for every idle word that men speak, they shall give an account in the day of judgment, and the apostle coudemus jesting and foolish talking. So they by no means get rid of the difficulty by saying it is better than some othea wrong thing. Better avoid all wrongs as far as possible, and not try to justify one wrong by another. We may say that murder is worse than rob-

bery, but that does not prove robbery to be right? But let us turn the scale a moment. Does anybody think dancing is better for young Christians than to sing the songs of Zion when together, and thus teach and admonish one another in Psalms and hymns and Spiritual songs, and thus refine their hearts and purify their manners? and also to read and talk about the word of God, and the love of God and the prosperity of the cause of religion and truth? No one will say this. We believe that young peple ought to associate together and enjoy each others company, and be happy, and make each other happy. But young Christians ought to learn how to find enjoyment in accordance with the Lord's will—things that are elevating, purifying, improving, and honorable to themselves and honoring to the Lord. Religious parents should certainly take pains to impress the importance of these things upon their children. Christians must learn how to deny themselves of everything that is inconsistent with our holy religion if they would be found among the righteous at the last day. We must in this life, form a character suitable for heaven, if we would be prepared to enjoy its pure and holy society; and this we can only do by a life of self denial and devotion to God and the Savior.

E. G. S.

Queries on Church Organization.

Bros. L. & S.: I wish to ask a few plain, practical, common sense questions, and would like to have them answered in the same way.

1st. After a congregation has been

organized a sufficient length of time to develop the talents of the members, a day is appointed and due notice given to all the members to be present for the purpose of selecting Overseers, Elders, Bishops, or Officers (or whatever you may choose to call them) to take the oversight of the congregation. Is it not the duty of every member that can, to be present?

2nd. If some of the members stay away and refuse to come forward and take a part in the selection, giving as a reason that there is no one in the congregation with the qualification for an Elder; the others think they have got members qualified and go on and make the selections. Is this a sufficient reason on the part of those who refused to have anything to do with it to absent themselves from the Lord's day meeting and also refuse to have anything to do with their own congregation?

3rd. If they continue this course after having been admonished, what ought the congregation to do with them for their conduct?

All ought to attend at all times if they possibly can. Whenever the church asks a meeting all should come that can. To do otherwise is discourteous to the body of Christ. I think that if Christians will meet together and candidly investigate these matters, they can agree, can be of one mind. It is their duty to be present and show wherein the persons are not qualified for the work.

The whole principle and practice of men staying away from a place and then mouthing and murmuring about it is not only unmanly and unchristian,

but it is cowardly and dishonorable. Be present and object at the right time, like a man, or "forever after hold your peace," is the only manly course. I think elections better not be gone into without unanimity among the faithful disciples. Churches frequently do better without elections than with them, unless they are made upon the true principles.

No disciple ought to absent himself from his congregation on any account.

No church ought to act in a case of discipline in one admonition, administered in a formal legislative style. Instruction, exhortation, admonition, entreaty with prayer and fasting, ought to be faithfully administered in the disciplinary process. These all having been faithfully used in the true spirit of brotherly love, with a true desire of saving a soul—when he refuses to hear the church there is but one resort, Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.

D. L.

Church News.

Bro's L. & S: It has been several months since I have written anything for your excellent paper and think that it is my duty to let the brethren and sisters know where and what I am doing. I have been teaching in the public school here till 16th inst. when I closed to attend to a more honorable work, the spread of the Gospel. During the time I was teaching I preached on Saturday and Sundays. During the Fall and Winter in the few congregations around we have had twenty three additions; seventeen reclaimed, four by baptism,

and two by commendation. My object is to wield the sword of the Spirit in such a way as to slay the stubborn hearts, that they may become willing to bow their stiff necks to the yoke of Jesus.

Since I have been laboring as a "teacher in the school of Christ," I have been a burden to none, laboring with my own hands to supply my temporal wants, I preach the old Gospel in its simplicity, and shall continue to strive against "Spiritual wickedness in high places."

I am earnestly working in the cause of temperance, well knowing the only safety of the church and the nation is prohibition. I wish that the brethren every where would remember that no drunkard can inherit the kingdom of God. Many of our congregations have been entirely ruined by king Alcohol, the arch enemy and destroyer of the human race.

Christians, let us remember that we must be clean in our bodies, that they should be presented to the Lord a living, holy, and acceptable sacrifice. Now, as Paul says in Rom. xii. ch. let us so act as to have respect for ourselves, "be temperate in all things," especially for our desires. Intemperance brings on old age, a scene of beggary, disease and shame. Be temperate therefore in all things." Let brotherly love continue—"Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

If we act thus, our adhesiveness will be strengthened by our work into deeper love.

I love to be at work in the good field which is as wide as the world.

In conclusion I must say that with the aid of the brotherhood I expect to preach, giving my whole attention to the work. I am poor in this world's goods, but rich in the Lord, who gives to his people liberally. I have not time to write more at present but you will hear from me again if success crowns my efforts. I still intend to do all I can for the Advocate. Yours in hope of immortality,

A. SPARKS.

Wadesburg Cass Co. Mo. Jan. 28, 1873.

TALENT AND FORCE.

LORD DERBY, in a recent address to the students of Liverpool College, touched upon a topic which our modern methods of culture are apt to leave out of sight. "Talent, he said is but the edge of the knife, which makes it penetrate easily, but whether it penetrates easily depends upon the force applied to it. If I were to tell you that in my belief that particular quality intellectual quickness and sharpness is by no means the first qualification for a successful career, many people would consider, in these days of competitive examination, that I was willfully indulging in paradox. But I believe it is the truth.

If Lord Derby is right, the popular estimate of intellectual ability is wrong for the popular estimate always awards the pre-eminence to cleverness. It is, however, a fact that, to-day, the plodding nations rule the world. As between the races of Northern and Southern Europe, the latter are the quicker, but the former are dominant. The Germans whom it was the custom in the 18th century to

ridicule as a phlegmatic and barbarous people, have come to the front of modern civilization. As between the American and the Englishman, the American is the quicker, but the Englishman, it is claimed, and we think truly, has the greater capacity for sustained intellectual exertion. Whether this is owing to climate or a tougher muscular fibre we do not pretend to determine. In the ancient world, the deliberate, resolved Roman swept down the acute, versatile Greek. The battle for ascendancy was not won by the swift, but by the enduring people. Nothing stands out with more prominence in the history of the old world than the slowness of Rome's growth. It was true enough that Rome was not built in a day.

Lord Derby's distinction between talent and force is intended as an encouragement to men whose powers unfold slowly. Nature appears to have no fixed law for the development of the human faculties; her great minds belong to both classes. Cromwell and Cæsar were civilians till middle life; Cowper and Milton wrote their best poetry after they had passed their meridian; Franklin knew nothing of science till after he had retired from business; Morse devoted years to art before he became an inventor. These men acquired new faculties and did the work that most distinguishes them in their later years. The explanation would seem to be that they had the quality of force, which keeps the intellectual machinery constantly at work. Underneath whatever talent they possessed was that without which all talent is valueless—persistence, and persistence

is but another name for an infinite patience.

It may be a question whether our systems of education have not tended to develop superficial talent rather than real ability, which is talent with force behind it. Perhaps the difficulty is chiefly in the impatience of our young men, who wish as quickly as possible to be done with the processes of preparation for life. We are changing for the better but slowly. The ready speaker who is ready because he is superficial, is still preferred to the man who really knows. The one conspicuous fact in our civil life is the very small ability of the men who control affairs. What crude theories of finance are expounded in Congress. What clumsy methods of taxation we practice. What flimsy ideas are prevalent with regard to currency. How little clear, dry light there is where light is most wanted. It all comes of our failing of mistaking alertness for strength, of the contentment of the men who are ready with their readiness as though it were the all in all.

"Genius," quotes Lord Derby, "consists in an enormous capacity for taking trouble," or, as we may vary the expression, Genius is a divine patience. It is very much like the highest faith, which trusts in Providence and then works with as much energy as if there were no Providence. He who can add a steady force to whatever talent God has given him will come to the front in this world. Fortune may be forbidding, but he will wrest success from fortune. The young man had already found out life's secret who replied to a disparaging remark, "But I can plod."—*Methodist.*

May a Christian Live With an Adulterer?

Brethren L. & S: A Married Sister is found guilty of adultery, the church withdraws from her,—the husband a member in good standing in the church, is in possession of all the evidence, but says he does not believe her guilty, notwithstanding the proof is pointed. Now the question arises, can we retain him so long as he continues to live with her? Reference to the 6th chap. 1st Cor. and specially to 15th 16th and 17th verses.

Fraternally

R. G. GLOVER.

Coopertown Tenn.

The passage reads, "Know ye not your bodies are members of Christ? how shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid. What, know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot, is one body? for two (saith he) shall be one flesh. But he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit. Flee fornication: every sin that a man doeth is without the body: but he that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit. * * What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's."

The argument of the apostle seems to be—the marriage with the harlot or fornicator makes the body one with the wicked one. But the union with Christ makes the spirit one

with Christ. To do both these at once, is to place the spirit of Christ in the body of a fornicator. This we have no right to do. We are not our own, we are to "glorify God both with our spirits and with our bodies which are God's." It seems to me clear, from this, that the Christian is not at liberty to continue the marriage relation with a fornicator. We raised this question some years ago. We had never seen or heard it raised. We received no response to our query. While it seems to us to be the teaching of the Scripture, it has never been the practice of the church or any church known to me to require a separation, when the individuals were content to dwell together. We doubt the correctness of the custom. There is much more in our personal contact with sin than we are accustomed to see—that influences us. God was very careful in the Jewish age, and among the Jews to guard against fleshly uncleanness and contact with impure persons. We do not see why we should be less guarded now, inasmuch as the fleshly uncleanness was intended to promote spiritual holiness. But if the man should be required to leave an unfaithful woman, the woman should be required to leave the unfaithful man.

The same principle holds good in both cases.

D. L.

QUERIES.

Bro. Lipscomb: was the second epistle of John addressed to an individual, or did he use the word elect lady as a figure of speech meaning the church? Second, in the 10th

verse does he mean our private house or the house of God? Please answer the above questions and oblige your brother in the hope of eternal life.

THOMAS BERNARD.

Ovillia Ellis Co. Tex., Dec. 8th, 1873.

If he used a figure of speech meaning the church, the church had an elect sister which was of course another church and that sister had children. I know of no instance of the church as one body being addressed and thus prefigured. I suppose it was her own private house. I know of no reason or rule for interpreting it otherwise. The common, plain, literal meaning must be accepted unless some clear reason is obvious, why it should not be, in a well established rule of language.

D. L.

In withdrawing from a member should the will of the majority be the rule of action? If not how must it be done? I know Christians are commanded to be one and have no divisions; but if such men as Paul and Barnabas—inspired men—had such a contention, “that they departed asunder one from the other” and each pursued that course that seemed right in his own eyes, how can you expect men in these degenerate days to be one?

Yours in the one hope

THOS. WHITE.

Fountain Creek Mau y Co. Tenn

Paul and Barnabas did not differ in reference to any rule or law of Christ or the Holy Spirit, but simply as to the fitness of Mark to be taken

to a certain work. We do not believe there ought to be majorities and minorities in the discipline of a congregation. The facts ought to be made out so clearly that every honest or candid man can see. The law as applicable to the facts ought to be cited, and there should be no division. There need be none. The man or woman, whose selfish feelings is so strong that he or she will not see a wrong in self or friends is not fit for the church of God. The individual who lets his family or fleshly feelings object to see the law applied to the dearest friend in life, is not a properly taught Christian. An individual that refuses to see his own wrongs is not fit for Christ. He is an enemy to his child, his brother, his sister, his mother, his father, who objects to applying the law of Christ to that dear one's life. Such individuals need to be taught and trained, or if they cannot be thus tutored, they ought to be withdrawn from. No will, prejudice partiality can rise above love for Christ. To object to apply the law of Christ to an individual, is to object to save him from his sins,—is to encourage him to go down to hell. It is cruel treatment. We know of churches that in all acts of discipline seek unanimity. They are harmonious and prosperous. No others can be. The law of Christ should be the rule of action. To it all should bow.

D. L.

The Christian Name.

Good men, who are deeply interested on the subject of christian unity, are beginning to question the

propriety of all sectarian names. Are they Scriptural? Were the Christians of the apostolic church called Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists? On the other hand, is not the thing itself expressly condemned? Does not the apostle Paul say, "For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" 1 Cor. iii. 4. And is there any difference in principle between using the condemned names, "Paulites," "Peterites," "Apollosites," and the more modern ones of "Calvinists," "Lutherans," or "Baptists," "Methodists," etc.? There is no difference; if the one is condemned, so is the other.—*Church Union.*

The Fireside.

We have failed to receive anything from brother Barnes for the Fireside for this number, and consequently put it to press without any, as we were expecting something from him, and waited till too late to furnish it ourselves. The cause may be tardiness in the mails.

DRUDGERY AND WORK.

The word is a good one, although the sound of it seems to frighten many people; and, more than that, it stands for something which must be done. Unfortunately, however, mankind have never been so free from guilt as not to be able to avail themselves of methods of avoiding it, slighting this, and shirking that and thus flattering themselves that they are doing a good thing. Thus it comes to pass that so much which has

been supposed to be work has turned out to be a mere apology for it. Illustrations of the fact are numerous enough, not only in trade, but in literature and art. The principle which lies at the bottom of it is the same, we suppose, as that which prompts the desire for increased gain by means of lotteries, or other methods where it is sought to obtain wealth by offering no equivalent value in return. Sooner or later we must come back to the belief that in this world nothing is profitably acquired except through an equivalent, whether in money or otherwise. If example be cited where men have honorably made large fortunes from the smallest beginnings, we reply, that in this the only exception to the rule that the equivalent was purpose put forth in work instead of in money.

Some there are who manage to keep at work constantly, and yet are the farthest possible from accomplishing anything.—It is not of such aimless and fruitless work that we intend to speak, but of work which produces results. Of such work the Bishop of Exeter remarks that "nine tenths must be drudgery," and Mr. Hamerton, in one of the letters of his recent volume, shows most emphatically the absurdity of supposing that this is not true in literary as well as in other pursuits. After making due allowances for the fact that one can do best that for which he has a natural bent, and that any work comes easier to one who has a liking for it, we think that every thoughtful person will be disposed to concur in the opinion we have just quoted. No matter how attractive and how congenial may be the em-

ployment engaged in, there will come times when either from the state of ones health, or depression of spirits, the work is a burden, and it is just there that the true "laborer" will feel that his responsibility lies. Any one can work when he takes a fancy to it, but to persevere against indisposition and listlessness, there is to do work with worthy results.

This is where the "drudgery" comes in: but after all, what is drudgery more than a formidable name? If one is determined to labor he will meet with some work that is hard, that is inevitable; but if his heart is in the work, it will not bear heavily on his elastic spirit. With a feeling that we are put here in the world to accomplish this work, and that our happiness lies in performing it, the depressing effect of the drudgery will be very slight. The world is indebted to Miss Alcott for showing in her charming volume, so full of healthy lessons, how much enjoyment may be got from hard, earnest work, and how near that comes to being the normal state of mankind.—*Exchange.*

POWER OF SIMPLE PREACHING.

Bishop Thompson relates that soon after he united with the church in Wooster, an exhorter of deep religious experience came into town every alternate Sabbath "to hold meeting." A lawyer of prominence happened to attend church one day, when the exhorter from the country officiated. He was deeply moved by his knowledge of divine things, his religious fervor, and his artless, un-studied eloquence. Of his interest

in the exhorter he said nothing, lest he might betray his own feeling on the subject of religion. And in order to escape detection, he resolved to attend church every Sabbath. In this way he hoped to secure the benefit of all the imploring appeals of his rural favorite. The knowing ones of the church observing his constant and respectful attendance with them in their religious services, and knowing the exhorter's marked deficiencies in learning, concluded to secure the services of another brother, who had been favored with a better education, and wielded a great general influence in the community. Our lawyer stood the change as long as he could, and then said to some of the leading members "Where is that man that used to come from the country to hold meeting here?" They frankly confessed to him that they had made the change in the simple hope of getting some one to occupy the place who would be more acceptable to him personally. "Why," said the lawyer, "I do not go to church to learn science, or for a knowledge of letters. I go there to study religion, and the man from the country has more religion than any of you, and he can teach me more of that which I especially wish to know than any one you have had here."—*Western Advocate.*

Anno Domini.

It was a noble thought, nay, it seemed like an inspiration, of an humble Roman abbot, of Scythian birth, who, in the middle of the sixth century, changed the mode of reckoning the confused chronology of the

world by dating all history backward and forward from the birth of Christ. The idea of "the little monk" Dyonsius Exiguus—so called either from his small stature or from his humility—was speedily adopted by the scholars, divines, and authorities of Christendom, and in less than a century was almost universally adopted. Thus the old method of marking time by Jewish, Greek, and Roman reckoning passed away. Hence the Christian era is known among chronologists as the Dionysian era. The error of the learned monk was in placing the birth of our Lord four years too late. But his grand conception not only relieved chronology of many perplexing entanglements of cycles, periods, eras, each having its own center, but it gave a tangible form to the truth that Jesus Christ is Himself the turning point of this world's destinies. It indicates that Christianity had already become the ruling religion of Europe, and that Christ was so exalted among the nations that there was none to dispute His dominion over all time and history. The adoption of that new era shows that then His name was above every name and that it was written deeper than the most enduring monumental inscriptions upon brass or marble, in records of every rolling year.

We have become so accustomed to the phrase, "the year of our Lord," that it scarcely awakens a question as to its origin, date, and meaning. Only the worst atheism the world has ever known has once tried to abolish it. But it would not stay abolished even in revolutionary France. It soon

came back with resistless power. And so long as this fact remains, it will tell the world that the government has been laid upon the shoulder of the Child of Bethlehem. There seems to be a providential propriety in the near connection of Christmas with the end of the old year. The Advent binds the years together in their indissoluble relations to Him who is the central personage of all human history, and who, as the Lord of all centuries, and controls their course. To use the eloquent words of Jean Paul Richter: "He who was the holiest among the mighty, and the mightiest among the holy, has lifted with His pierced hand empires off their hinges, has turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the ages."—*Christian Intelligencer*.

MORAL CULTURE.

The very etymology of the word education, which every school-boy knows, indicates that the human soul is a living power, capable of progressive growth. The man is in the infant as the oak is in the acorn. Both require cultivation under favorable circumstances in order to proper development. The tree will be strong and healthy or otherwise just as it happens to be placed in a rich or barren soil. The child from the first dawning of life, subjected to wholesome, healthful influences, adapted to enoble and refine, becomes the true man. If, however, he be exposed to unfavorable influences, he will fail to secure the mental and moral stature of the educated man. He may secure an abundance of food and drink, may wear costly clothing,

dwell in an expensive mansion, ride out in a glittering equipage, and dazzle the eyes of the passing throng; but he is not yet educated; so far as the great purposes of life are concerned, he is as useless as the stunted desert shrub.

It is not mere intellectual development that education accomplishes. That is essentially defective as a system of culture which leaves out of view man's moral nature. Man has a heart as well as a head—a conscience as well as an intellect. In order to fulfill his high destiny he must be virtuous as well as wise. He must be charitable, kind, honest, and humane, as well as possess ability to reason, imagine, classify and remember. The result is not the gaining of money. True, it socially elevates, and its subject is raised above want. But education is necessary to the fulfillment of the aim of our Creator in our existence.—*Home and School.*

The Religion Needed.

"We want a religion that bears heavily, not only on "exceeding sinfulness of sins," but on the exceeding rascality of lying and stealing—a religion that banishes small measures from the counter, small baskets from stalls, pebbles from the cotton bags, clay from paper, sand from the sugar, chicory from coffee, alum from bread and water from the milk can. The religion that is to save the world will not put all the big strawberries at the top, and all the little ones at the bottom. It will not make half a pair of shoes of good leather, and the other half of poor leather; so that the first shall redound to the

maker's credit and the second to his cash. It will not put Jouvin's stamp on Jenkins' kid gloves, nor make Parisian bonnets in the back room of a Baltimore milliner's shop, nor let a piece of velvet that professes to measure twenty yards come to an end in the sixteenth, nor a spool of sewing silk that vouches for twenty-five yards, be nipped in the bud at twenty nor all wool delaines and all linnen handkerchiefs be amalgamated with clandestine cotton, nor coats made of old rags pressed together, be sold to the unsuspecting public for broad-cloth. It does not put bricks at five dollars per thousand into chimneys it contracts to build of seven dollar material, nor smuggle white pine into floors that have paid for hard pine, nor leave yawning cracks in closets where boards ought to join, nor daub the ceilings that ought to be smoothly plastered, nor make window blinds with slats that cannot stand the wind, and paint that cannot stand the sun, and fastening that may be looked at but not touched. The religion that is going to sanctify the world, pays its debts. It does not consider that sixty cents returned for one hundred cents given is according to the gospel though it may be according to law. It looks on men who have failed in business, and continue to live in luxury, as thieves—*Ex.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Why so few are saved. No. 1.....	145
Correspondence.....	148
Away up in Tennessee.....	151
Dancing Christians.....	155
Queries on Church Organization.....	159
Church News.....	160
Talent and Force.....	161
May a Christian live with an Adulterer?..	163
Queries.....	163
The Christian Name.....	164
The Fireside.....	165
Drudgery and Work.....	166
Power of Simple Preaching.....	166
Anno Domini.....	166
Moral Culture.....	167
The Religion Needed.....	168

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 8.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, FEB. 19, 1874.

ACTION OF BAPTISM.

After the resurrection of our Savior he said to his apostles, "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts i: 5. I believe it is generally admitted that this promise was fulfilled at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost and this opinion seems to be confirmed by Peter's allusion to the matter as given in Acts xi, Peter in rehearsing the occurrences at the house of Cornelius, says, "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Now let us see how this baptism of the Holy Ghost was performed. We are told, "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire and it sat upon each of them." Acts xi: 3. And when the multitude came together to witness the manifestations that followed, and some of the people were disposed to scoff at them and attribute the manifestations to the

drunkenness of the apostles, Peter assured them that they were not drunk, and continued, "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Acts xi: 11-16 and part of 17. We have thus mentioned two instances, viz, on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius in which the baptism of the Holy Ghost seems to have been performed by pouring, for Peter by applying the prophecy of Joel to the occurrence on the day of Pentecost shows that the Spirit was poured out upon them then, and he tells us that the Holy Ghost fell upon Cornelius and his household like as it did upon the apostles at the beginning. Now the word used by the Savior in promising that the apostles should be baptized with the Holy Ghost is baptidzo, and Peter uses the same word baptidzo in referring to the fulfillment of the promise and this seems to me to demonstrate that baptidzo is sometimes used in the New Testament to express the idea of pouring, and if this be the case we ought to accept it as one of its Bible

meanings no matter what may be its primitive and classic meanings. Again we read, "Then came to Jesus Scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the traditions of the elders? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread." Matt. xv: 1-3. Then again, "And as he spake a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him; and he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner." Luke xi: 38-39. Now it appears very plain to me, that both the passages here quoted refer to the custom among the Jews of washing their hands before eating. In the passage from Matthew, the word translated wash is *nipto*, while in that from Luke, the word translated wash is *baptidzo*, and if the passages both refer to the custom of washing hands, does it not demonstrate that the word *baptidzo* is sometimes used in the New Testament to express the idea of washing? Or, was the custom of immersing before dinner so prevalent among the Jews, that the Pharisee should be astonished when the Savior failed to observe it?

If I have given the wrong interpretation to the passages quoted, you can doubtless point out the error.

A. E. McLAUGHLIN.

Rosedale, Tenn., Feb. 6, 1874.

The above is a fair specimen of the arguments usually made in behalf of sprinkling and pouring for baptism. Mr. McLaughlin, like all other advocates of affusion, has undertaken to settle the primary or literal meaning of the word *baptidzo*, by the second-

ry or figurative meaning, and use of that word. While the true, and acknowledged method is first to settle the primary or literal meaning, and then by means of the literal meaning, we can always with certainty settle the secondary or figurative meaning. The word *baptidzo* is used to represent the giving of the Spirit to the apostles, but it is figurative when used thus, and not literal. John the immerser was attending to baptism in its literal sense, when he promised the baptism of the Holy Spirit. "I indeed baptize you with (in) water, but he shall baptize you with (in) the Holy Spirit." Mat. iii. We prefer the word *in*, to *with*, because it better expresses the meaning of the original in such relationship. Now all must admit that in the baptism which John did, the word is used in its literal or primary sense. If therefore we can learn what John did literally, we may from that, learn something of the figurative meaning and use of that term, when applied to the Holy Spirit. Now what did John do with or to the people when he baptized them? The first declaration regarding it is, "Then Jerusalem and all Judea, and the region round Jordan went out unto him, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Mat. iii. And Mark says, "in the river of Jordan." From these plain statements it is clear that these people were baptized *in* water, as John himself declares. Now common sense will have to look for something besides sprinkling or pouring to fill the meaning of the word baptize, in this passage, for everybody knows there would be no necessity of being *in the water*, in order to have a few drops sprinkled on them.

But to be immersed, they must be in the water. So the literal facts agree with, and require immersion. In order to immersion, people must be where there is water, and must actually be in the water when immersed. In the case of John's baptism, the people went out to John to the Jordan, and when baptized were in the river of Jordan, and Jesus is spoken of as coming up "out of the water," when he was baptized. The next question is, does the literal meaning of the word baptizo require such procedure? Every Greek Lexicon in the land, gives dip, plunge, or immerse, as the literal or primary meaning of *baptizo*. Not one single authoritative Greek lexicon can be found, that gives sprinkle or pour as the primary meaning of this word, and the facts pertaining to the literal performance of baptism by John all agree exactly together. The word itself literally requires dipping or immersing. The facts are that they went out to the water, were baptized *in* the water, *in* the river, and when the baptizing was done, they came up *out of the water*. The literal requirements of a word, and the facts connected with its performance, could not possibly be more harmonious. But there is not one single thing, either in the literal requirement of the word itself, or in the facts connected with its performance, that in any way resembles sprinkling or pouring. For in these actions, there is no need of going to the river, no need of being in the river, nor of coming up out of it. Having thus ascertained the literal meaning of the word, we are now ready to inquire into its secondary or figurative mean-

ing The figurative meaning of a word, must always carry with it the leading features of the literal. The literal meaning is immersion, overwhelming, or a complete submersion. The figurative must be in its leading features like it; must be a complete overwhelming of some sort. So then this baptism of the Holy Spirit must be some sort of an overwhelming. And such is really the case with the apostles on the day of Pentecost. The room was filled where they were sitting; cloven or separated tongues sat upon them, they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. So the effect of the Holy Spirit upon these apostles was perfectly overwhelming. As the whole body is put under the water in the case of literal baptism, till the whole person is involved in the immersion, so it was in the figurative baptism of the Holy Spirit. The whole being of the apostles was involved in it. Their whole personality was impressed by it, until they could readily speak in languages they had never learned before. And indeed this is a power and an influence that sprinkling or pouring could never represent. What sort of representation would a few drops of water sprinkled on a man be of such a wonderful overwhelming and impartation of power as that which came upon the apostles on Pentecost, or upon Cornelius and his household? Just none at all. The wisdom of God never indulged in such weak and meaningless figures as that would be. But says Mr. McLaughlin, the Holy Spirit was *poured out* on this occasion, and therefore water baptism may

be performed by sprinkling or pouring. Does the act of pouring out the Holy Spirit represent the baptism? not at all; for the apostles were to be the subjects of the baptism; "He shall baptize you," &c. But the Spirit itself was the subject, or thing poured; or, in other words, the apostles were themselves the objects of the action expressed by the word baptizo. He does not say, "He shall baptize the Spirit upon you," but, "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit." But the word *Spirit*, is the object of the word *pour*. "I will pour out of my Spirit." So then, if the pouring was the baptism, then the Spirit, and not the apostles, was baptized, for it *was* poured, while they were not. But the pouring does not constitute the baptism. The pouring took place in heaven, where God and the Savior were. The baptism took place on earth, where the apostles were. The pouring took place at one time and place, and the baptism at another. The baptism of the Holy Spirit was the wonderful overwhelming of these apostles in the miraculous powers of the Spirit, the result of which was speaking with tongues, performing miracles, etc. Now to confound the pouring out of the Spirit which took place in heaven, with the baptism of the apostles in it, which took place on earth, is confusion beyond measure. We must learn to distinguish between things that differ. But again; if we take this case as being an exposition, of the action or manner of baptism, then we must of course imitate it as near as possible. The facts in this case are that the apostles were in a house. The Spirit was poured out till the

house was filled with its miraculous presence and power till they were completely overwhelmed in it. So then, to imitate this example, we should have the person to be baptized in some sort of large vessel, and then pour water into this vessel from above it, till it is full so that the person is completely overwhelmed by it. Then you would have something about as near like what occurred on the day of Pentecost as one thing could be like another. But the common practice of sprinkling, relied upon for baptism, does not in any sense resemble what occurred on the day of Pentecost. Why claim this then as an illustration of the action of baptism, and yet never follow or imitate it in any sense in the world: better drop the claim or imitate the example.

But when we take this Spiritual baptism as a figurative use of the word and compare it with the literal, which is to put the whole person under water, and understand that as the whole body is literally overwhelmed in water, so the whole personality, the whole being of the apostles was overwhelmed in the Holy Spirit then all becomes very plain, and easily understood. With this view of the subject, we get something tangible, something plain, that any one can understand, and that perfectly fits all around in every respect. So sprinkling and pouring get, no comfort whatever from this case of Spiritual baptism, when we explain this, the figurative use of the word by the literal, which is immersion. No man will dare to say that either sprinkling or pouring is the literal meaning of baptizo; Dr. McLaughlin will not say so. All

are compelled however to acknowledge that immersion is. But he also finds one or two cases in the New Testament where the word is rendered *wash*, and thinks that as *nipto* is also rendered *wash*, where only the hands are spoken of, that therefore baptizo sometimes means only to wash. Suppose it does, then what? does that prove sprinkling? How do people generally wash their hands? Is it by sprinkling a few drops of water upon them? No one washes hands that way, and no one can wash hands, or anything else, in the way sprinkling and pouring are done for baptism, for they do not use water enough to wash one little finger. People wash hands by dipping them into the water and rubbing them till clean. And if you will do the whole body that way when you go to baptize people, dip them into the water like you do your hands when you go to wash them, all right. But say you, washing is sometimes done by pouring water upon them. Grant it; still the pouring is one thing, and the washing, is another. The pouring is not the washing. You sometimes have some one to pour the water while you wash your hands. In such case he does the pouring while you do the washing. The two are not one and the same thing. And besides, in such cases, you have water poured on copiously, so as to thoroughly saturate them. You never stop with just a few drops as *Pe-* does when they sprinkle or pour for baptism. If you will just pour the water all over the candidate till you thoroughly saturate him, like you do your hands when you wash them,

then you may with some propriety claim that illustration. But, then, who would not rather be plunged all over and under at once, and be done with it, than to have it *poured all over them* till they are as thoroughly wet and saturated as the hands are when you wash them, or as they would be when they come out from immersion? The practice of pouring would not last long if it were done that way. The people would drop it. So there is nothing gained in this case by taking the figurative use of the word, instead of the literal. But simply explain the figurative use of the word baptizo by the literal and all becomes plain. The literal meaning is dip, immerse. So when applied to the hands, to the whole body, or to garments, it must carry the same primitive or literal idea, which is really the case in the passages before us. So the word *wash* does not help one particle to get rid of the idea of immersion. Can clothes or beds, or pots, or any kind of vessels be washed simply by sprinkling a few drops of water upon them? Every one knows they cannot. Then why resort to the washing of these things by which to sustain sprinkling, when there is no more resemblance between the two than between noonday light and midnight darkness? Where *nipto* is used, it always has reference to some part of the body, as the hands, or feet. It is the word used where Christ is said to have washed the feet of the disciples. But baptizo is never used where either hands or feet are specified. It may have reference to the hands in the passage in Luke referred to above, but no hands are mentioned there.

But be it hands or feet, or the whole body, the word baptizo always indicates a thorough saturation or immersion of the thing spoken of. And washing is always done that way. What sort of washing would you regard it, if you were to employ a woman to wash the clothes for your family, and she were to take them and only sprinkle a few drops of water upon them? Would you regard the meaning of the word *wash* as fulfilled in that case, and would you pay her as per contract for washing? In washing clothes, and such like, they are plunged, dipped, and soaked. I cannot see for the life of me why people are so anxious to interpret baptizo by the word *wash*. True, it may not always refer to the whole body, but it means about as much as immersion does in the part referred to. But baptizo is never used where the hands or feet are mentioned. And the word *nipto* is never used to indicate the ordinance of baptism in any sense. The word *louo* means to wash, but differs from *nipto* in this; while *nipto* refers to the hands or feet or some particular part of the body, *louo* refers to the whole body, and signifies the washing or bathing the whole body, and this word *louo* is used to signify baptism, as in Hebrews 10, 22.

This is somewhat significant that *nipto*, which signifies the washing of some part of the body only, is never used to refer to baptism, while *louo*, which refers to the washing or bathing of the whole body, is so used. That certainly points strongly to immersion. But while on the figurative uses of baptism, we will notice one more. Christ refers to his sufferings

under the figure of baptism. Mat. 20, 22-23. He says, I have a baptism to be baptized with. Now could the sprinkling of a few drops of water upon one be a fit representation of such a scene of suffering as that of Christ upon the cross? We know it could not. The whole body, the whole being of the Savior was involved in this suffering until he cried out, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" He was thoroughly, completely overwhelmed in these terrible agonies of the cross, till life was entirely exhausted, and he was dead. Now can we believe that the Son of God would have attempted to illustrate such overpowering agonies by a word that merely means to sprinkle a few drops of water that do not touch or in any way affect one thousandth part of the body? Is it possible that he was so unskilled in the use of language as to make an illustration so weak, so meaningless? We cannot so believe. But just remember that he was talking to his disciples who had themselves been baptized, immersed, and that had witnessed the baptism of many; had seen them put under the water, had seen them completely overwhelmed in it. Then let Jesus say to them, referring to his death, I have a baptism to be baptized with, and then you have something with meaning and force in it. Stand upon the bank of a stream, and see some one immersed, overwhelmed in the water, and then stand by the cross and see Jesus suffer all the agonies of that terrible death, till he is completely overwhelmed in them, till he finally breathes his last, saying, "It is finished, and then you can see some fit-

ness in the figure. Indeed all the figurative allusions to baptism are of this character. Paul, in Col. 2, 12, says, "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." Here it is positively shown that in baptism there is a burial, and resurrection. Now is there any burial, or resurrection in sprinkling or pouring a few drops of water? All know there is not. But when you immerse a man, you bury him in a watery grave, and raised him up again; and so again, the figure is complete. So then, we insist upon it, that we must ascertain the literal, primitive meaning of baptizo, and then interpret the figurative uses of the word by the literal and not undertake to give the literal meaning by the figurative.

E. G. S.

Why so Few are Saved. No. 2.

We took the position in our last that earthly objects have always been the means used by Satan to ruin mankind. Man will not and cannot act without motives. No party or organization of men ever attempted to get others to do their will or act in concert with them without presenting motives; by doing this they have been able to run nations mad.

If we are correct in saying that worldly objects are the means used by Satan in ruining the human race, we will find the Savior presenting different objects, we will find him and the apostles continually warning men of the danger of these things and exhorting them to seek heavenly things.

We find Jesus saying to those who are seeking the praise of men, "woe unto you when all men speak well of you, for so did their fathers to the false prophets." We find him saying to men who have set their hearts on wealth, "woe unto you that are rich, for you have received your consolation." We find him saying to the gay and fashionable who run after trifles and treat his words with contempt, "woe unto you that laugh now, for ye shall mourn and weep."

Yes, this is the way Christ addresses these people. They didn't like it when he was on earth and they don't like it yet. The world has agreed to call them blessed and they would like to have it so.

On one occasion when a vast multitude were following Jesus, (whose minds no doubt were filled with splendid visions of an earthly kingdom) he turned and said unto them, "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also he cannot be my disciple."

He told them that wise men of this world counted the cost before they commenced building or engaged in war, and gave them to understand that it would cost them the loss of all earthly objects to follow him. If they understood him, there must have been a powerful change in their feelings, to think that so far from realizing a glorious temporal kingdom, that poor and oppressed as they were they would have to give up the little they had in order to follow the long-expected Messiah—this was so contrary to their expectations that they could not understand him.

May we ever sit at the feet of the learned with the docility which becomes a plain and ignorant man. It has been one of our sweetest pleasures to converse with them through the medium of their writings, whenever we could snatch a moment from a life of toil. We now beg the privilege of making a few references to some of the arguments they use for the purpose of driving the infidel from his position and to strengthen the believer. We do this that we may confirm the position we have taken and to give us the opportunity of asking a few serious questions, and as we wish to ask some questions, permit us to address the second person.

In your writings on the evidences of Christianity you prove that it is like no other religion in the world and that its true followers have always been prompted by unearthly motives. You make comparisons between the doctrines of Christ and those taught by impostors, and show that his precepts raise men above the flesh while the precepts of others prompt men to action by appealing to the flesh. In tracing the history of the true Church through the dark ages and on to the time when Christ was on earth you have pointed us to a people who avoided the customs and manners of the busy world around them and who condemned until death the most popular things of their day, by this mode of reasoning you prove the divinity of Christianity.

In tracing the history of Anti-Christ you always point us to a people immersed in the affairs of the world, to a people who were valiant servants of Cæsar both in council and

in war, a people who plainly proved by their conduct that they were full of the spirit of the world. We hope you will not think us imprudent if we tell you that your arguments have had the effect you desired, and if we beg you to run your conclusions to their legitimate results and if we ask you to apply the same rules in finding the true Church in our day that you apply to find it in the past. And if we should ask you to apply the rules you have used in finding Anti-Christ to the present, that we may all see where we stand, we hope you will not treat it with contempt.

You have told us that had Christ been an impostor that he would have conformed to the expectation of the Jews, in setting up his Kingdom and that this very disappointment was the cause of their infidelity and ruin. You remind us of his lowly birth and humble associations and tell us that he made his appearance among the Jews who were despised by all the rest of mankind and that he was brought up among the humble people of Nazareth who were despised even by the despised Jews. You show us that he rejected the very things that men had always admired and ran after most, and that he accepted of the very things men had always despised and run from. You remind us that when the Jews would place an earthly crown on his head that he fled from it and ran to the cross to die an ignominious death. You prove beyond doubt that his precepts are unlike any ever taught by men and demonstrate their great superiority over the doctrines of men. You have told us of the darkness that filled the earth before Christ made

his appearance, confirming the words of Paul who says that men were without hope and without God in the world, thereby showing what their philosophy and self-legislation had done for them, after they had spent thousands of years in trying their own *Plans*. You then tell us that it was absolutely necessary for some pure and holy being to visit our world as a teacher and model to men before they could be elevated from their ruined state.

You tell us that Christ did not call on the philosophers, the great, the wealthy and the influential, (who had brought such ruin and darkness by their management,) to assist him in his work, but on the contrary called humble, poor and illiterate men who had nothing to recommend them to the notice of the great, and you remind us that he placed no worldly objects before them as inducements to follow him but on the contrary told them that the time would come when men would think they were doing God's service in killing them.

You then tell us how these twelve Galileans, without learning, without wealth, without military or political influence, and without one earthly motive to prompt them, fought the battles of their Master and carried the Gospel to the end of the earth, although the powers of hell and earth rose up against them.

You then tell us of the bloody persecutions waged by Pagan Rome in the first three centuries and how Christians grew in opposition to all the mighty powers of earth. You can see very plainly that the religion of Jesus was at war at that time with every institution of men and

that if the Jews and Gentiles had all submitted to it that it would have leveled all their institutions with the dust. You tell us too that their zeal for these institutions kept them away from Christ. *They* could see that Christianity struck at the foundation of every man-made government and institution then existing and that if they suffered it to be carried out that it would "break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms and fill the whole earth;" and you know that this is the reason they fought it with such desperation; and to-day when you would point us to the Church in its purest state, you point us to the time when Christians were battling with the powers of earth, to the time when they did not rely on earthly helps, but stood aloof from the world, to the time when millions willingly gave up their lives before they would submit to the customs of men.

You have been so kind as to tell us all about how Anti-Christ grew and how he was placed on a throne, and what have you said about it? You have explained to us how the flood-gates were opened and a mighty tide of corruption poured into the church. And how have you explained it? You have told us how the professors of Christianity toned down their religion to suit the world around them; and how they introduced heathen rites and ceremonies into the church in order to influence men who were accustomed to pompous show and ceremonies, in the worship of their idol gods. You refer to the time when the rulers of the world ceased to persecute, to the time when the great began to smile on them;

to the time when Christians began to build magnificent church-houses and to worship in splendor; to the time when their great preachers lived in princely style and became the most abject flatterers of the great men of this world; in a word you refer to the time when they rejected the simplicity of the Christian religion and conformed to the customs of the world, and began to seek political and military honors. Then it was you say that the long night of darkness began to fill the earth; then it was that Anti-Christ began to aspire to universal dominion. But in giving the history of the true Church you have all the time pointed us to a poor and despised people who were so far from having anything to do with the things of the world that they were hated and persecuted by the false church and political powers. You have pointed to their earnestness, their pure lives, and to their deadness and contempt for the things of this world, for some of your strongest arguments for the Divinity of Christianity. With these arguments and many others of like nature you convince the skeptic and astonish the infidel.

We will now ask our questions. Do you believe that Christ required the first Christians to pursue the course they did merely to prove the Divinity of Christianity, or do you believe that the great principles of Christianity required them to act as they did or lose their souls?

If the course they pursued proves the divinity of Christianity and that they were children of God how would you find his children now?

Will not the same characteristics

which distinguished the children of God in the first and second centuries necessarily be possessed by his children now?

Will not the same characteristics by which you have been able to distinguish Anti-Christ from the true church hold good yet if you will apply them?

You combat the errors that have filled the Church, and trace them back to the Mother of harlots: Why do you do this and still leave the great fountain of all the mischief open to pour corruption into the church faster than you can reform it?

What have you told us made Anti-Christ what he is and gave him an empire?

If you are right in saying that darkness covered the earth and that dominion was given to the Beast in consequence of Christians conforming to the customs of men and entangling themselves with the affairs of Cæsar how can we have a permanent reformation without complete disentanglement and without pursuing the same course that Christ and the Apostles and first Christians did?

Do you not believe that the humble, pure and holy lives of primitive Christians who held all earthly pomp and glory in contempt did more for the conversion of the world than all the books and preaching of this age are doing?

Can you profess to be a follower of the meek and lowly Jesus and to stand on the broad platform of Christ and the Apostles, without warning men day and night not to participate in war and politics and the customs of men *which things you say* corrupted the church and built up Babylon?

Can you profess to be a watchman on the walls of Zion and to take Christ as your model and the word of God alone as your guide, and fail to warn this generation of their danger, and their blood not be required at your hands?

POOR CAL.

Prayer of Jesus for the Sanctification and Unity of His Followers.

No more interesting moment can be imagined as occurring between the birth and death of the Savior, than that in which he, alone with his disciples, amid the darkness of the night engages in prayer to God. The world so far as we know was wrapped in solemn silence, excepting the stealthy tread and muttering voices of that crowd of villains who are coming with the treacherous Judas to capture and crucify the Prince of peace. Having concluded his discourse, "Jesus raised his eyes toward heaven, and said :

'Father, the hour has come ; honor thy Son, so that thy Son may also honor thee : as thou hast given him authority over all mankind,* in order that he may bestow eternal life on all those whom thou hast given him. And this is the eternal life, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus the Christ whom thou hast sent. I have honored thee on earth ; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, Father, honor me with thyself,—with the honor that I enjoyed with thee before the World existed.

*This word "mankind" limits the teachers meaning to the human race ; whereas the figurative use of "flesh" here includes too much, even all the animal creation.

I have communicated thy name to the men that thou gavest me out of the world. They were thine ; but thou gavest them to me, and they have kept thy word. They now know that all those things which thou hast given me are from thee ; for the words which thou hast given me, I have given them ; they have accepted them ; they know positively that I came from thee ; and they believe that thou didst send me. I pray for them I do not pray for the world ; but, for those whom thou hast given me ; for they are thine. For all [that are] mine are thine, and thine, mine ; and I am honored in them. And I am [to remain] no longer in the world ; but these are [to remain] in the world and I am coming to thee.

Holy Father, preserve in thy name those whom thou hast given to me ; so that they may be one as we are one. While I have been with them [in the world,] I have kept them in thy name ; those whom thou gavest me I have kept :—not one of them is lost, except the Son of perdition ; [and this has taken place] that the Scripture might be verified.†

And now I am coming to thee ; but these things I am speaking in the world, in order that their joy in me may be complete.

I have committed thy word to them and the world has hated them because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I do not ask thee to take them out of the world, but to keep them from the evil one. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.

† "Yes my own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, who did eat of my bread, has lifted up his heel against me."—Ps. xli, 9.

Sanctify them in thy truth; thy word is truth.

As thou hast sent me into the world, so I send them into the world. And on their account I sanctify myself that they too may be sanctified in the truth.

I do not pray for these only; but, [I am praying] for those, too, who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee that they may be one in us; so that the world may believe that thou didst send me.

And the dignity which thou hast conferred on me, I have conferred on them; in order that they may be one, as we are one; I, in them, and thou, in me; so that there may be a perfect unity, and so that the world may know that thou didst send me, and didst love them as thou didst love me.

Father, I wish that those whom thou hast given me may be with me where I am; so that they may look upon my majesty, which thou hast conferred on me; for thou didst love me before the founding of the world.

O righteous Father! the world has not acknowledged thee; but I have acknowledged thee; and these have acknowledged that thou didst send me. And I have communicated thy name to them, and shall communicate it so that the love with which thou didst love me may be in them and I in them.' It was not proper to interrupt this, the Lord's prayer, nor to say "Amen," till the close.

We do not know whether Jesus said "Amen," or not; nor are we

aware that the Apostles said the Amen, to sanction this prayer in their behalf. It is not always necessary, perhaps, that the Amen be said at the conclusion of a prayer or a thanksgiving. But some might think this foreign word † not understood by many who utter it, necessary to mark the close of a prayer, as a period marks the end of a sentence. It certainly is a very proper termination of a solemn, earnest address to our heavenly Father.

Such is the plainness, simplicity and peculiar appropriateness of the prayer of Jesus that it does not seem to require any comments, to explain or enforce its meaning. Yet as we look around upon the religious world in order to see that unity for which Jesus so evidently and so earnestly prayed, we are surprised at the division, contentions and endless differences, observable among the professed followers of the Lord.

Before considering particularly the subject of Christian unity, it seems proper to remark, in harmony with Jesus' own words, that that divine personage enjoyed with his father, before the commencement of this time—world, the honor, splendor, and dignity that pertain to God; that is, divine majesty: for he said to his Father: "Thou didst love me before the founding of the world."

To the Jews, on a former occasion, he said: "I existed before Abraham." These texts prove his existence prior to his being born of the Virgin Mary. But questions arise here,

† Webster says: "In English, after the original manner, it, [amen] is used at the beginning, but more generally at the end of declarations and prayers, in the sense of "Be it firm, be it established." (See Smith, Art. Amen.)

which cannot be fully discussed in this chapter without spinning out to a tedious and unprofitable length. However to encourage an inquiring disposition, and to convince those who may be somewhat conceited, that they should not be too confident in asserting opinions respecting the Eternal Sonship, the humanity and the divinity of Christ, I wish, at least to propound a few questions, relating to this so-called theological subject.

I. Is Jesus Christ the eternal Son of the Father? If so, is this Sonship to be understood of his humanity, or his divinity?

II. Jesus Christ is declared to be the "only begotten Son of God." (John i. 14.) Was he, therefore "eternally begotten;" or did he become a son of God as well as a "Son of Man," when born of the Virgin Mary? The Angel said to Mary: "The Holy Spirit will come upon thee, and the power of the Highest will overshadow thee; for this reason, too, the Holy One that is born will be called the Son of God." Does this prove, that Jesus was not called the Son of God, till begotten by the Holy Spirit?

III. What was Jesus before his humanity was created, and his "body prepared for him?" (Heb. x. 5.) John says, that "in the beginning, the word existed, the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (John i. 1.)

IV. If Jesus, as the word of God, and as God existed "before the world existed," is he therefore "very God," in the sense of modern Creeds? Paul writing to the Colossians, said: "All the fullness of the Godhood [Deity

or Divinity] resides substantially in him; "that is, in Christ. May not this mean, that Jesus who was the Son of God, possessed Godhood; just as we speak of a son's *manhood*, which makes him *man* as well as his Father? (See Col. ii. 9.)

V. Is it correct and Scriptural to speak of three persons in the Godhood, of equal power and divinity? Jesus said: "My Father is *greater* than I." How then can we say they are equal?

VI. Jesus is spoken of by modern theologians as the "second person in the adorable Trinity." Is he "second" in rank, in power, in authority? Is "Trinity," a proper or Scriptural appellation for God, or for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, comprehended in one?

But a more appropriate question perhaps than any of these, is the one which Jesus propounded to the Jews when he asked: "What do you think of Christ? whose Son is he?"

This Scriptural question admits of a Scriptural answer. The Father declared at the immersion of Jesus: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I delight." With the Scriptural designations of the Son of God, and the inspired statements concerning him, we should be satisfied. And if we must indulge the imagination, let us conjecture what were the Saviors "recollections of a lifetime," extending back and beyond the moment when "the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy." But we shall be lost in wonder, if we attempt to penetrate those secrets unrevealed.

It is surely not claiming too much for him, when we assert, that every

thing belongs to Christ; for, "all that is the Father's is mine," said the beloved Son. The apostles he said were given him by his Father; and all other Christians belong to him, as well; for Paul says: "All things are yours; you are Christ's and Christ is God's." (1 Cor. iii. 23.)

We might here inquire: "Can any thing which belongs to Christ be taken from him?" Would it be Predestinarianism to teach, that none who truly belong to the Lord will ever be lost? On the other hand, would it be reasonable to contend, that the Evil one could deprive the Son of God of any portion of his inheritance? John says in his first letter, (Jno. v. 18:): "He who has been begotten by God, keeps himself, and that Wicked one does not touch him."

Is there any assurance here, that those who have been "begotten by the word of God," "born of the Spirit," chosen, sanctified, saved and adopted into the family of God, will be preserved from apostasy, and never be lost?

By asking such questions as these we might be led to adopt the old theory of election, or some modification of it; but when we inquire for some Scriptural teaching on the subject of apostasy, we find Paul writing thus: "I therefore so run, as not uncertainly; I so fight, as not beating the air. But I keep under my body, and bring into subjection; lest possibly, having preached to others I myself should be rejected." (1 Cor. ix. 26, 27.) Also, in the next chapter, (x. 12, he writes; "Wherefore, let him who thinks he is standing be careful, lest he fall." This certainly implies a possibility of falling away, or apos-

tatizing, notwithstanding the assurance given in the next verse, "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted beyond what ye are able." But, in Paul's letter to the Hebrews, we have the plainest teaching on this point, in all the Scriptures: "For it is impossible," writes the inspired apostle, "that those who have been once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come and have fallen away, should again be renewed to repentance." (Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6.) This may not apply to erring disciples, or to backsliders in general; I think it does not; but it teaches plainly, that persons who have enjoyed all the blessings of the Gospel, and been truly converted may fall away and be lost.

Jesus said: "I am not of the world." And of his disciples he said: "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." Christians are not of the world; for Paul wrote to the Colossians: "If you are dead in Christ from the rudiments of the world, why are you subject to human ordinances?" (Col. ii. 20, 21.)

What, then, it may be inquired, have they to do in the affairs of the world? Should they be entirely shut out from all intercourse with people of the world? Certainly not for Jesus said, in his prayer on behalf of the Apostles: "I do not ask that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil one." But is there not danger that Christians, by too much mingling with the world, shall become corrupted from the

Simple faith, true teaching, and pure morals of the primitive church? Does not the world now exert a deleterious influence on the churches of Christ? It certainly does, as every day's observation teaches. Great efforts, therefore, should be made, and that, persistently,—to counteract such outside influences as tend to the corruption of Christianity.

The unity, or oneness, of the apostles and of all the followers of Jesus, was a prominent point in Jesus' prayer. This unity was to produce an important effect on the minds of men; it was to lead to the conviction of the world, or, at least, a very considerable portion of it; so that those who should observe the unity, harmony and love, subsisting among the disciples of Jesus, and contrast them with the discord, alienation and hatred in the world, would be attracted or "drawn" towards Him to whom the disciples were so closely united, and around whom like the planets of the Solar System, they in most perfect harmony revolved.

Therefore if Christians, now, desire the conversion and salvation of the world, or any considerable portion of it, they should earnestly pray and diligently labor for the unity, harmony and peace of the churches of Christ, throughout the world.

Jesus prayed for the unity of his followers; yet the so-called religious world has been distracted by numberless divisions, ever since the days of the apostles. Has the prayer of Jesus therefore not been answered? Skeptics, no doubt, are willing to say it has not. But will not the earnest Christian, observing the unity, love,

and harmonious co-operation of particular congregations, say:

"Whenever a number of disciples constituting a Church, great or small is found united in the bonds of Christian love, the prayer of Jesus is answered." And universal Christian unity would be fully realized, if all communities of Christians throughout the world were in the same manner united and harmonious, and embraced all the believers in Christ, in every particular neighborhood.

This kind of unity is not denominational union, so much talked of in the present age. It may be inquired, can a union of the denominations ever be effected? Would it be desirable if practicable? Was it for denominational union that Jesus prayed? Or did he pray for a union of congregations into church-confederations, or religious sects? Was the unity for which he prayed to be a "general visible unity," such as the apostate Roman bishops tried to bring about, and whose efforts resulted in the first and greatest of ecclesiastical organizations, erroneously called the Roman Catholic Church? Was it to be an organic or inorganic unity? Or was it to be an invisible, Spiritual unity, consisting with visible diversity, and carnal divisions? My manner of asking these questions will suggest negative answers. All efforts at a general, visible, denominational unity of all the followers of Christ, have proved abortive, and only resulted in the fearful multiplication of sects.

Undoubtedly, there should not only be a similarity between the members of the different congregations, but a mutual sympathy and love should exist; and they may co-

operate in works of benevolence, and in spreading the Gospel. But no combinations of churches should ever be formed, under the pretense that in unity there is strength;" for denominational strength is but another phrase for party power.

The Psalmist says: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brothers to dwell together in unity." (Ps. 133, 1.)

1. But Christian unity is a unity with Christ; Christians are to be "one in Christ, their head." Eph. iv. 15,

2. It may be an organic unity, in the sense in which a church may be organized, when all the members are "set" in their places, fulfilling in harmonious action and co-operation all the duties devolving on them respectively.

3. It must be a spiritual unity; for Paul wrote to the Ephesian Church "I, the prisoner of the Lord exhort you, therefore, to walk worthy of the calling with which you have been called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, bearing with one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." (Eph. iv. 1, 2, 3.)

4. It must also be a unity of faith and oneness in teaching; for the apostles taught that there is "one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God" (Eph. iv. 5, 6.) In the 1st Letter to the Corinthians, Paul writes; "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." (1 Cor. 1. 10.)

5. It must be a most intimate union; for the evangelist, Luke, speak-

ing of the first Christians converted by the Apostles, says: "And the multitude of those who believed were of one heart and one soul." (Acts, iv. 32.) No more intimate union than this can be imagined. If all congregations or societies of Christians were thus united, we could wish for no more perfect unity. Then there would be really a "general, visible unity; but it would not be a general organic, or Sectarian union. Nor is a union of sects desirable or practicable. The invention of church-constitutions and creeds has ever failed to unite the followers of Jesus. Christians can only unite on Christ; can only agree in adopting the Bible as a "rule of faith and practice;" and must let creedism and denomination-alism pass away.

W. PINKERTON.

Waynesfield O. Feb. 1 1874.

Infant Baptism.

Messrs. Lipscomb & Sewell: You and your brethren are frequently challenging the world to produce a case of infant baptism in the New Testament. This I now propose to do, and ask as an act of justice that it be published in your "Advocate." I do not go to the household baptisms or any others wherein it is *supposed* there were infants, but to a case in which we *know* there were infants. As my object is not to discuss the propriety of the practice, but simply to show that the New Testament speaks of infants being baptized, I will give you the quotation, and close. It is in the 10th chapter of 1st Cor., where Paul is speaking of the children of Israel crossing the

Red Sea. He says, "They were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea." As there can be no question about there being infants among the Israelites when they crossed the Red Sea, this settles the question as to whether the New Testament speaks of infant baptism or not.

Respectfully,
P. W. A.

We believe infants were subjects of this baptism, *i. e.*, they were under the cloud and passed through the sea. The intent essential to all service in the kingdom of Christ was lacking. They were thus immersed. Still that whole baptism is figurative, and is not the baptism of the New Testament. It is not the baptism instituted by Christ. Under the Jewish dispensation, children were in covenant relationship with God, under the Christian they only enter into it through faith in Christ. None can enter who are incapable of faith, confidence, trust in the Savior. Our friends who contend for faith alone, to introduce persons into Christ, are strangely inconsistent in introducing those incapable of faith.

D. L.

Prayer in Meeting.

Brethren L. & S: Some of the brethren here seem to think there is no precept or example laid down in the New Testament, for us to pray in public or to open our Lord's-day worship with prayer, notwithstanding all that Paul has said to the Corinthians in regard to prayer, 1st. Cor. xiv. 13. and 16th. and to Timothy 1st Tim. ii. 8th.

What do you understand Paul to mean when giving charge to Timothy 1st. Tim. i. 18-19 in regard to his warfare, holding of faith and a good conscience, and then in the next chap. 1st verse, do you not understand it to be a command; (particularly, when the eighth verse is taken into consideration;) to commence worship in audible voice understandingly &c. &c.

Please give your views

J. W. WILSON.

We ourselves often doubt the propriety of much of the public praying in the mixed assemblies. We do this not because we think it wrong to pray to the Father of Spirits then, but because we think the larger portion of such prayers are to the public instead of to God; to be heard and admired by men rather than to be accepted and answered by God. The temptation in these assemblies is very strong to pray, to be heard of men." It is right and proper to pray to God at all times when we can fervently and humbly pray—to be heard of God. But all the eloquent high sounding talk to God that men may hear and admire is simply mockery. We do not believe the apostles introduced their preaching to unbelievers with prayer.

We think all prayer, humbly and earnestly made to God in direct and simple language, for the things we desire, is acceptable. All meetings of brethren to worship should be opened and interspersed and closed with earnest petitions to God for the things we really need. Merely formal prayer is not prayer. We never believed any specific order of worship is laid down

for the assembly of saints. We understand Paul to teach Timothy he should cultivate and cherish faith and a good conscience, which some having put away or failed to hold made ship wreck.

The language in the 1st verse of 2nd chapter is exhortation to do what is the will of God. God's will is made known. His children do not need a command to make them do their Father's will. He makes his will known, knowing that all his true children will gladly do his will. "If ye love me ye will keep my words. The expression of his will has full force of a command to his children. The man that will not do God's will because not expressed in the form of a command, may draw nigh with his mouth but his heart is far from God. He deceives his own heart if he thinks he loves God, yet he will not do the will of God, because that will is not expressed in the form of a command. All social prayer should be expressed in words, audibly. We have no faith in prayer that is not sufficiently earnest to find expression in words. Even secret private prayer if earnest will find this kind of expression. When this is put aside, the prayer soon ceases. Hannah, prayed in her heart in secret, yet the lips moved.

D. L.

Something New under the Sun.

There are some plain statements in the Bible that give the orthodox preachers considerable trouble to harmonize with their respective theories. Many have been the efforts I have heard in that direction, and yet almost every one would have a faith

of his own, and would differ from the others. I had thought there was no room for anything more, yet in this I was mistaken.

I had the pleasure yesterday of hearing Mr. Ditzler throw "hot shot," as he called it for upwards of two hours into the ranks of that dangerous heresy, he came out last January to "kill," but in which he left life enough to require another trip last fall, and still another one this winter. To my mind he presented some things entirely new, and, thinking the readers of the Advocate would be as much interested in them as I was, I jot them down for their benefit.

First, then, in speaking of a call to the ministry, he said it was possible for persons to be called to preach by the Holy Spirit, and yet preach different doctrines; that Peter and Paul were so called, yet they preached doctrines; that in the council at Jerusalem in Acts 15, Peter made the first speech and in the *main* was correct. And there I was curious to know what part of the speech was *not* correct? Was it his assertion that the Gentiles by his mouth were to hear the *Gospel* and *believe*, or that God bore them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit? I rather expect here was his mistake as the learned gentleman said afterwards that he gave them the Holy Ghost to pardon their sins.

In speaking of the day of Pentecost, he said the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the twelve Apostles and devout of every nation who were at Jerusalem; that the multitude were amazed when they heard them—the Apostles and devout men, speak-

ing every man in his own tongue, wherein they were born. Would it be a cause of wonder to hear a number of men of different nations speak the *languages* of these nations? Has he never noticed that the people were amazed because the speakers were all Galileans? Mr. Ditzler's brethren certainly have serious cause of complaint against him. It is presuming greatly upon their ignorance to expect them to believe such nonsense. Again in speaking of the Samaritans, he said they never believed in Christ; they only believed what Philip preached, and were baptized, but not pardoned, until Peter and John came down and gave them the Holy Spirit by laying on their hands, then they were pardoned. There I was led to ask myself, what did Philip preach? He preached Christ—was that not the same as preaching the Gospel? Then Paul was mistaken when he said the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that *believes*, and that the Corinthians were saved by it if they had not *believed* in vain. Again thought I if that is the way people have to be saved I wonder who can impart the Spirit now, by laying on hands? I have believed just what the Samaritans believed, have been baptized like they were, and now if somebody has to lay hands upon me and thus give me the Holy Spirit before my sins are pardoned I would like to see him speedily.

None but Apostles could do this. Are any of them now living? Perhaps the other Apostles were not mistaken when they concluded from a remark of the Savior that John was not to die, and that he is now living for that purpose. If so where

is he? Bro. Sweeney thinks that inasmuch as Mr. Ditzler has found out that Abel had a family, that he is in Abel's line, and has therefore learned from his ancestors those wonderful things about the Jordan that none of the descendants of Seth or Cain ever knew. If that is so, perhaps he can tell me where is the old apostle, that those people who like the Samaritans have believed and been baptized may go and be pardoned.

By the way I heard Mr. Ditzler get off a fine speech last fall about these third parties in religion. These third parties might not be comeatable. There might be a storm, a dark night, a big rain, too cold, too warm, armies, provost marshals, and a hundred things might keep them away, then the poor penitent would be *lost*, *LOST*. To a common English scholar it would seem the same objection might be urged here. Samaria was a good ways from Jerusalem, and as they had no rail-roads nor telegraph lines it took some time to send all the way up there for these third parties, Peter and John, and for them to get ready and go down. Maybe some of them died before they got down there. But perhaps a little Syriac would enable one to see there is no similarity in the cases.

Verily, Mr. Ditzler must be a man of "infinite jest." I will also speak of one or two more new ideas.

In speaking of Saul's conversion he said the advocate of baptism for remission of sins would never read Luke's account of it in the ninth chap. of Acts, but would always go to the 22nd. He had a use for both; and this was the use he made of them:

In the 22nd, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," he was to wash his sins away, not in baptism but by calling in faith on the Lord, calling was simply praying in faith. The baptism preceded both the washing and calling. Hence like the Pentecostians and Samaritans, Saul was baptized before his sins were pardoned.

But somehow when Mr. D. came to examine the 9th chapter he had the scales as it were to fall from his eyes at the same time his sins were pardoned and after all this he arose and was baptized. Mr. D. in his debates and preaching explains each case of conversion seemingly independent of all others. Some he has baptized before pardon, others after, and attempts to explain why some were baptized before and others after; but how Saul could have been baptized both before and after I cannot well see.

In this discourse he had John to baptize the people before they had even repented; the Pentecostians to be baptized before faith and pardon; the Samaritans and the twelve at Ephesus before, while Cornelius and his house, the jailor and his house after and left the impression that there were many cases of conversion where baptism was never attended to.

He pretended to give an analysis of every case of conversion in the Acts, but somehow he left out the Ethiopian in the eighth and the Corinthians in the 18th. I was a little curious to see what he would have done with these. He had laid down as a fundamental proposition that to "believe Jesus Christ is the Son

of God, is not the faith that purifies the heart." This is just what the Ethiopian believed, and upon that faith an inspired man baptized him, and he went on his way rejoicing. Was he pardoned? or did he have to wait until he met up with some one to lay hands on him, and impart the Holy Spirit as the Samaritans did? Again, as for the Corinthians, Paul had testified that Jesus was Christ just as Philip had done down at Samaria, and the record simply says they heard believed, and were baptized, when were they pardoned.

Mr. D.'s entire effort was to show that baptism is not for the remission of sins, and did it no doubt to his own satisfaction. But while trying to show what it is *not* for, he never once told us what it *is* for. It must be for something. The discipline says it is a "sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians may be distinguished from those not baptized, also a sign of regeneration and the new birth." Whatever may be its design we must all go to the Bible to learn it, and not only to the Bible, but to the records of baptism, if we ever get at the truth. To one Jew, circumcision signified the same thing and secured the same blessing that it did to another. To every person entitled to eat the Lord's supper, it signifies the same thing and secures the same blessing. These propositions being true are we justified in the conclusion that baptism to every person entitled to it, signifies the same blessing? If this be true, then specific characters are to be baptized. That must either be the regenerated or unregenerated, pardoned or unpardoned. Whoever

was baptized by the apostles and inspired men of the New Testament was a proper subject. But Mr. D. has them baptizing some pardoned individuals and some unpardoned. If he is right there was no uniformity of practice among them. How then did the maker of the discipline ever come to the conclusion that it is a sign of regeneration, if the unregenerate are also proper subjects of it? Certainly they would not have the sign without the thing signified. But they further say it is a mark of difference &c. If the people on Pentecost and at Samaria were baptized before they were pardoned, and they were still unpardoned for a time afterwards, what was the difference between them and other unpardoned persons, what different relation did they sustain? The discipline says it is a mark whereby Christians are distinguished from those not baptized. Then of course properly baptized persons are Christians; were these Samaritans, in the interim between their baptism and the visit of Peter and John down there when they were pardoned, Christians. If both Mr. D. and the discipline are right they were. Then there we have Christians whose sins have never been pardoned. To what will a theory lead persons.

If Mr. D. is to be relied on, no person can tell what baptism is for or who are to be baptized. Who could say the applicant is like the people at Pentecost or Samaria, and should be baptized before or like the jailer and Cornelius, after remission of sins? He says it is right to be baptized, and if a person willfully neglected that or any command of God, it showed rebellion and he would be lost. Then

when a person who has become the proper subject and has an opportunity, is not baptized, he is willfully neglecting it and is in danger of being lost. According to Mr. D. the apostles baptized some who were unpardoned, yet others they would not until they say they were pardoned. If the Samaritans had willfully refused to have been baptized after believing what Philip preached, though they were not pardoned, they would have been as culpable as Cornelius had he refused baptism after the Holy Spirit came upon him.

J. D. FLOYD.

Flat Creek, Tenn., Jan. 19, 1874.

Obituaries.

Departed this life on the 10th of July, 1873, Sister Martha Ewing, in the forty-fifth year of her age. Sister Ewing has been a member of the Church of Christ for more than twenty years.

Although we were not present at the time of her death, we have learned that she lived a devoted Christian, and died as she had lived in triumph of a living faith.

In her death she leaves a Christian companion, and ten children, to mourn their loss; but thank God they mourn not as those who have no hope, although the family will feel—deeply feel—the stroke that cut her down, yet the bright hope that lingers on the memory, of meeting her again, will to some extent, banish these sad reflections. The children have lost a fond mother.

The relations have lost a beloved associate—one who in life often cheered their troubled hearts—the neighborhood a valuable citizen and the church one of its brightest ornaments.

The radiant smile of sweet and joyous hope,
That beamed so brightly in a mother's eye,
Telling of joys long fondly treasured up,
Shrouded in death, alas! all now in silence lie.

NATHANIEL DAVIS, M. D.

Cleburne Texas Sept. 26 1873.

Bros. L. & S: We are called upon to announce through the Advocate the death of Priscilla Watson, daughter of brother and Sister Lemuel H. and Letha Watson. She was born December 29th 1859. Died of Typhoid fever on 20th November 1873. She had not quite

grown to womanhood; her Parents and brothers and sisters take her death to heart very sadly, but why not rejoice. seeing the rest of the family have all been spared; five of the family were down at the same time with the same disease. Sister Watson and four children. They have all recovered except the one. She was nipped in the bud, and thereby released from all the sorrows and temptations and troubles of a sinful world. She possessed a quiet, meek, and gentle disposition, was loved by all her relatives and acquaintances. But she has gone the way we must all go sooner or later. Peace to her immortal Spirit, O that we who have made the good confession may be as well prepared for death when it shall come, as those who have gone before, who had not violated the law of Liberty as set forth by our ever blessed Savior.

W. C. HUFFMAN,

Enon College Tenn. Feb. 7th. 1874.

Messrs. L. & S.: Permit me to record the death of my Grandpa, L. B. Mullins. He was born in Virginia, April 11 1806 and moved to Tenn. in the year 1820 and departed this life April 22nd 1873. he lived to be 67 years and 11 days old, and has been a member of the Church of Christ nearly forty years, and of which he lived a faithful member until his death. He leaves a wife and four children to mourn his loss and a large circle of friends. But we sorrow not as those who have no hope of the promised land.

Your Friend,

MAGGIE C. HARTMAN.

Lavergne Rutherford Co. Tenn.

Church News.

I have just closed another meeting at Nevills Prairie, Houston Co. Texas with one addition. The Church is prosperous, and we hope will have much success this year.

Yours in Christ

JOHN T. POE.

THE SERPENT OF APPETITE.

It is an old Eastern fable that a certain king once suffered the Evil One to kiss him on either shoulder. Immediately there sprang therefrom two serpents, who, furious with hunger, attacked the man, and strove to

eat into his brain. The now terrified king strove to tear them away and cast them from him, when he found, to his horror, that they had become a part of himself.

Just so it is with every one who becomes a slave to his appetite. He may yield in what seems a very little thing at first; even when he finds himself attacked by the serpent that lurks in the glass, he may fancy he can cast him off. But, alas! he finds the thirst for strong drink has become a part of himself. It would be almost as easy to cut off his right hand. The poor poet Burns said that if a barrel of rum was placed in one corner of the room, and a loaded cannon in another, pointing toward him, ready to be fired if he approached the barrel, he had no choice but to go for the rum.

The person who first tempts you to take a glass may appear very friendly. It was not a dart that Satan aimed at the fated king. He only gave him a kiss. But the serpent that sprang from it was just as deadly, for all that.

O, be careful of letting this serpent of appetite get possession of you, for it will be a miracle of grace, indeed, if you are able again to shake him off.

Guard against every sin, dear children, however small; let it not gain a hold upon you. Pray to be kept from temptation in every form, and think not that in your own strength you can battle against it.—
Youth's Temperance Banner.

Prosperity is a great teacher, adversity greater. Possessions pamper the mind; privation trains and strengthens it.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

SEWING-ACHES.

Jessie sat down by her mother to sew. She was making a pillow case for her own little pillow.

"All this?" she asked, in a discontented tone, holding the seam out.

"That is not too much for a little girl who has a work basket of her own," said her mother.

"Yes," thought Jessie, "Mother has given me a work-basket, and I ought to be willing to sew;" and with that she took a few stitches quite dilligently.

"I have a dreadful pain in my side," said Jessie in a few moments. "My thumb is very sore," she said in a very few minutes after. "O, my hand is so tired!" That was next. And with that she laid down her work. Next, there was something the matter with her foot and then her eye.

At length the sewing was done. Jessie brought it to her mother.

"Should I not first send for a doctor?" said her mother.

"The doctor for me mother!" cried the little girl as much surprisd as she could be.

"Certainly," said her mother; "a little girl so full of pains and aches must be sick, and the sooner we have the doctor the better."

"O mother!" said Jessie, laughing "they were sewing-aches. I am well enough now."

I have heard of other little girls,

besides Jessie, who had sewing aches and pains whenever their parents had work for them to do. These aches and pains do show sickness; they are symptoms of a bad disease, a disease which eats some people up. This disease is called "selfishness." It makes children cross and fretful and disobliging and troublesome and unhappy; and I am sure it makes those selfish and sad who have charge of them.

ALPHABET OF PROVERBS.

A grain of prudence is worth a pound of craft.

Boasters are cousins to liars.

Confession of faults makes half amends.

Denying a fault doubles it

Envy shoots at others and wounds herself.

Foolish fear doubles danger.

God reaches us good things by our hands.

He has hard work who has nothing to do.

It costs more to avenge than to forgive.

Justice lives with benevolence.

Knavery is the worst trade.

Learning makes a man fit company for himself.

Modesty is a guard to virtue.

Not to hear conscience is the way to silence it.

One hour today is worth two to-morrow.

Proud looks make foul work in fair faces.

Quiet conscience gives sweet sleep.

Richest is he that wants least.

Small faults are little thieves that let in greater.

The houghs that bear most hang lowest.

Upright walking is sure walking.

Virtue and happiness are mother and child.

Wise men make their own opportunities.

You never lose by doing a good turn.

Zeal without knowledge is fire without light.—*Christian Advocate.*

One grand want of our times is individual action. People are too much afraid of doing any thing alone. We crystalize activity into cold formality by our cumbersome machinery.

If a man has a good idea, if he is inspired to build a church, found a mission, or inaugurate a reform, instead of carrying out his idea, he tells it to the church; the church refers it to a committee; the committee call a public meeting; the public meeting forms a society; the society organizes its machinery, and by that time the idea is dead.

For the benefit of those who suppose California's newly-fledged university is only for rich men's sons, somebody has taken the trouble to find out how many worked their way last term. He finds 98 such. Many of the students have found work about the grounds of the university. Some work for their board in private families. Others spend their Saturday in San Francisco, working at their trades, and he estimates that over half the students assist themselves by manual labor.

No one Perfect.

One day you will be pleased with

a friend, and the next day disappointed in him. It will be so to the end; and you must make up your mind to it and not quarrel unless for very grave cause. Your friend, you have found out is not perfect. Nor are you; and you cannot expect to get more than you give. You must look for much weakness, foolishness, and vanity in human nature: it is unhappy if you are too sharp in seeing.—*Country Parson.*

To be discontented is to live a life of perpetual longing. "The highest point to which outward things can bring us," says Sir Philip Sidney, "is the contentment of the mind, with which no estate can be poor, without which all estates will be miserable." And a greater than Sir Philip Sidney even St. Paul, tells us that "godliness with contentment is great gain."

No man is so happy as a real Christian; none so rational, so virtuous, so amiable. How little vanity does he feel, though he believes himself united to God! How far is he from abjectedness when he ranks himself with the worms of the earth.—*Pascal.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Action of Baptism.....	169
Why so few are saved.....	175
Prayer of Jesus for the sanctification and unity of his followers.....	179
Infant baptism.....	184
Prayer in meeting.....	185
Something new under the Sun.....	186
Obituaries.....	189
Church News.....	190
The Serpent of Appetite.....	190
Fireside.	
Sewing-Aches.....	191
Alphabet of Proverbs.....	191
No One Perfect.....	192

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 9.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, FEB. 26, 1874.

(Below we give a report of Bro. Sweeney on the debate in the *Apostolic Times*. He details some points on a question that we did not hear discussed and expresses his appreciation of some other matters that occurred :)

More about the Brents-Ditzler Debate—Mr. Ditzler's New Position— A Paragraph on Courtesy &c.

Bro. Cave :

In my last letter to the *Times*, I promised that in another I would report Mr. Ditzler's new position, or discovery, it may be more properly termed perhaps, as to the establishment of the church in the world. For some time past the advocates of infant baptism have very generally contended that the church of God now existing in the world was set up in Abraham's time, and in his family and that it is identical with the covenant of circumcision or nearly so, there having been only some four or five changes relating to the law of membership made about the time of Christ and his apostles; but of late the most wary debaters among them,

for reasons apparent to them and other close observers, have grown somewhat shy of this old position. Suffice it to say, as I do not wish to be tedious, that Mr. Ditzler is not willing to take this old position. When he tries to establish infant Baptism, however, he assumes that the church was in existence, with an infant membership, when Christ came into the world. And as Dr. Brents was disposed to press him to an answer as to when this church was established, Mr. D. was forced, as he doubtless supposed to hunt up a new beginning; and where, reader, do you suppose he found it? Why, "in the days of righteous Abel." Mr. D.'s new position is, that all righteous men and infants, of all ages, have been members of the church of God; and as Abel is called "righteous Abel," and was the first righteous man after the fall, the church was founded in Abel's day, and he was a member of the same, Of course Mr. D. does not go back of the fall, and as on this side of it Adam and Eve were not righteous, he leaves them out. Nor does he attempt to make it right clear to the common mind how Abel got in.

The logic is simple and clear, and syllogistically runs thus: All righteous men are in the church; but Abel was a righteous man, therefore Abel was in the church. Can anything be clearer? Observe, reader, I do not mean to say that Mr. D. submits the matter thus syllogistically; for while it is so notoriously true that he reduces many things to the *silly*, it is equally true that he is quite chary of syllogisms. Syllogisms are dangerous things in debates. But I am wandering. Here Dr. Brents showed that Mr. D. had a church without bishop, elder, deacon, class-leader or infant; a church with one member! And after twitting Mr. D. on this anomaly, he then wanted to know where the church was when Cain had slain Abel. Sure enough! then where was the church? What, reader, do you suppose was Mr. D's answer? Positively, I do not believe any man could guess it at fifty trials. It is now generally understood that the writer hereof knows Mr. Ditzler as well or better than any other man does and he frankly confesses that his answer in this case surprised him. "Why," said he, "the church was continued in Abel's family!" Abel's family! What shall we learn next? By the way, I have thought ever since I made his acquaintance that the Doctor stood in a line with which people generally are not well acquainted. His is the line of Abel. At any rate, he professes to belong to a church descended from the family of Abel; and, until I attain to more perfect knowledge on that point, I will let that circumstance account for his being at times so otherwise unaccountably out of harmony with

all other families on questions of theology, philology, philosophy, lexicography, geography, etc., etc. Some of the members of the family of Abel must have lived in the snow-capped mountains of Lebanon, whence the waters flow into Jordan; and hence, by tradition, the doctor has learned so much about that river. What descendant of Seth or Cain, would think of telling us that that stream is too small, and too poisonous, and too cold for one to stand in its waters for the purpose of immersion! Certainly all this knowledge is too much for any ordinary man.

Henceforth the followers of Mr. D. will contend that Abel was the "Father of the faithful, instead of Abraham, as we have heretofore been taught.

It is hoped that a specimen of Mr. Ditzler's skill in the tactics of debate will not be wholly uninteresting, and so the following is recorded: When Bro. Brents reminded him that Abel was killed, and hence his church destroyed, he retorted that Brents made Jesus the head and founder of the church, and therefore when he was killed, Brents' church must have perished also. To this Bro. B. replied, that according to his view Jesus was not made head of the church nor did he establish it, until after the resurrection; but that, according to D's view of the church, it was founded long before Christ came into the world—if Christ was its head, then the head was dead three days sure enough; so that the death of Jesus only affected the church disastrously upon Mr. D's theory.

Mr. D. came again on this wise: It was only the *humanity* of Christ

that died;" so that the "divine head of the church was never dead." Then Bro. B. wanted to know why he did not discover that fact before bringing up the matter of Jesus as against him, as he supposed.

The last that was seen of Ditzler in this little effort at retort was a brilliant flight to Syriac, wherein he disappeared from the common vision, and wherein he can generally escape from the descendants of Seth and Cain.

A paragraph on *courtesy* may not be amiss as a conclusion to this letter. I suppose there are those who look upon Dr. Ditzler as one of the most, if not *the* most, remarkably courteous gentlemen now in America. So exceedingly refined is he in his feelings that when he reads authors in debate, he frequently stops and apologizes for introducing one so decidedly in favor of his own cause and against that of his worthy and respected opponent. That the reader who has not heard Mr. D. may appreciate him fully, I will give one such of his apologies nearly in his own words as I can. Well, we will suppose he is trying to prove that *baptizo* means sprinkle. He finds a lexicon that defines it by *wash*. Then he takes wash back into Greek, and thence into Syriac, and thence perhaps he runs into some Chaldee word; then, while reading a definition of this word, he will stop suddenly, as if his refined and sensitive nature were shocked, and say, apologetically, "this is more on my side than I want it, and more against my opponents. My sympathies are aroused for *them*."—(Mr. Ditzler's relative pronouns are nearly all

third person plural.) Then he will stop and look, as sympathetic as ever Uriah Heap looked, humble, until what he has read is forgotten; then *hastily* reads the remainder of the definition, and many of his admirers fail to see that what he read was really against him, though in fact it was, and he—he—but "charity hopeth all things." But, as illustrative of courtesy more strictly, I give what follows: Mr. Brents and he had agreed to discuss four questions at Franklin, and to make the discussion exhaustive. They had each two affirmatives. Brents affirming in a debate about sprinkle for the sake of having an equal number of affirmatives. Now in such a debate, as one must have who debates with Mr. D., there is much advantage in being in the negative, and having the closing speech in every session of the debate and no one has keener appreciation of the fact than Mr. D. himself. In the spirit of the agreement, Brents led off on the action of baptism, allowing Mr. D. the advantage of following for five days. Then Mr. D. led off on infant baptism, with Brents following, and one day was all the time he would devote to the question! One day was quite time enough for an exhaustive discussion of infant baptism, with an opponent closing after him, specially as there is so little Syriac in the whole range of the discussion of that question. Then, when Brents informed him that on the design of baptism, he meant to lead him through on the fast line, and proved his earnestness by laying down twelve distinct arguments in his opening speech, thus stretching Mr. D. across the field that he

actually did nothing in his reply, he concluded that it would be well to close the debate without further discussion of the design of baptism, and without even reaching his affirmative on the question of spiritual influence. To this Mr. Brents agreed, and the debate was closed by mutual consent without discussing the design of baptism further than the two speeches referred to, and without discussing the Spirit question at all; and, after Bro. Brents had gone home, Dr. Ditzler proceeded alone to discuss those questions. And what ought to shame him more, if such a thing were at all possible, he improved the opportunity to class our people with Romanists and infidels.

I would gladly believe there is some mistake as to this shameless and cowardly course pursued after the debate was closed by mutual consent, if I could. But it comes too directly to me, and I must believe it, though I do so reluctantly. I am prepared to believe that he is a theological adventurer; I am prepared to believe that he is a boaster, pretending to knowledge that he does not possess; an empiric. I am very certain our brethren have given him notoriety (a thing by no means distasteful to him) beyond any merit he has as a scholar, or debater; or as to any influence he has with his own church. But I was not fully prepared to say that I would expect him to pursue the course it seems he did after the close of the debate at Franklin. Of course I do not make this a question of good morals. It is nearer one of æsthetics than of ethics.

I have it partly in mind to write a little about a matter that bears upon

the question of scholarship, suggested by a little Latin episode of the debate and may do so; but, if so, it must be in another letter.

Very Truly,

J. S. S.

Paris, Ky. Jan. 7, 1874.

The Fulness of the Gentiles and the Future of the Jews.

Bro. Lipscomb: In the investigation of Romans xi. 25th to the conclusion of 28th, three questions appear to present themselves.

1st. What is to be understood by the term, the fulness of the Gentiles?

2nd. Has the deliverer come in the sense here spoken of? If so, why does this blindness continue upon Israel? Christ said of Jerusalem and it shall be trodden under foot of the Gentiles, etc. etc.

3rd. Has the covenant here spoken of been entered into? It may be proper to add, we do not discuss such questions beyond their legitimate bounds.

We add, What is the proper mode of expelling a member?

JAS. T. GRUBBS.

Beverly, Ky.

In reference to brother Grubbs' questions we feel that we but do justice to ourself to say, we do not know. This probably would be as profitable an answer as we can give. Yet he might not think it courteous. The whole subject of the future of the Jewish people is a matter in reference to which we can scarcely claim to have an idea. We read certain seemingly clear and plain statements of Scripture concerning them. But then we learn that "they are not all

Israel who are of Israel. Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children, but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called." That is, "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed."

The lesson he is teaching here, is, that not fleshly Israel can lay claim to the promises and appropriate the blessings guaranteed to Israel, but those who are the children of Abraham through faith. "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham or his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all." 4th chapter Romans. To Galatians, he says, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith, not to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ." * * * "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." * * "For ye are all the children of God through faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." * * And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Chapter 3, "Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman; he

who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh, but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants, the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, * and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." * * Now, we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. * * * * Cast out the bond-woman and her son; for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the Son of the free woman—we are not children of the bond-woman but of the free." Chapter 4.

These Scriptures seem to me to teach plainly, that as the promises to Abraham's seed, descended only through Isaac, and not through Ishmael—that Isaac's children alone were accounted Abraham's seed, as heirs of the promise, and again only Jacob's, not Esau's, constituted the family of Abraham, which was embraced within the blessings and promises, so only those who are Christ's are accounted the seed who are embraced within the promises, and who were the subjects of prophecy. We are all the children of God through faith. If we are Christ's, we are Abraham's seed. Those who are not Christ's, who are not Abraham's seed, are rejected and not received among his seed, as Ishmael and Esau were not received of Abraham's seed. Whoever fails to recognize this truth, but applies these promises to all the fleshly family of Abraham, produces the same kind of confusion that would have resulted from applying the promises made to Abraham and his

seed, to Ishmael and Esau and their descendants. It is spiritual Israel, not fleshly, that is frequently the subject of prophecy and promise. Fleshly Israel has been cast out as the bond-woman was cast out, and the children of fleshly Israel no longer received as the seed, as the bond-woman's children were not received as the seed, or heirs of the promise. The promises made to Abraham's seed can be applied only to those received as his children—that is Christ's.

A failure to recognize this principle of receiving the seed often leads to most hurtful errors.

A man failing to recognize this truth might be led, from Paul's expression, "so shall all Israel be saved" to conclude that all the fleshly Israel will be saved. Although Isaiah says, Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed we had been as Sodom, and made like unto Gomorra." Those who are grafted in, become the seed of Abraham, the heirs of the promise. Those who are Christ's are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. This much is proper to be said, because plainly taught in the Bible.

As to what constitutes the fulness of the Gentiles we are not certain. We have been accustomed to hold the idea, that the full time for the Gentiles learning and rejecting the Gospel, is meant. If asked for a reason we do not know that we could give one.

To the second and third we would not venture an answer. They are questions we have not studied. We have not studied them, from a lack of time, from the unsatisfactory re-

sults of what time we have bestowed upon them, and from the results so frequently seen on men who enter into the subject of prophetic study and especially prophetic interpretation. They so frequently lose sight of the practical lessons of Christian truth, run off into a kind of sect or schism, after some favorite theory, which at best is a mere probability with them, and disturb the peace and harmony of congregations on mere abstract, impractical theories that we have been deterred from writing or even thinking much on the subject. Their courses, so far as human effort is capable of so doing, thwart the very ends which they so eagerly strive to convince the world are nigh at hand, and altogether desirable. He who strives to bring the church to that state of spotless and unblemished purity in life and practice, that prepares her as a bride adorned for her husband, really is a co-worker with God to produce the happy condition of affairs, looked and longed for by Christians, whether he ever speculates on the time of the Savior's appearance or not. He who so speculates as to withdraw the attention of the church and the world from the practical work to be done, to prepare the church and the world for the coming of Christ (whatever that may be) and causes an idle, dreamy waiting for some interposition of Divine power, to convert the world, or that so presents his ideas as to create division and strife, really militates against the speedy reign of God in the world.

I do not see why such results should follow the close study of the prophecies, but that they frequently

do, is true. It is probably owing much to the peculiar temperament of the individuals who speculate or who teach on the subject.

It has seemed to me that the idea of soon meeting the Lord ought to make us strive to purify ourselves as he is pure; to be earnest, active, faithful in the Master's business, when he shall appear. The apostles seemed to think it would have that effect. But that it always works so in practice, is not evident.

We believe that God fails to bless the church as his own true and worthy bride, because the church is impure. Her garments are not spotless. She is so connected with the ungodly kingdoms of earth, so imbibes their spirit and works their works that she is liable to the charge of an adulteress. Christ delays his absolute and full reign and perfect blessing because there is no bride made ready with garments pure and white, to receive him. He cannot bless the church without blessing much that is practiced and cherished in it, that is at enmity with him and opposed to all good to man.

He is the true co-worker with God to bring about the full and perfect reign of Christ, who losing sight of all else, strives to make the church pure and perfect, and thus fit it for his coming. We have been content to try to be a co-worker with God in thus bringing about the desired end. I am not sure that the idea of expelling an individual from the church is exactly a Bible one. A man separates himself from God and God's church by sinning against God and violating his law. "They judge themselves unworthy of eternal life."

The church's province, is to declare that separation and withdraw herself from association with those who walk disorderly. This is done at once as an earnest practical reproof to the sinner and a means of preventing the spread of an evil example in the church.

We have never seen any room for voting or a division in the church. All should be of one mind, all should walk by the same rule. The law should be cited by the Elders or by some one selected by them. The character of the evil should be plainly marked, the impenitent guilt of the sinner beyond dispute. The Elders should see that every member is satisfied. It can be done, where the cause is just, and the proper amount of patient instruction is given. The case made out, the law applied, all satisfied, the announcement by the Elders or some one selected by them to make it, should be made, followed by earnest prayer for the repentance and salvation of the offender, and the safety of the entire body of Christ. This would be most in harmony with the teaching of the Scriptures.

D. L.

The Mode of Baptism.

Bros. Lipscomb & Sewell: By your permission I will notice some more of the sayings of the Reverend J. Atkins, Sr. He recapitulates his arguments on close communion and the mode of baptism. He seems to think, when the people become enlightened, that "close communion and close baptism—immersion will pass away, and that there will be no more of them. Well, I think, when the

people become enlightened *on these subjects*, it will be just to the reverse. If you want to keep up infant *rantism*, or adult *rantism* for *baptism*, all you have to do *on these subjects*, is to keep the people in the dark. It will not do to tell them there is no higher authority for these practices than the Pope, or Popes of Rome—said by some, to be “The man of Sin—the Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above every one who is called a god—or an object of worship, so that he, in the temple of God, as a god sitteth, openly showing himself that he is a god.” 2 Thes. ii : 3, 4. McKnight. Sprinkling water upon persons was at first, only recognized as a *substitute* for baptism, but long after, by the authority of a Pope, declared to be *valid* baptism—but it is said but few, even of the Catholics, practised it, till about the thirteenth century. But no one can find *any* authority in the New Testament for infant or adult *rantism*, called a *mode of baptism*. T. K. Beecher of Elmira, N. Y., says, “I quite agree with you,” that the New Testament gives no authority for infant baptism. It is almost certain that baptism was by immersion *always*—quite certain that it was so *usually*.”

Mr. Atkins says, “From the days of Abraham down to Christ, the children were taken into covenant relation with God with their parents, and by the same sign or seal, which, in that dispensation, was circumcision, but in this—baptism.” I would quote more from him, but it would take up too much space. Well, let us see some things said about the New Covenant, in the New Testa-

ment. We will see there, whether infants were taken into covenant relation, with God, or not, by baptism.

Paul says, “You are *all*” (Jews and Gentiles) “the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus, *for*” (*because*) “as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. You are *all* one in Christ Jesus. And if you be Christ’s (in this way) *then* are you Abraham’s seed, and *heirs* according to the *promise*.” Gal. iii : 27-29. Now, if “we are *all* the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus, *because* as many of us as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ,” how can infants be the children of God, in this spiritual sense, till they become such, in the same way? They are not, and cannot be the children of God, according to the *new* covenant. It is different from the old covenant. Paul says, God said, “Behold the days come, when I will make a *new* covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, *not according* to the covenant I made with their fathers.” Christ was the mediator of a *better* covenant, which was established upon *better* promises,” &c. “I will put my laws in their *mind*, and write them in their *hearts*.” “Under the new covenant, God says, “*all* shall know me from the *least* to the *greatest*.” Paul says, “God hath made us” (apostles) “able ministers of the *new* Testament—not of the letter” or old. Paul tells the Coriuthians, “You are our epistle, *written in our hearts*.” In this way *they* wrote his laws in the people’s hearts. It has been done in this way ever since. Men do not now, nor have they ever, received God’s laws in any other way than by

hearing, or reading them. Are all these Scriptures applicable to the infants Mr. Atkins puts into covenant relation with God by the sign and seal of what he calls baptism? Are the laws of God put in their mind, and written in their hearts? Do they all know God from the least to the greatest? Do not Mr. Atkins, and his brother ministers know it is not so with the infants they seem to think they bring into covenant relation with God by the sign and seal of baptism? They cannot enter into the new covenant relation with God, but by faith in Jesus Christ, and baptism. This, infants cannot do. If the apostles baptized the infants of believers, it was known to all, among whom they lived and preached; and they must have baptized many hundreds of thousands, before they all died. And if so, this practice must have been continued, by all Christians, to the days of Tertullian, A. D. 220. Then how can any man account for the fact that Tertullian opposed infant baptism? Why array himself against what the apostles and all Christians did, up to his time? The truth is, Tertullian opposed it because it was an innovation, contrary to apostolic faith and practice. In his day, they baptized catechumens—instructed children. This *may* have been right, but even in Paul's day, "the mystery of iniquity had commenced to work." "The man of sin" had commenced to show his hand, but he who did hinder continued to hinder till he was taken out of the way. Then he commenced to carry out his designs with a vengeance, and with power. If a man was not told of it, he never would know he was baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in his infancy. Every one who tells him he has, in this way, been placed in covenant relation with God, tells him, in effect, to disobey Jesus Christ in the very first requirement he makes of him, after he becomes a believing penitent. Jesus Christ says to him, and to all, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But his adviser says to him, "Don't you do this. You were placed in covenant relation with God, by being baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in your infancy." Who can find anything like this in the New Testament? *Not one.* The poor man, or woman is deluded all his or her life. Jesus Christ requires him or her to believe in him first and then be baptized, as he directed, "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," and he who has not been thus translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, in my opinion, *my belief*, is not in it at all—because Jesus Christ says, "Except a man" (not an infant) "be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It makes no odds who says he can be placed "in covenant relation with God, by the sign and seal of baptism in his infancy." I had rather go by the authority of Jesus Christ than all the Popes that ever lived, whether they make up what is called "the man of sin—the son of perdition" or not. I am satisfied Jesus Christ is right, and by his word we are to be judged in the last day. He authorizes no one to be baptized in ~~his~~ name, but those

who believe the Gospel. All such "know him, from the least to the greatest;" and have his laws in their minds, and written in their hearts, by the apostles of Jesus Christ. I intended to say more about the sayings of Mr. Atkins, but my space is out.

Your Bro.

DELANCEY EGBERT.

Crab Orchard, Ky., Jan. 17, 1874.

The Condition of the Jews.

Bro. Lipscomb: I have a few questions to ask you, and if you deem it proper you can answer them through the Gospel Advocate. What is the condition of the Jews at the present day? Are they not in captivity? And must they remain in that state until the fulness of the Gentiles' times? Or are they yet to be instrumental in the last days, in converting the world? Were not the baptism of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost and that at the opening of the gospel to the Gentiles, the only two baptisms of the Holy Ghost? Were these two all, or were there any more? I am inquiring after the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as it is in Jesus.

Your brother,

C. B. BUTLER.

Rienzi, Miss., Jan. 23, 1874.

We are inclined to believe that our brother will hardly attain to what he is inquiring for in this state, that is the whole truth. When a man attains to the whole truth on all subjects he will be as wise as his Maker. On some of these questions we can throw no light.

We have never known the present

condition of the Jews or any similar to it called a *captivity*. We would suppose they could more properly be said to be in the dispersion. It was prophesied they should be dispersed among all nations—a scattered people—no longer inhabiting the country given to their fathers. The captivity was a different matter from their present dispersion. They were, when said to be in captivity, as a nation, and as individuals, in slavery or bondage.

We do not know when their condition will change, or whether it ever will in this world. Some passages seem to indicate that it will change and that they will bear a prominent and efficient part in the conversion of the world. But then we do not know but that these passages refer to spiritual Israel instead of fleshly Israel. Other passages seem to indicate they will not be converted. We do not know when the fulness of the Gentiles will come, or what it is or will be.

We have but little faith in our own interpretation of prophecy, and cannot help our brother any on these subjects.

The two outpourings of the Holy Spirit mentioned are the only instances called in Scripture baptisms of the Holy Spirit. There are two other occasions where the same effects or results follow, to wit, at Samaria and at Ephesus. Acts viii: 19. The same causes acting under like circumstances produce like results. We think these causes might properly be called baptisms of the Holy Spirit. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is such an overwhelming of the Holy Spirit, as to completely bring the

individual, in soul, mind and body under the influence and guidance of the Spirit. There were probably individual cases other than these but we have no evidence of any general or universal prevalence of Spirit-baptism in the early ages. A sufficient number were thus brought under the direction of the Spirit, to teach and guide the infant church in the various nationalities until the fulness of revelation came.

D. L.

When are Persons Married?

Editors Gospel Advocate: When two lovers engage themselves to be married, are they not then married in the sight of God and wouldn't it be as wrong for them to break the engagement, as for them to part after marriage? How did people marry before the coming of Christ? Please give us a long lesson on this subject and oblige,

A FRIEND.

Meigsville, Tenn.

I do not think they are married until before Heaven and earth they take each other as husband and wife. The promise to marry is no more marriage, than the promise to become a Christian is becoming a Christian. The espousal is one thing, the coming together as man and wife another thing, in both human and Divine law. We believe where persons are promised to marry and they find they have mistaken the character and the feelings of one toward the other, it is frequently better, in a candid and honest way, to stay proceedings and not marry. After they are married

the bond is indissoluble before God, save for one cause. While this is true; the light and frivolous manner in which young people enter into these promises and break them, is very sinful as well as corrupting to their own hearts. No man of honor, to say nothing of the Christian religion, will ever lightly trifle with the feelings of a lady on the subject of marriage. He will not intentionally excite feelings of love or hopes of marriage until he has made up his own mind on the subject. No young woman of refined feeling and a truly pure and virtuous heart ever will intentionally excite hopes of marriage until she has made up her mind to marry; or lightly trifle with the feelings of a young man. Honor and virtue and purity of feeling all forbid these. They will, with the best intentions, frequently find themselves mistaken in these as other matters. The kind, lady like or gentlemanly course, then is the Christian one. Candidly and kindly tell the change or state of your mind, and never destroy your own self-respect or the respect of the good, by raising false pleas, or trifling with tender or sacred feelings.

People married by leaving parents and cleaving to each other. This, in the sight of God is marriage now. The ceremony is of men to satisfy human law. It is the duty of Christians to comply with this ceremony, because the Bible tells us to "obey the powers that be."

D. L.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: Believing the readers of the Gospel Advocate would

read with interest a short letter from this part of the Lord's moral vineyard, I have concluded to write a short letter for its columns. I feel sure that all the preaching brethren that know more of our surroundings and all that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth will rejoice to learn that the Lord has again visited his people at Shiloh, Butler County, Ky.

On Saturday before the third Lord's day in December our highly esteemed and well-beloved brothers A. and George W. Sweatt commenced a protracted meeting, continuing the following week, over Lord's day night. The immediate result of the meeting was eight added to the family of the faithful—five by confession and baptism, one from the Baptists, and two united that had been immersed before. To the Lord be all the praise. The meeting was well attended all the time, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather; and the most attentive and well-behaved audience I ever saw. We trust much good seed has been sown, and some strong prejudice removed. We feel sure that these additions will prove a tower of strength to the cause in this section and that an abundant harvest is just ahead if we only live in the discharge of duties.

Brother George W. Sweatt will preach for us regularly this year and we feel justified in saying that the cause of truth is safe in his hands.

O, that we may all be faithful unto the end is my prayer.

JNO. P. TUCK.

*Sugar Grove, Butler Co., Ky.,
Feb. 17, 1874.*

A. C. Review please copy.

Books For Boys.

Perhaps the most amazing present form of Evolution is The Boy of to-day. How the pastoral and simple adult Adam of Paradise should have passed into the sophisticated and complex Adam of America is a lesser puzzle than the question of how to deal with this queer embryo so that he may bequeath a better than himself to the next age.

To the boy the printing press has become the shaping influence of our time. Father and mother may be voted unsympathetic and slow. Comrades may show themselves arrogant and mean. Sisters may not be above temptation in the way of small tempers, tale-bearing, or fibs. But the friends in the story-books are all that the most exacting boy could desire. If they have weaknesses, these are not visited on him, and he forgives them all sins but tediousness. He thinks their thoughts, speaks with their speech, sees with their eyes, adopts their conscience. Lesson-books are alien, to be respected or despised as the case may be. But story books are bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh.

Yet not one conscientious Christian parent in ten troubles himself to see what books and papers his boy reads for pastime. Thus a free market opens to enormous supplies of profitless or poisonous literature. Not to speak of those prurient publications which, at least, do not lie open on news-stands or heap the shelves of reputable book stores, there is a class of boys' books and papers hardly less menacing to morals and a thousand times more widely read.

Good Jacob Abbot with his model *Rollo*, his amiable *Marco Paul*, and his preternatural *Jonas*; dear old Gaffer Day with his innocent *Sandford and Merton*; sweet Mary Howitt with her whole delightful library of stories; clever Miss Edgeworth, and alas! even great Sir Walter; these and their gentle kindred who delighted the young world twenty years ago are shoved aside by bustling and coarse "Oliver Optic," "Walter Aimwell," Pierce Egan, and the evil brood of authors of *Boys of America* and *The Boys' Own*. We have doubted indeed, whether *Robinson Crusoe* and *Settlers in Canada* might not be out of print, since we heard a bright lad of sixteen declare that *Plutarch's Lives* was too slow to interest a boy of spirit, though that is the book to which great Napoleon, who is thought to have a reasonable taste for adventure, gave his school boy days and nights.

According to this modern literature there is an experience called "life" wholly distinct from and incompatible with that simple life which the home roof covers. Indeed the youth whose noble aspiration impels him toward this joy of eventful living must begin by running away from home. Previously he will have shown the mark of his high calling by bullying his teachers and superiors, breaking up the school, perhaps, deceiving father and mother, and telling what white lies may be necessary to his large ends. Having thrown off the tyranny of loving kindness he enters on the liberty of the street, the fore-castle, the frontier, the mines or the forge. His companions are low-lived criminals. His ambition is

the vulgar genteel. Everybody about him commits more than the seven deadly sins, but he remains a Bayard of spotlessness, delightfully reckless, picturesquely rollicking, always ready, one against ten, to floor the most dangerous "enemies," always loftily superior to circumstances, and in the end marrying the rich girl and setting up as the Patron of the Virtues; the inevitable moral being that the wilder the boy and the coarser his surroundings, the more admirable and successful will be the man.

The whole philosophy of even the best of these productions is false, their style is tawdry, their language ungrammatical, their atmosphere mephitic, and yet they are interesting. As the Greek youth heard the legend of Homer and was kindled to emulation of the triumphant gods and heroes, so the American boy pores over the *Adventures of Jack Harkaway* or the *Starry Flag Series* and daily sets up newer and shabbier images in his motley Pantheon. As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he. The reader of these epics coarsens, his speech is garnished with cheap slang, the pitch he handles slowly defiles him. When Fifth Avenue and Five points hang delighted over the same literature, admire the same heroes, form themselves, more or less consciously upon the same models, it is not because the Five Points have heard anything about sweetness and light.

In the distorted mirror of these prints every moral quality looks awry. Thrift is stinginess. Obedience is mean-spiritedness. Extravagance is open-handedness. Bluster and

brag are maliciousness. Patriotism is the doctrine of manifest destiny. In the late Cuban excitement those students of *The Boy's Own* were few who did not long to "lick" Spain, declaring that a Spaniard was "too mean to live," that Cuba was rightfully ours, and that peace was disgraceful. Neither the sufferings of the patriots nor the cruelties of the volunteers were an appreciable factor in the sum of their conclusions. Not one boy in fifty took the pains to know the facts before fulminating this bloody ultimatum. It was the brute thirst for conquest, stimulated by a false notion of the glory of victory, which their reading had taught them.

And yet we do not believe that our bright, provoking, delightful, misled, beloved boys are given over to a reprobate mind. We parents, by our carelessness, have let loose among them a whole Pandora's box of evils. But Hope still lingers in the bottom. Out of this moral dust-heap it is our task to sift those bits of pure gold which allure the lads. Either climate, or the vague intimations of coming manhood, or complex social conditions which cannot now be considered, or all these together have mingled fire with the blood of our young barbarians, and prompted it to seek the fuel of wild incident and adventure, if not in their own lives then in those dramas which fascinate them in story-books,

Nature commonly knows what she is about, with all her queerness. Let us give the boys simple diet, pure air and abundant exercise to keep the blood down from the base of the brain. Let us make ourselves as

parents so delightfully agreeable to them that they will think father and mother "better fun" than any other acquaintances, and be ready to accept books of our choosing. And then let us have in those books plenty of stirring times, of hair-breadth 'scapes, of breathless moments of suspense.

Providentially, virtue is as energetic as vice. Merit is not less brave than demerit. Worth is quite as likely to do pioneer's services as worthlessness. History, biography, and the infinite world of imagination are heaped up with treasures ready to the hand of those wise and brilliant ones, who will take up the writing of fit books for boys. We hope we see their names already written in the list of contributors to the best of our juvenile magazines. But their work ought not to be one moment longer postponed. The books that reach everybody's son reach everybody's daughter. And the popular juvenile literature of to-day is determining the morality of the next generation—*Christ's Union*.

One More Appeal.

We hereby make one more appeal to our brethren and friends to aid us still further, in extending the circulation of the *ADVOCATE*. We have received many encouraging letter from brethren, though we are not in the habit of publishing many things of this character. We also receive many verbal encouragements from brethren who visit our office. And if the *ADVOCATE* is doing the good in the cause of Christ that many good brethren think and say it is, it certainly deserves to be much more

widely circulated than it is. And besides, we think we could make it still more profitable, if we had a circulation that would justify us to devote more time and labor to it. The price at which we are publishing it is so low, that with our present circulation it scarcely pays anything more than the expenses of publication. So that it is impossible for the editors to devote the time to it that they otherwise could. Still we are devoting a large amount of time and labor upon it, and intend to do so still, the Lord being our helpers. And the brethren themselves being judges, the ADVOCATE is doing much good. We therefore earnestly solicit our brethren still to aid us in so extending its circulation as to do much more still for the cause of truth. Readers will not each one of you try to send us at least one more subscriber, or as many more as you can, and if you can give us the names of persons you think would like to subscribe, send them to us, that we send them specimen copies or circulars. We have received a number of good and encouraging lists this year, from Middle and West Tennessee, from Southern Kentucky, Texas, and from Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. But we are sure that many more could be obtained in all these States, and also in other states, in many of which the ADVOCATE already circulates more or less, by a little earnest effort.

We do not make this a begging appeal, we simply ask those who are satisfied that the ADVOCATE is doing a good work, to co-operate with us in extending and increasing that work. For if we were not satisfied that the

ADVOCATE is doing a good practical work in the Cause of Truth, we should at once cease to publish it. Then brethren, may we not look for a good many more subscribers soon. We can still furnish back numbers to first of January to those who wish them, so that they may have the volume complete. We also wish our brethren everywhere to give us all the items of news, that they think will be interesting to the readers generally, and any matters of interest that they may think practical and profitable. We also ask our brethren who send us money, to send by money order, bank drafts, or registered letters, where these can be had. The safest way there is to send money is to send by money orders, where they can be had. But where none of these means can be had, put the money in colored envelopes, seal carefully, and drop in the office, saying nothing about money and we will have to take the risk for subscriptions thus made to the Advocate.

We are perfectly satisfied that there is not a cheaper paper, for the amount of practical reading matter and style of paper, published among our brethren.

E. G. S.

QUERIES.

Bros. L. & S.: What do you understand to have been the sin for which Moses and Aaron were denied the privilege of entering the promised land?

We have had some discussion on that subject here among the brethren, and since it is with us, as yet, an undecided question, I have con-

cluded to appeal to you, hoping to receive in answer a satisfactory conclusion.

Your brother,

JAMES WATSON.

Centre Point, Ark.

Numbers xx : 7, "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take the rod, and gather thou the assembly together, thou, and Aaron thy brother, and speak ye unto the rock before their eyes: and it shall give forth his water, and thou shalt bring forth to them water out of the rock; so shalt thou give the congregation and their beasts drink. And Moses took the rod from before the Lord as he commanded him. And Moses and Aaron gathered the congregation together before the rock, and he said unto them, Hear now ye rebels, must we fetch you water out of this rock? And Moses lifted up his hand and with the rod smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank and their beasts also. And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them."

God had commanded Moses saying, "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people will I be glorified." The sanctifying and glorifying of God was in ascribing all work due him, to him. Whatever was done through Moses and Aaron was done by God, and the work should have been ascribed di-

rectly to him. Moses failed to give the proper honor and praise. It is possible he did more in his unbelief than God required. He struck the rock, God had not commanded it, yet it is possible it was implied. In an impatient and angry tone of self-righteous superiority, he said, "Hear now, ye rebels, must we fetch water out of this rock?" God was not named in the connection, God was not glorified; God was not sanctified as the author of all blessing, as the God of power, goodness and mercy. Moses talked just like some of our evangelists, especially the younger with untempered spirit, "I added to the church," etc. We never see this style without thinking of Moses at Meribah. It would sound so much better to follow the ancient style, and say the Lord added the sayed to the church. It would be so much more reverential and becoming. It would show that we had God in our hearts, that self was lost sight of, that we regarded ourselves but unprofitable servants, that "it is God working in us, to will and to do of his own good pleasure." Moses in unbelief failed to honor and sanctify God before the people, by taking the honor to himself. For this God refused him admittance to the land of promise.

D. L.

Brothers L. & S: The Bible says thou shalt not kill. Christ says in Luke 22nd ch. 26th verse "he that hath no sword let him sell his garment and buy one." What were they intended for? Swords are used to fight with. In 1 Cor. 5. 5, "deliver such a one, (such a fornicator) to Satan for the destruction of the

flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." Please explain through the Advocate, and oblige,

Yours in the Fraternity,

A. J. ROBINSON.

We can only tell what was done with the sword. When he told them to sell their garment and buy, one said to him "Lord here are two swords, he said it is enough." When the multitude came against him with swords and staves, "one of them that were with him drew a sword and smote the servant of the high priest and cut off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, put up again thy sword into his place; for all those that take the sword shall perish by the sword. Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels." He only used the sword to show they must not use it.

2nd. The passage is involved in some difficulty—I am inclined to believe the meaning of it, for the destruction of the rule or dominion of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved.

The delivering him to Satan was the excluding him from the association and companionship of the good and the holy. Cut off from the ordinances and appointments of the Lord's house—humiliated and shamed by the disgrace consequent upon a refusal of the Lord's people to associate with him, he may subjugate his fleshly lusts, that his soul or his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. This seems to me the true meaning.

D. L.

Bro. Lipscomb: Please explain, through the Advocate, the last five verses of the 17th chapter of Luke, particularly the last verse.

Also, If calling the church, "The Christian Church,"—is objectionable, by what name should it be designated? Should a person ask you to what church you belong, what would be your reply?

AN EARNEST INQUIRER.

Jordan Ky. Feb. 9th.

The following are the verses: "Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it. I tell you in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken and the other shall be left. Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two men shall be in the field, the one shall be taken and the other left. And they answered and said unto him where, Lord? And he said unto them, wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." In this passage the Savior is foretelling directly, the destruction of Jerusalem; and indirectly the final end of the world. We have no doubt but that both these events will be similar, especially as pertains to the actions and doings of men. When the flood came, Noah and his family, so far as we know, were engaged in the common pursuits of life, side by side with the rest of the antediluvian world. But at the coming of the flood, Noah and his family were gathered into the ark while the others were destroyed with one common destruction. In the days of Lot, he

and the wicked inhabitants of the plain were toiling on in the common pursuits of life, till the very day Lot and his family were rescued, and the wicked were all destroyed. So it was to be at the destruction of Jerusalem. And such no doubt it really was, and such it will be at the final end of the world. The Savior let them know it would not be in the power of any to tell just when the end would come. And as not even the righteous should be able to tell when the end would come, it would necessarily be their duty to continue their daily avocations to the end. And as the righteous always have, and doubtless always will be mixed up among the wicked, and frequently engaged with them in the same avocations, so it was to be at the destruction of Jerusalem, and so doubtless it will be at the close of time. For often, in the same family, some are the servants of God, and some are not. Sometimes one brother is a Christian, and another a wicked man. Sometimes the husband, and sometimes the wife is a servant of God, and the other a sinner. And in this way, and by contact in society in general, the righteous and the wicked are associated together in this life, and always will be. Two men working together; the one saved, the other destroyed. So it really was at the destruction of Jerusalem. The righteous and the wicked were all mixed up together in the same towns, cities, neighborhoods and countries. But just before the final blow was given to the city of Jerusalem, the righteous, as we are informed by history, were given an opportunity to depart out, and thus

avoid the terrible calamity that befell the wicked and the doomed City. Eusebius informs us that forty thousand Christians were saved from the awful destruction that befell Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. This is the principle evidently that the Savior meant to illustrate by the two men, and two women working together, and one of them taken and the other left. In the passage, whosoever will seek to save his life shall lose it, he evidently means, that if a man will place a higher estimate upon this poor mortal life than upon an eternal life in heaven, and shall sacrifice the principles of eternal life to save, secure, or prolong this physical, this mortal life, he shall lose his soul, his eternal life. But if he be willing to sacrifice this mortal life rather than sacrifice the principle that pertains to eternal life, and which alone can prepare one for eternal life, he shall save his soul, or gain eternal life in heaven. Hence, if a man loves anything pertaining to this life more than he loves God, and the holy and divine principles upon which he has required his people to live, he need have no hope or expectation of heaven. "Wheresoever the body is thither will the eagles be gathered together." Christ had just been telling the disciples what should take place at the destruction of Jerusalem, and they asked him where? and the above is the answer to their question.

The answer amounts to saying, these things will take place with the Jewish nation, and in Jerusalem. Just as the eagles or vultures will gather together where the dead body is, upon which they can feast, so the spoilers, the destroyers, which God

would raise up against the Jews, would gather where they lived, in their country, and about their cities, where they and their property were, that they might destroy them and gather upon their goods. The Jewish nation then, was almost ripe for destruction; they were then rejecting the Savior, and soon after the utterance of the above language, they crucified him, and when the apostles were sent out to preach to them, the masses of them rejected the gospel, and persecuted and put to death the apostles and thus filled up their cup of iniquity. So that near the year seventy, the Roman armies gathered about the Jewish nation and Jerusalem, like the eagles would gather around a body upon which they desired to feed, and in the space of four years the city was taken and destroyed, together with the Jewish nation. Never, perhaps did a nation suffer as this nation suffered, and never were a people more thoroughly broken up and scattered.

Regarding the expression, "The Christian church," the only objection that I know of that could with propriety be urged against it, is that it is not a Scriptural expression, and Paul to Timothy says, "hold fast the form of sound words." And by sound words he doubtless means Scriptural words, or words found in the Scriptures. We nowhere in the Bible have the expression "The Christian Church," but we have the expression "the church of God," many times. Paul addresses both his letters to the Corinthians "to the church of God." To Timothy, when speaking of the qualification of elders, he says, "for if a man know not how to rule his

own house, how shall he take care of the church of God." 1 Tim. 3, 5. To the elders of the church of Ephesus he said, "feed the church of God." Acts 20.

So we also frequently have the expression "the kingdom of God." This therefore would be a Scriptural appellation. It is better always to call Bible things by Bible names. We might establish the expression "Christian Church" by a process of reasoning, thus: The church or congregation of God, is a church or congregation of Christians; and a church or congregation of Christians, would be a Christian Church or congregation. To say a Christian congregation meaning an individual one, (the word church more properly means a congregation) or the Christian Congregation, meaning the whole family of God, would do no violence to the word of God as we can see, only simply in not holding fast the form of sound words, which however, we regard a very important matter. If all men who speak on the subject of religion would speak as the oracles of God speak, all would speak alike, when speaking on the same subject, and soon all divisions and party names, and party interests would be done away. Hence, if we would all say the church of God, or the kingdom of God, instead of saying the Christian Church, we would thus make one more step towards a pure speech, a sound speech, that could not be condemned. As individuals, we may Scripturally be called *Christians*, but as a body of people we should say the church of God, or the kingdom of God. The word church is woefully misunderstood, and misap-

plied at the present time, and we should use it with great care.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S: Can a Christian consistently belong to any secret institution?

Paul says in Eph. 5th chapter and 12th verse. "For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." Who is that pronoun "them" spoken of there? You will please give me an answer soon.

Yours affectionately,

H. L. B.

We have never been able to see any reason for secret societies in a country like ours. In despotic governments, there may be some excuse and even justification for men of the world forming secret societies to accomplish ends that could not be accomplished openly. But in this country no such necessity exists. We have never believed that any good pertaining to any association would lose its influence or be hindered by being made public. The bad and indifferent ought to perish. The "them," in the verse quoted, refers to those who did evil works in darkness or secret among the heathen. But the works done by them in secret are specified in the preceding verses. "Fornication, whoredom, uncleanness, covetousness." I do not think it refers to the same class of works performed by our secret societies at this day. Indeed I think they do no works in secret. Their works are usually done with a good deal of publicity and parade.

We have never been able to see

why a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, should desire any other society than that formed by the Lord Jesus Christ for his subjects. Through this he proposes to bestow all good here and hereafter.

D. L.

Brethren L. & S: Please give through the Advocate an exposition of 3rd verse, of the second chapter of the book of Job.

Can we for a moment think that the all-wise merciful and omnipotent God can be moved or influenced to destroy a perfect and upright man, without cause.

Your Bro.,

W. A. BRUMMER.

Hendersou Tenn. May 29th 1873.

It does not say, that God was moved or influenced to destroy Job. It says the devil moved him or endeavored to influence him but failed. The whole book of Job is a clear representation of this. God had so much faith in Job, he was willing for the devil to test him, try his fidelity but in the end God blessed him.

Many times one person moves or strives to influence another to a certain reverse but fails in influencing him. He moves him, but the other is not moved.

D. L.

Repentance Toward God and Faith in Christ.

A brother from Whitesburg Ga. asks why Paul places repentance toward God before faith in the Lord Jesus Christ in Acts 20-21. "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto

you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ," In the first place Paul spoke to individuals with ordinary common sense. So he was not careful always to preserve the exact order in which the requirements or conditions of pardon occurred, when speaking and writing to those familiar with the idea of conversion. Hence Romans 10-9. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Now there he places confession with the mouth before believing with the heart. Yet none think that a man is required to confess with the mouth before he believes with the heart. When the terms are first given to ignorant individuals the specific order is given, and all the conditions specified in order. Afterward one is made to represent the whole, frequently, and the order is not observed.

Again there is a reason why our duties to God, the Father should be recognized before those to Christ our Saviour. We must believe in God before we believe in Christ. Repentance toward God necessarily leads to faith in Christ. A turning toward God brings to Christ. Especially was this true to the Jews. They believed professedly in God, but their heart was far from him. A repentance from this rebellion against God, a harmonizing with the known will of God—was essential to acceptable faith in the Son of God. It was the first step in the reception of Christ.

We think the first explanation we gave is the true one.

D. L.

OBITUARY.

Fell asleep in Jesus in the evening of the 2nd of July 1873, of Cholera at her residence in Bedford County Tenn, Sister Harriett Freeman, daughter of Barker and Nancy Johnson of Rutherford Co, and wife of Bro. Joseph H. Freeman. She died giving council to her husband, children and friends that were in attendance. She died leaving a memory of virtue, piety and devotion. Seldom do we ever witness a more rapturous departure out of this world than that which was granted to sister Harriett Freeman. May her husband and seven children find consolation in the recollection of her Faith, hope and works.

Sister Harriett was born April 12th 1825, married Bro. Joseph H. Freeman Dec. 7th 1843. Confessed the Savior in August 1859, and was baptized by that faithful, fearless, and able defender of the grace of God, Geo. W. Cone, since which time she lived in the faith and died in hope of a glorious immortality. Then let us sing.

Peaceful be thy silent slumber,
Peaceful in the grave so low,
She no more will join our number,
She no more our song will know.

Yet again we hope to meet her
When the days of life are fled
Then in heaven with joy to greet her.
Where no farewell tear is shed

SMITH BOWLIN.

Bell Buekle Bedford Co. Tenn. Feb. 8 1874.

Query For Bro. Brents.

What has become of Bro. Brents work? The prospectus took well with the brethren and neighbors, and a goodly number of copies were engaged. I think more notice of the present condition of the work, in the Advocate would meet a generally felt want. I have had the subscription price of one copy, in my pocket for more than six months.

Yours in the one faith

J. H. LAUDERDALE.

Covington Tenn., Feb. 16th 1874.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

Old Harding's Revenge.

BY S. ANNIE FROST.

I had been in the pretty little village of Millville, paying a visit to my aunt there, for two weeks, when I first saw Roger Harding. My little cousin Bob and I were walking together through a shady lane when he pointed out to me an old man, very ragged and dirty, seated upon a stone, eating some scraps of cold meat and bread.

"There's old Skinfint Harding," said the boy, contemptuously.

I looked gravely at my little cousin. "The poor man looks to me old and suffering," I said, "and it pains me to hear a child speak slightly of the aged."

Bob looked a little ashamed, "But, cousin, he's a regular old miser. He makes money enough for decent clothes and food by going errands, selling rags, and doing odd chores, and he starves and saves every penny. We boys nearly worry the life out of him. We steal his hat and hide it, and get his old rag-bag to throw the rags all about; and last week Joe Grant and I told him his house was a fire. You ought to have seen him hobble off in a hurry, as white as a sheet. He was so scared he forgot to scold at us when he saw us again. Wasn't it fun to see him hurrying along, his rag-bag hanging after him, and his hair all streaming out under

his hat! He was half frightened to death."

"And do you call that *fun*?" I asked. "Giving a poor harmless old man a fit of terror that may shorten his life! It seems to me a very poor sort of fun, Bob."

"Oh! you are so fussy, cousin," Bob replied, uneasily. "All the boys torment old Harding."

"Shame on all of them, then," I said. "Some might be excused for ignorance, but not you, Bob. You know it is wrong."

Bob at that moment detected a squirrel up a tree, and the conversation was interrupted by his darting off after him. He was not sorry to have an excuse to finish my lecture, and I did not see him again till tea-time.

He was not a bad boy, not a cruel boy either, this cousin Bob, but a very thoughtless one of nine years of age. Wherever the other boys led, Bob was very apt to follow, not stopping because they were bent on mischief. He was a truthful, honest boy, but his scrapes were endless. Yet I had never thought Bob could be guilty of the cruelty and irreverence for old age which he had just confessed to me. The next morning I caught him after breakfast, and, after a long talk, he would join in no more of the plans for tormenting the poor old ragman. It was still early in the forenoon when I saw him starting off to sail his boat on some of the little puddles or ponds near the river.

"Remember, Bob," Aunt Lizzie cried, "you must not sail it on the river."

"Not at the bridge, mother? It is

safe at the bridge if I have plenty of string."

"Not on the river at all! It is very deep water at the bridge, and if you lost your balance you would certainly be drowned. "Stay at the ponds."

Bob walked off swinging his boat in his hand, and I was sewing busily some time later when Aunt Lizzie called me.

"Would you mind taking a walk as far as the bridge?" she asked. "Bob, I am sorry to say, forgets to obey me sometimes, and I am uneasy about the river. If he is there please bring him home and his father will punish him."

I walked down to the river, seeing nothing of Bob near the ponds, where he was allowed to sail his boats, nor beyond, until I was on the bridge, when, on the railing, his feet hanging down outside, I discovered my naughty little cousin. Whether the sight of my face startled him or he lost his balance from some other cause I cannot say, but a moment after I saw him perched upon the railing I heard a cry and splash and Bob was struggling in the water.

I ran from the bridge to the bank, calling for help, and saw start up from a rock seat the old man we had seen the day before. He looked out at the water, throwing off his hat and ragged coat.

"One of them tormenting boys," I heard him mutter. "Small loss if he did drown!"

Then he plunged into the water, and swam toward the spot where Bob had gone down. I still stood screaming, and several men ran to the bridge throwing over ropes, while one hastily got out a boat from a boat-house

near by. Bob came to the surface and the old man seized him, but the struggle in the water seemed dangerous for both. Bob clung desperately to his preserver, whose feeble strength was failing very fast, and there is little doubt that both would have been drowned if the old man had not caught one of the ropes thrown from the bridge. He clung fast to this, holding the boy's head above the water until the boat came up and both were saved.

We were all too much frightened and thankful to punish Bob as he deserved, and the wetting and terror were a good lesson for him. As soon as I saw him safe in bed, I started for the old man's hut with a basket my uncle's clothing, and a charge to find out in what way Aunt Lizzie could most acceptably prove her gratitude.

Already, however, the poor man had been decently clothed, and his wet garments were drying on the fence, while near by a subdued group of boys stood looking at him, quite forgetting to jeer him for wearing his Sunday clothes on a week day. I took a seat beside him, and told my errand.

"Thank you, miss," he said gently, "I don't deny the clothes will be very handy, for it is hard for an old man like me to support four helpless people."

"Four!" I said, "I thought you were alone."

"I live alone ma'am. The hut, poor as it is, is my home for many a long year. But my daughter is in the next parish with a crippled husband and two babies, and not a bite nor a sup to eat except what I can send

them. My son-in-law had a fall and it left his legs useless, ma'am, while his health is very bad, so Mary do be most of the time nursing him. I'd get along pretty well here if it wasn't for the boys, but they do torment me awful. You see, one way I live is by buying rags all about here, and getting a trifle more than I give for them at the factory, two miles from the village, and if them boys can get my bag and scatter the rags all about they think it is the best kind of sport. That little chap now, Bob, he's done it often, and a bit back, Mary came over, with her babies, and went to the paper factory for me, leaving the bits of young ones in the hut here. I went to the village for some bread and milk for them, and met Bob and another lad screaming out the hut was a-fire. I never mistrusted it was one of their tricks, but thought of the poor babies alone here. When I saw the hut safe I fell like a dead man, and so Mary found me. I've not been like myself since."

"And yet you saved the boy's life," I said.

"God be thanked, I did, miss. I hope he'll be none the worse for his wetting. He's a fine lad, except the streak of mischief, and he'll outgrow that. Thank you for coming over, miss!"

I think if there ever was a boy heartily and thoroughly ashamed of himself, Bob was that boy, when I told him word for word the old man's story. If Roger Harding had wanted revenge I think he would have had it when Bob, with downcast eyes and low voice begged his pardon for all his cruel acts, and thanked him for his life.

"There lad," he said kindly, "say no more about it. You'll not pull my rags about again, and I'm asking no more of you."

But Bob did not rest till all the boys joined him in the resolution to change their tormenting ways for helpful ones, and to-day, there is not a more popular man in Millville than the old rag-man, who often finds upon his step boyish offerings of pennies, apples, turnovers or gingerbread.

Uncle got the crippled son-in-law into the hospital and the daughter brought the babies and lives with her father, earning something by sewing, and making the poor hut more home-like while hoping the doctors words will prove true and her husband soon be able to work again.—*Methodist.*

The College Pen.

The above is the title of a Monthly Paper, in neat Pamphlet form, published by the members of Neophogen Collegs, Cross Plains, Tenn. The February No. is before us, and contains some well written articles. Subscription price, .150 in Advance.

Address, W. D. CORKREN Ed.

Cross Plains Robertson Co. Tenn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

More about the Brents--Ditzler Debate— Mr. Ditzler's new position—A Para- graph on Courtesy.....	193
The Fullness of the Gentiles and the future of the Jews.....	196
The Mode of baptism.....	199
The Condition of the Jews.....	202
When are persons Married.....	203
Church News.....	203
Books for Boy's.....	204
One More Appeal.....	206
Queries.....	207
Repentance toward God and Faith in Christ	212
Obituaries.....	213
Query for Bro. Brents.....	213
Fireside.	
Old Harding's Revenge.....	214
The College Pen.....	216

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 10.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MARCH 5, 1874.

Crusade of the Women upon Whiskey Sellers.

Most of our readers we presume have heard something of the war that is now carried on by the women of Ohio and some other States against saloon-keepers. To give some idea of how this warfare is carried on, we give the following from "The Methodist," of Feb. 21 :

"The woman's war upon the dram-shops spreads, and gathers force as it goes on. We hear of it in all parts of Ohio; it has begun in several towns in Indiana; a movement has been made in Wheeling, West Virginia; and on Long Island it appears in a modified shape, in the negotiations which the women are carrying on with the South-Side Railroad. The work is prosecuted with earnestness and prudence, which give good ground for hope that permanent results will be gained by it. The plan of operations is simple, and has proved so far generally efficacious. The movement is under the control of the women; the duty of securing the moral support of the men of the place is not neglected, but it is not

expected that they will be called upon to give active help until some event occurs which renders their intervention necessary for the protection of the real laborers. The operations commence with religious meetings in some of the churches. An address is prepared and presented to the saloon-keepers, worded in temperate and even kindly language, setting forth the evil results attendant upon their traffic, and the woe it inflicts especially upon women. Prayer-meetings are then held—in the saloon, if the permission of the keeper can be obtained; if not, in the street in front of his door—and the effort is kept up with prayer, exhortation and persuasion, until the object of the visitation agrees to give up his nefarious business.

One of the most promising features of the proceedings is the energy and determination with which they are conducted. "Ordinarily," says one account, "the exercises are begun at 5 o'clock in the morning, and continued until 10 o'clock at night." At Hillsboro, O., one woman, of ample means, says she has laid by \$20,000 for the purpose of seeing the

crusade through, and others are said to be "just as ready, and liberal, according to their means." At London, Ohio, two organizations have been formed, one of women and one of men, which are intended to be permanent. One of the leaders in the movement at this place, says that it is their intention to hold themselves in readiness to march at any moment, if it be three years from now, and that the only signal for action necessary will be a drunken man. It is not only in words and professions that such determination is exhibited. The real practical test is given, in the sacrifice of personal comfort shown by the large crowds exposing themselves in the streets, in rain, or snow, or mud, or slush, enduring all the changes of the most capricious of winter climates day after day. At Franklin, Ohio, we read that "all came with umbrellas and waterproofs, in readiness for the rain about to fall. A few who were delicate or aged were seated on chairs provided by male friends, but the majority stood on the wet pavement, or in the mud of the street, but seemed as much at home as in their own parlors." There is heroism in such endurance, worthy to be compared with any instances.

It has been suggested that the movement may degenerate, that it may tend to bring prayer into light repute, and may be followed by reaction to the detriment of temperance. This cannot be while it is prosecuted with earnestness and sincerity, and managed with a due degree of discretion. Real prayer never yet brought itself into light repute, and we may trust to God that it never will. Some

excellent suggestions have been made by Dr. Lewis as vital for the governance of the operations, which, if observed, cannot fail to keep them within the bounds of wisdom, and assure for them a respectable degree of success. They are: 1. That there shall be a general interest in the movement in the town, and that the various churches shall heartily participate. 2. That there shall be a committee of at least seventy-five women for every twenty-five dram shops and that their movements shall be simultaneous. 3. That a large number of responsible men shall pledge themselves to stand behind the women with their pocket-books in hand. The last is for the payment of costs to which the women may be subjected, for the use of money as a persuasive is strongly objected to as likely to bring harm to the cause. In all the operations, moral force alone is to be depended upon. Only after this has been tried faithfully and found to fail will the law be invoked.

One of the most beneficial effects of this movement will be the moral stimulus it will infuse into the community on the subject of dram-selling. We believe that those who claim to be temperance men in belief and practice are largely responsible for the prevalence of liquor selling and drunkenness throughout the country. They could at any time put an end to both everywhere, except in the large cities and those towns which are overslaved by the foreign population, if they would rise in their might and do what they may lawfully do. But they sit still and wait for some one else to do the

work, while they lament the ruin that is coming upon their neighbors. We have laws enough, and strong enough; prohibitory laws in New England; civil damage laws in New York; Adair and Baxter laws in Ohio and Indiana. They put the liquor traffic on a par with crime. If enforced they would exterminate it from three-quarters of the land. Yet it seems to have required a woman's earthquake to awaken the community to the duty of enforcing them. The pressure of public opinion, even when the law is against it, is almost irresistible; what could stand before it when it is fortified by law? Yet while public opinion throughout the most of the country is preponderantly against the liquor trade, it rests in quiet, or disputes about details, while the opposing interest is ever on the alert, unites, pours out its money profusely, corrupts or intimidates officers, and carries the day. We hope that we are witnessing the beginning of a new era."

We insert this, not for the purpose either of endorsing or opposing the movement, but simply to give our readers the leading facts concerning it. We have noticed some instances in which they have purchased the liquors of certain saloon-keepers, and destroyed them to induce them to quit the business. The movement seems to be a very determined one on the part of the women, backed by very many of the men. As to what will be its final result, we pretend to make no predictions. One thing is certain, and that is, that strong drink is sweeping like a mighty deluge of ruin over our country, and it

does seem that if something is not done to stay its course, desolation must be the result. And we further state, that we have but little confidence in anything putting a permanent stop to it but the religion of Jesus. We would indeed be glad if the whole traffic, as now carried on, could be broken up. While we do not deny that whiskey, and strong drink in its various forms are valuable for medical purposes, we are quite sure the world would be better off without them entirely, than to have them, with all their present attendant evils. But how the current is to be broken in its present terrible headway, is a very difficult problem. And how far the present movement of the women will go towards the accomplishment of that end, time only can develop. But we would urge most strongly upon all Christians, to use all the means the word of the living God affords them, to operate against the fiery tide. Christians can work effectually through the Lord's appointments, against this, as well as every other evil, if they only will. And we insist upon it, that Christians are under the highest obligations to do everything that lies in their power, through the institutions of God, and his authority, to stop this terrible evil. How any Christian man, with the positive command before him to "abstain from all appearance of evil," can carry on a dram-selling business, and thus place the temptation before his neighbors, to bring them and their families to degradation and ruin, is more than I can see. Indeed I am very certain that no one can do it, without bringing shame upon the cause of Christ,

and degrading himself, both in the sight of God and men. And every congregation should see to it that none of its members shall engage in so ruinous a work. Just think of it. Here for instance, is a member of the church, a Christian, engaged in the business of selling drams, and thus laying the temptation before his neighbors; nay, he even places the bottle before his neighbor, to induce him to drink, and he perhaps a brother in Christ, and thereby causes him to fall—drags him down step by step to ruin, till all the happiness of the family is broken up; till the man himself is often a raving maniac, his religion all gone, and the wife dies away by slow, but terrible grief and distress, and the children are neglected, and in tatters and rags, and all the bright sunshine forever gone from that once happy home. Now compare the few dollars he has made, (for we know the traffic brings money,) with the blight, the terrible ruin he has brought upon that once happy family. And what does it weigh, when balanced against such darkness and grief? How can such an one enjoy his own pleasant fireside, and the company of his own warmly clad family, when he knows that which is brightening his own home, has caused darkness and desolation in another? And can the like of this be made to harmonize with those pure requisitions of the New Testament: "Do good unto all men, especially to them of the household of faith;" "But judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block in his brother's way, to cause him to fall?" Every one who at all appreciates Christianity knows they cannot. But say

some of the liquor-dealers, "We never sell drams to our neighbors; we wholesale it, and send it off to distant regions." Very well then; you are only doing this same work upon a much larger scale. While the dram-seller only reaches a few dozen, or a few hundred, the wholesale dealer reaches and destroys his thousands; or at least his whiskey does, and he, by selling it, is accessory to it. So the wholesale man is much deeper in the work of destruction than the retail dram-seller. There can be no justification for Christians to engage in such a work. Let the brethren everywhere look to these things with diligence. But we would like to modestly suggest to the women, that while they are waging such a war upon the whiskey-seller, they certainly ought to wage it with equal force upon the drinker; upon their husbands, their sons, and their neighbors. For while we look with horror upon the man who sells it, we also look with equal horror upon those who drink, so far as their individual acts are concerned. And we desire to contribute our mite in this direction. There seems to be a disposition in society to pity and commiserate the man who gets drunk, and makes a brute of himself, and throw all the blame upon him who sells it.

For my part, I confess that I have not very much pity in such cases; for I think there is not much innocence in such characters; not much that deserves pity. True, men may give way to their appetites in this practice, until they lose all power to control it, until they are swept along by it, as drift upon the swollen stream. But when they began the practice, it

was not so. They then could have kept out of it, if they would. And indeed we think there are but few that could not control the appetite if they would. What pity is deserving the comparatively young man, who deliberately indulges in drinking, little by little, and thus deliberately fixes upon himself a habit that he well knows will bring ruin upon himself and family, sooner or later? Can any one who thinks for a moment, entertain pity for such a man, when he is deliberately, by a slow but certain process, wringing the heart of his tender wife, and crushing out all her joys and bright prospects, and finally bringing her to a premature grave—darkening all the avenues and pathways of her life whom he stands pledged by the most solemn obligations to love, protect and cheer? I ask, again, can any one find it in his heart to exercise much pity for such a one? Surely no one can. And yet how many, O! how many are doing this. The shades are now gathering, little by little, round many a cheerful home, while the world around sees it not, nor knows anything of the little heart-aches and pains suffered by the gentle spirit of the loving wife and mother. She sees the shadows gathering, but alone in silence she suffers and bears, and toils on, and tries to avert the coming storm and seem cheerful, but all in vain. And these very men who are thus acting, are many of them making high claims as the disciples of Christ. More than once, have we noticed the effect of drink upon the faces, breath, and tongues of comparatively young brethren, who had young families at

home. We have even seen those making high claims in Christianity going into, or coming out of saloons, in broad open day time. Now it does occur to me, that when a Christian man does the like of this, he is in great danger of falling, and his wife and children are in great danger of after a while suffering all the sad woes of a drunken husband and father. O! that I had powers of speech, and sympathy and pathos of soul sufficient to induce such men to forever desist from such a course, ere the awful tempest of ruin shall burst upon them. Christian men, think, O! think before you further go. Think of the happy homes you now have. Think of your tender wives, and sweet, innocent, prattling babes, and the obligations you are under to them. Then think of the church of God, how it will suffer by such a course; think then of death; think of the resurrection-morn—think of the judgment seat of Christ, and remember that the drunkard cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. And may you, by these solemn reflections, be induced to forever abandon such a course; “touch not, taste not, handle not” the dangerous fluid. Brethren, let us everywhere exert ourselves against drunkenness in all its forms. The only hope of the world is in the religion of Jesus. If that fails, all is lost. If the religion of Jesus Christ, with all its pure and ennobling and elevating influences here on earth, with its motives of heaven, and all that heaven means and contains cannot reclaim men from such a course of ruin, the poor, weak wisdom of man never can accomplish it. The whole matter of drunkenness ought

to be exceedingly odious in the sight of all Christians, and they should labor most earnestly and devoutly to put it away from the earth. And the most effectual way that this work can be accomplished, is through and by the means which the Lord has ordained. If these appointments fail, the hope of the world is forever gone.

The public sentiment of the church should be made to bear against the practice of drunkenness, and of drinking in all its forms. In the darkest catalogues of sin that are laid down in the New Testament, that of drunkenness stands prominent. It is positively declared the drunkard cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Paul teaches that Christians shall not even eat with a man that is called a brother, who is a drunkard. God intends that among his people, the practice of drunkenness shall be made odious. It must be understood that no one can hold a position in the church, and be a drunkard, nor receive common countenance at the hands of Christians. If after proper Scriptural admonitions a man cannot be induced to leave off drinking, then the church ought to leave him off. No Christian man ought ever to be seen at a saloon, under any circumstances. If his physician prescribes it as a necessary remedy, he can get it at a drug store, where a pure article is generally kept for that purpose, or by some other means than by going to a grogshop for it. But really we have doubts about the propriety of physicians ever prescribing it, on account of the mischief that is done with it. The use of it, even for a

short time as a medicine, often forms a taste, and fixes a habit of drink that brings ruin and death. A man better die sober than live a drunkard, any time. And there is no chance to put down drink, but by a strong unyielding public sentiment against it. And certainly the church of the living God ought to take the lead in this work. Let every Christian arm himself for the conflict, and fight valiantly for the Master, and against drunkenness, and all other forms of immorality; and may God in his infinite mercy grant success to every laudable effort by his people to put down this terrible evil, which is pouring like an overflowing flood through our beloved land, and involving hundreds and thousands of our youth in its destructive whirlpool of misery and ruin. No man can be faithful to God, and in any way encourage or countenance strong drink. And since the women are the chief sufferers from this fiery tide, no wonder they are at work against it.

E. G. S.

Elder G. W. Abell.

This successful preacher of the Gospel, now a veteran in the army of Jesus, at this time located in Murfreesboro, Tenn., is from Virginia, where for more than a quarter of a century he has plead earnestly and very successfully the cause of Christ. We are truly glad, that in the providence of God, he has been cast into our midst, and we anticipate much good to result from his labors in Tennessee, where, judging from the tone of his letters, he is permanently located.

We do not design this as a *commendation* of Bro. Abell to the brotherhood; this is unnecessary; his "work of faith and labor of love" are well known to most of us. I am certain too, our estimation of him will never grow less by a personal acquaintance with him. His self-denial, his earnestness and faithfulness in preaching the word, which won a large proportion of the 15,000 disciples now in Virginia will commend him to every man's conscience, who loves the Lord Jesus. We confidently look for a great benefit from our Bro. in this part of the vineyard, not only in converting sinners but in comforting and confirming the saints. We bid him welcome; thrice welcome to a place among us, where we hope again to have the pleasure of his company, and co operation in the great and glorious cause.

GRANVILLE LIPSCOMB.

Shall Christians Withdraw from the Disorderly?

Bros. L. & S.: Please give, through the Gospel Advocate your views of the Scriptural teaching, in regard to withdrawing from members of the church. When, and for what, shall they be withdrawn from? I desire as full an explanation from you on this subject as you can give. I think it will be of great benefit to some of our brethren just at this time.

Your bro. in Christ,

J. H. SILLS.

Pine Apple, Ala., Jan. 21, 1874.

It seems to us that the Scripture teaching on this subject is plain, too plain, to be misunderstood. The Sa-

viour in the first place pronounces woes against those who sin and lead others into sin. To offend a disciple in the Scriptural sense, means to lead that disciple into sin

In the Sermon on the Mount, Mat. v. 23, "Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Here the offering of the gift is intended doubtless to represent all worship or offering to God. Prayer, praise, thanksgiving, the offering of fellowship, gifts to the treasury or any other service to God. It teaches plainly that if we are conscious that we have wronged a brother in purse, feeling or character; if we have wounded him or done any wrong to him, we must first seek to right the wrong, to undo the wrong and obtain the forgiveness of our brother, before God will accept of our worship. Remember it is the man who has done the wrong, not he who is wronged, that is commanded to abstain from the service until the wrong is rectified.

In the 18th chapter of Matthew the Savior treats of offences. He there gives specific directions as to procedure. The individual who is wronged is commanded to go by himself, and tell the wrong-doer of his wrong,—a Christian, gentle spirit of course is implied. "If he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother." This shows the spirit, the desire to gain or save the brother from wrong-doing, and its consequences, suffering.

But if he fails to hear thee, "take

one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the church, but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a publican and a heathen man." This Scripture seems so plain that comment is needless, as to its meaning. We only premise it to be done in the true christian spirit, keeping the prime end in view, the salvation of the erring.

While the meaning of this is plain, some doubt its applicability to the church at this day, inasmuch as it was spoken to the disciples before the establishment of the church. But these things were taught the apostles that the apostles might teach the church. This was a part of the all things which Christ had taught them, and commanded them to teach to the disciples. Mat. 28. 10. It is again contended that the church is not to regard him as a publican and a heathen, but only the individual that was first wronged. This idea is too crude and unreasonable to be maintained. Why tell it to the church, if the church is not to become thus a party to the settlement and responsible for the proper settlement of the question? When the church demands in the name and by the authority of her Master and Lord, and the individual refuses to hear, he is to become a publican and heathen to one of the members, but although he sets at defiance and treats with contempt the whole church and its decisions, the others are to treat him as a faithful brother in the Lord! This too, in the face of the admonition that they are all to walk by the same rule—to be

perfectly joined together in the same mind! How anything but strife and confusion and bitterness could follow such a course, we cannot see. Here the whole church was personified as one individual with oneness of mind and action. Hence it is addressed as "thee." The apostles in teaching the churches observed these same rules.

Paul to the Romans, says, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrines of Christ and avoid them." 16 : 17. Here he simply says, avoid them. 1st Cor. 5 : 9, "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators; yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous or idolaters, for then must ye needs go out of the world (to avoid keeping company with these.) ** If any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not you judge those that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Here they are commanded not to keep company with them, not to eat with them. To put them away from among you.

The companying and the eating with, those that are forbidden who are within the church, who call themselves brethren, are allowed with those who are without. That is, we are allowed to associate with and eat with fornicators and covetous and idolaters and railers and drunkards, who have never made a profession of

religion, in a manner that we are forbidden to do with professed Christians who do the same things. It cannot refer to eating at the Lord's table, for this is not allowed to the wicked of the world. It is a command that an individual who, while professing to be a Christian, does these things, is to be rejected as socially unworthy of countenance. A man who vows fealty to God and Christ, and then violates these obligations ought never by Christians to be regarded otherwise than as having betrayed the trust, in such manner, as to be unworthy of countenance by Christians. This precept and principle are but little regarded at this day. Men who are guilty of these crimes, are excluded from the church, yet treated socially with all consideration and respect as though they never were guilty of wrong. But such an individual is not only to be treated thus but to be put from among you. That is, he is to be put from among the number of Christians. His course has separated him in spirit and life from them; has proved he is unworthy, and now the command is to put him from among you; certainly we think that the world and all the members may know that you do not sanction his course and that his example may not contaminate other members of the household of faith.

2nd Thes. 3 : 6, "For we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." 16 v. "If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and

have no company with him that he may be ashamed, yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." The keeping no company with him is explained in the quotation from 1st Corinthians.

It is plain from these Scriptures that individuals should be withdrawn from, who separate themselves from Christ, by unholy lives. It should be done whenever the proper Scriptural efforts have been made to save them from their sinful lives and wicked ways. It is folly to think of laying down an inexorable rule, that will apply alike to every case. Cases differ. One is more obdurate and hardened than another. One's temperament differs from another's. Here the wisdom and prudence and love of discreet elders, who enjoy the confidence of all must come in to decide.

It must be borne in mind there are two extremes. One, a hasty, harsh judgment, even though a true one, that drives the erring one further into sin. The other, the careless indifferent disregard of the case that leaves the brother to go on in sin and the wrong-doing to spread in the church. Promptness in admonition, exhortation, rebuke and working is especially needed. Final excision, we think, ought to be resorted to not lightly or recklessly, but only after the most prayerful deliberation. It ought to be done only with the feeling that we are delivering a brother, weak and sinning though he be, over to eternal ruin. Earnest, faithful, loving efforts ought to be made to save him. Even when refusing to company with him, we are commanded not to regard him as an enemy, but

entreat him as a brother. Then to remove all difficulty, we have often found it good, when a man sins, and the church commences to deal with him, to announce that his course was such that the church could not at all countenance it but that her work was to save him if possible from his own course. Let all understand that it is forbearance to try to save him. It will have a good effect upon both him and the world.

All shyness of public mention on the part of the wrong-doer or his friends is an exceedingly bad omen. It indicates horror and shame not for sin, but for the disgrace of sin. A man who sins and truly repents of the sin, wishes the world to know his deep penitence and to hear his hearty confession. Most certainly sin should be condemned by Christians, and the sinner withdrawn from just so soon as they are satisfied that he cannot be separated from his sins. This is evidenced when all Scriptural means fail to bring repentance. Remember that these means are Scriptural only when used in a Scriptural spirit and with a Scriptural design, that is to save the sinner.

D. L.

Queries on Church Discipline.

Bro. Mack: I wish you to give me your opinion on 2nd Thes. 3. 6. In speaking of disorderly brethren who will not work, we are commanded to withdraw from such. In the above passage are we to understand we must withdraw from him who will not work with his own hands in order to obtain bread to eat or from him who does not keep the traditions de-

livered them by us, or from both. In other words are not both considered in disorder. Again, suppose a brother neglects going to meeting, stays at home—a good, easy, good-for-nothing sort of a man—does no one any harm, don't get drunk, or curse, or tell lies or steal. No one has anything against him, only he don't go to meeting, can we consider him in disorder (of course we cannot consider him walking disorderly, for he is not walking at all). If so what ought we to do with such a one. This question is for investigation at our next business meeting. I have taken the position that both are in disorder. Hoping to hear from you on this subject I remain,

Yours in the one hope,

N. T. BARNETT.

Pine Apple, Ala. Jan. 10 1874.

Ataktos and *ataktos* found in the New Testament only in the two letters to the church of the Thesalonians (1 Thes. 5: 14 here translated "unruly." 2 Thes. 3: 6, 7 and 11), is said by the Lexicographer to be a military word and is used in reference to those who quit ranks, shun or neglect duty; keep in confusion, act disorderly: Now we are bound to keep in mind the meaning of the word or we will lose the idea, and of course the command Paul would have observed. There are too many species of disorderly conduct for a word of such wide and extensive meaning to be narrowed down to "not working" and "being busy bodies." A man may quit the ranks of the faithful, shun and neglect duties in many ways and be very industrious, let everybody alone and still come

within the scope of this word's meaning. Notice Paul commands to withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly. This seems to be the general command and is strengthened by the 14th verse. 'Tis restricted however to the traditions which Paul has told us are given in word and Epistle, 2 Thes. 2 : 15. What he delivered to them by word is supplied by his other letters. Not working is one species of shunning or neglecting duty, but surely does not, cannot cover the whole number of those walking disorderly to whom Paul has given instruction or tradition. The army of the Lord is making a forward march for eternal life. Some who have enlisted and have been properly mustered into his service straggle from ranks, others go to sleep on post, some mutiny; desertion, treason and base cowardice may be charged upon some. None but the good soldier is in order. All others may be classed with Paul's unruly, disorderly. "Warn the unruly or disorderly." 1 Thes. 5 : 14. Could you conclude that only those who will not work, and are busy-bodies, are meant here? The church at Pine Apple has a command from God to withdraw from every member who walketh disorderly; and not after the tradition he has received from Paul. Now you want to do your duty with this instruction before you. Instead of two epistles you have fourteen from Paul. In these are many traditions—many things on walking. The army regulations are laid down here complete. 'Tis easy to ascertain when a soldier is well drilled, under good discipline, in ranks or out of them, and a shunner of duty.

'Tis the duty of the church then, with the traditions of Paul in hand to look out the disorderly and withdraw from them. Your good-for-nothing man if in the army of a well regulated government would not be considered a good soldier or treated as such. He neglects or shuns duty. Paul praised the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11 : 2) for keeping the traditions which he delivered to them. In the same chapter he says he delivered (this is the verb of the word translated tradition) to them the Lord's supper. The man who stays away from the Lord's house does not keep the tradition and of course walks disorderly, is off duty, and does not walk after the tradition he has received from Paul. I have said that the command to the church of The Thessalonians is binding upon every church of God now. I have said that it is the duty of a church to look after the disorderly of every character and if they are not walking after the teaching of Paul, then it is the duty to withdraw from them, and I gave as my reason, that the church is bound to go as far as the meaning of the word disorderly goes, bounded only by the tradition. Paul did not say withdraw from those who will not work, but the disorderly are to be withdrawn from and those who will not work come under that head, because they shun duty, neglect it and leave the ranks of the true. Paul gave them as an instance or illustration. But in the mean time Paul has given something for the church to keep. There are some traditions for those who are spiritual to walk after. Paul said "warn the unruly, comfort the feeble minded, support

the weak, be patient toward all men." Whilst it is of the greatest importance that the church keep pure and purge out the leaven of malice and wickedness, there is no surer way of doing this than by showing a love for all the brethren and an interest in the welfare of every body. 'Tis a quick and certain way of blotting the character of the church and destroying its usefulness to haste to withdraw and show an anxiety to execute a misconceived justice. Let me state again that keeping yourself pure, unspotted from the world is of the greatest importance in the sight of high heaven and of man, but it can only be done by getting rid of the the disobedient after having shown them a love that cannot be questioned or gainsayed. The church should maintain her exalted position in every thing she does. He that is cut off from the body should be constrained to have a high opinion of the people of God. The church is God's only representative on earth and she should act godly in all her dealings with men. We should study the patience, forbearance, love and holiness of God.

Now to walk after the tradition Paul has given, before you can withdraw, you must warn comfort, support and strive by patience to restore those who are overtaken in faults, in the spirit of meekness lest you be tempted also. I am satisfied, when the messenger from the church leaves these overtaken, many times, they are in a worse state of mind than before visited, others however seldom fail to bring the wanderer back. There is as much difference in these characters as there is in shepherds.

A good overseer of the flock looks after the sheep, is tender with them and they do not flee at his approach. He gently brings the strays back to the fold. Here is the model. The church should keep her level. This is the high plain of love, mercy, gentleness, long suffering, kindness, forbearance, forgiveness. There are other traditions Paul has delivered which we would do well to think of too and be certain to walk after these. We are told to consider one another and provoke (excite, "Living Oracles") one another to love and good works, also to exhort and teach one another. Before we can say we are spiritual, we must follow the teaching of the Spirit, that is we must ourselves walk after the traditions. Then we ought to be diligent in serving the Lord and our brethren in urging them to duty, stimulate one another to love and good works. Haste or impatience to withdraw shows a disposition to display authority. It looks a little like tyranny or a desire for revenge. Hence it begets contempt or indifference rather than sorrow. No pains should be spared to keep before the wrong-doer two things, God's love of holiness and the love of the church for its members. But there is a class of forbearing creatures in the church, whose conduct deserves not the name, for they are ever anxious to be in with others and do nothing to restore or give life. This reminds me of the treatment of the man who had a chill a few days ago. He complained much, but head of the family said he always made a fuss when he had a chill. Visitor thought something ought to be done for him, but all went

to bed, and master of the house slept but guest could not for the sick man's lamentations. Morning came, man no better and the doctor was sent for and brought after several warnings on the part of the stranger, but when he came the man was dead, dead, dead.

Many professing to be spiritual and following the traditions can be just as quiet as this man, whilst the spark of spiritual life is gradually but certainly going out of their brethren right around them. This is not the forbearance or longsuffering the Bible speaks of. That is a false modesty which keeps us from doing for our brethren that which will do us no injury and will be inestimable and of lasting value to them. Love, while it covers a multitude of sins, opens our eyes to the disastrous advances of sin and arouses us to turn a sinner away from the error of his way. If a shepherd saw his sheep wandering away among wolves and looked on unconcerned or unmoved would you call him forbearing? Cowardly or lazy should be said of of him. I shall not think hard of you or any one for differing from me, but would be glad to see anything that any one chooses to write on the subject.

J. M. BARNES.

Words of Comfort.

Dear Bro. Elisha: I have intended ever since I saw in the Advocate the announcement of the bereavement you had suffered, to write you a letter. But this is my first leisure. But what can I say more. He that spake as never man spake said, "of

such is the kingdom of heaven." But one link, at least, of the family chain has passed the veil, leaving no doubt behind. The Omniscient One only knows what may be the final doom of those left behind. But there are two sides to most questions. If it were best that all should die in infancy, why should some have to drink the bitter cup to its dregs, while others only taste of the mere brim of life and then depart? No doubt those who bear the burden of life through all its stages, learn lessons which neither infants or angels can ever learn; so that those who live the life of the righteous, down to the shadows of old age, are more blessed than those who are taken ere they learn to know good from evil. Say then that the rose is nipped in the bud, and all a fond parents hopes blasted, so far as earth is concerned. Say that the house is desolate when you return home, because the pattering little footsteps do not meet you, nor the little angel's tongue salute you. Say that as you pass from room to room of your earthly tenement, you "feel as one who treads alone, some banquet hall deserted, whose lamps are fled, whose garlands dead, and all but he departed." Yet there is an image in two fond parents' hearts, strangely mingled with the sweetest and the bitterest that it is man's lot to know, yet so pure, so holy, so unearthly, that you feel more like heaven were begun on earth and the angels were here, than you would ever have felt if the little lost one had lived. To a Christian, there is a strange kind of solace even in his grief, which mellows down the human heart, and makes us precious in

the sight of heaven. Even the Savior "learned obedience by the things which he suffered." And you will find a new chord vibrating in your breast which never trembled before. You will find yourself possessed of new earnestness and new power to awaken the slumbering susceptibilities of the human heart, when you stand up to plead for God and for immortality. Your neck will be more gently bowed to the Redeemer's yoke, and there will be a sweeter pathos on your tongue when you tell the story of the Cross. As a family we have been highly favored. Every one, from the father and mother who so kindly brought us up on their knees, down to the little grand-daughter—the cherub that has so lately flown to its native heaven—every one, I believe whose place on earth is vacant, fell asleep in Jesus. I think of it and tremble. This cannot continue, I fear. But Oh! my soul! whose children among us all will be the first to break ranks, and desert to the enemy's camps? I never knew responsibility till since I saw that soon I will have children trying their steel in the unequal conflict with a world of wickedness and fast-growing unbelief. If I could live to see all my three children firmly bound to the Redeemer's cross, and established in the faith, I would gladly then be relieved of further burden and care, tenting thus in the wilderness, in this wearisome pilgrimage.

So much of feebleness of body, has fallen to my lot, while a full share, I think, of life's labors and burdens, disappointments and misfortunes have attended my pathway, that if I could see all my children as our father

saw his, I should then be ready to say, "Now let thy servant depart in peace." And while

"Jesus can make a dying bed
Feel soft as downy pillows are:
While on his breast I'd lean my head
And breathe my life out sweetly there."

I think, too, that I would be well prepared to appreciate "the rest that remains for the people of God."

"But hush my soul, nor dare repine;
The time my God appoints is best,
While here to do his will be mine,
And hitherto fix my time of rest."

"Now unto him that is able to keep us from falling, and present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever, amen."

Your affectionate brother,

C. W. SEWELL.

Louisville Ky., Feb. 19th. 1874.

GOSSIPING AND TATTLING.

Bros. L. & S: By your permission I wish to say a few words on the above named subject.

We must not appear to be pleased with the tales of gossip and, news-mongers, much less with the scandals of the backbiters. If there were no listeners, there would be no reporters.

We should endeavor to avoid and discourage the deceitful practice of indulging a tattling disposition under the false cover of lamenting over the faults of our brethren. It is often the case that while they are afraid or ashamed to mention the faults of a brother, or sister in direct affirmation or report, they easily find, or attempt to find, a disguise for their backbiting-disposition in the way of lamentation.

For instance you may go any where and find four or five brethren and sisters who have met together for social conversation, they will commence talking about everything and everybody, and they will bring up as a theme of conversation the faults of their brothers and sisters, and will exclaim What a pity brother A. should have acted so badly! I am sorry to hear he has acted so badly. What is it he has been doing? say the others? Have you never heard of it? says the first. No say the others. They then go on and relate all they have heard about the brother. They will then commence about sister B. one will say, I understand sister B. has been acting badly too, and then they go on and tell all they have heard about Sister B. and thus reports are circulated to the injury of our members, who in all probability are innocent. The tongue of the slanderer may have originated the whole matter, or if they are guilty, it is not becoming in us to make their faults public. Would it not be much better for us to do as directed by the apostle James. "Brethren if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he that converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, hide a multitude of sins." By so doing we may save an erring brother and hide his wrongs. I have a piece of poetry I will give and close this piece hoping some better and abler pen will take up the subject, and give us a thorough and exhaustive examination, show all the Scriptures treating on the subject.

"They say—ah! well suppose they do, But, does that prove the story true? Suspicion may arise from naught,

Or malice or from want of thought,
Why count yourself among the they,
Who whisper what you dare not say?

They say, but only the tale rehearse,
And help to make the matter worse,
No good can possibly accrue
From telling what may be untrue,
And is it not a nobler plan,
To speak of all the best you can.

They say—well if it should be so,
Why should you tell the tale of woe?
Will it the bitter wrong redress
Or make one pang of sorrow less?
Will it the erring one restore?
Henceforth go and sin no more.

They say,—oh, pause and look within.
See how thine head inclines to sin
Watch, lest in dark temptation's hour
Thou too, should fall beneath its power
Pity the frail, weep o'er their fall
Speak that is good or not at all."

H. R.

Postponing Baptism.

"Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." "If a man preach, thou shalt not steal; dost thou steal? If a man preach: thou shalt not commit idolatry, dost thou commit sacrilege?"

From the above language of the apostle, we see and understand if a man preach anything, he must conform to his teaching; otherwise he condemns himself by his own teachings: for it is by our words we are to be justified or condemned.

According to the law of the Spirit of life as contained in the New Testament, we do not find one single place or instance where an appointment was made by an apostle or the early Christians for baptizing an individual or individuals on to-morrow or next Lord's day. But "they were baptized the same hour of the night" or day in which they believed. Why? Because obedience to the

command "to be baptized" was in order to the remission of their sins. And just so long as they remained unbaptized, they remained in an unsaved state.

It is the custom of some of our good brethren to appoint to-morrow or next Lord's day for the purpose of baptizing. These same brethren preach baptism for (in order to) remission of sins; that baptism in connection with faith, repentance and confession, brings a person into a justified state; which is so. But suppose I preach faith, repentance, confession and baptism for the remission of sins; and one, two or three persons come forward and make the good confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. These persons are sorry that they have ever sinned. Now these persons according to my preaching are still in an unsaved state; although they have determined in their hearts to be baptized—they cannot baptize themselves, and I am an instrument to place these persons in a justified state by baptizing them. Now suppose I appoint to-morrow or next Lord's day to baptize them. What would be the language of such a procedure? It speaks in language too plain to be denied—that I do not believe what I preach, or that I care but little in regard to their justification; or at least it says I am thinking what I will do tomorrow, when really I do not know what tomorrow may bring forth. It may bring with it an untimely death to one, and it is possible to all these persons who have taken the first three steps on the road to justification. Could I, knowing these persons had no promise of tomorrow

go home or elsewhere and rest contented, slumber and sleep sweetly during the the hours of the night, knowing these persons were yet in an unsaved state? I think not.

I would be glad those brethren who appoint some future day for baptizing would do as did the early Christians, baptize the same hour of the night, or day on which the applicant made confession. Then I could defend the truth against the attacks of others without embarrassment. But when I am attacked upon this subject, I am bound, not without embarrassment to confess them to be wrong in this matter.

ELIAS LAND.

Groesbeck, Limestone Co. Tex. Feb. 13th, 1873.

CHURCH UNION.

Cumberland and Reunited Presbyterians Likely to Coalesce.

Important Results Reached Through the Conference of the Committees.

The joint committee of the Presbyterian Church, closed their sessions last night, after having been in close consultation during the last two days. The committee on the part of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church submitted a proposition that both confessions of faith be retained, and that the candidates for the ministry and ministers be allowed the privilege of selecting according to their own desires, both confessions of faith to be on equal footing, and have the equal authority in the united Church and the literature that was common to the two bodies should be recog-

nized by both ; and that the name of the Church when it should be united was to be the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America ; the members of the church not to be required to subscribe to the confessions of faith, but only the officers and ministers.

The other committee presented a paper in which they expressed themselves as regarding a union of the two churches as a very desirable event, and that there were points of difference between them which should be considered and discussed calmly and fairly, and expressing an earnest hope that an organic union of the two Churches would take place. In view of this fact they recommended a cultivation of kind and fraternal feelings, a Christian spirit and interchanges as far as possible. They also recommended that the next General Assemblies should appoint committees, similar to those already appointed, to continue the conferences, with a view of arriving at some definite terms of agreement. The Spirit of the meeting was perfectly fraternal and harmonious, there not being an unkind word uttered, and the general opinion of the committees was that a union of the two bodies would be the ultimate result.

The two committees will submit reports to their respective General Assemblies next May, but as the work for which the committees were appointed is not yet completed, they can only report progress, which will be done. Several members of the committee from distant States, left for their homes last night, and the

others are likely to depart to-day.—
Nashville Banner.

Should these people succeed in making one body out of two, there will be one name less than we now have among the parties of our time. The Cumberland Presbyterians as such will be lost, but we cannot see from the programme upon which they talk of uniting what will be gained by the union so far as set forth in the New Testament is concerned. There will be nothing gained so far as creeds are concerned, for they are talking of using both their confessions of faith still leaving it to the choice of the people as they may chance to prefer. In this event, some will take one, and some the other, and as to the name, the New body is to be called it is quite as unscriptural as ever. Why not, while they are in a state of ferment, just drop off all unscriptural names, and all their creeds, and simply take the New Testament as their guide in all things and wear the names given in the Scriptures, as a church, and as individual Christians? Why should men take such trouble to build up parties, and party names, and creeds and confessions of faith, when God in his infinite wisdom and mercy has established a kingdom or church, and has given it a name all furnished to their hands without a single effort on their part? And besides, when men refuse the names which God has given, and adopt others, they in these matters reject him, and set up for themselves. And when they go to work to frame creeds for the government of the church, and for the management of the affairs in the church, it

is a virtual rejection of the word of God, and amounts to a declaration that the wisdom of God revealed therein is insufficient to guide them, and they, by their wisdom can frame laws and regulations that will far surpass the wisdom of God. When the ancient Jews desired an earthly king, to govern them, that they might be like all the nations, God let them know that in so doing, they had rejected him. And most assuredly the same principle is true under Christianity. Those who propose to frame creeds and laws for the people of God to go by, virtually exalt themselves and their wisdom above God and his wisdom, and thus fulfill to the very letter, the prediction made by Paul of the man of sin. 2 Thes 2. In our humble judgment it is just this very principle of exalting man's wisdom above the word of God by making human creeds for the government of the church, and wearing party names given by man's wisdom instead of the name given by inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God, that constitutes the man of sin. And while we are willing to admit that Catholicism presents a very large embodiment of the man of sin, they are by no means all. A very large and dangerous embodiment of it is found in Protestantism generally. And never will any people be true to God until they are ready and willing to be guided alone by the word of God in all matters pertaining to the religion of Jesus. We long and pray to see such a time come.

E. G. S.

QUERIES.

Bro. Sewell: X and Y are Chris-

tians. X goes to the grocery and indulges in alcoholic liquors to an excess, when everybody can see who he is, and does not try to keep them from knowing it. Y talks much about X being drunk, he tells every brother and sister that he meets with and worldlings too; yet Y is not satisfied, he gets up and talks about X being drunk before the church, and tells what a bad thing it is to get drunk, although X may not get drunk once in six months. Y does not go to the grocery and get drunk, yet he keeps alcoholic liquors at home and indulges in them daily, and very often to an excess.

Now lay aside the example and the question is which is the worst in the sight of God, Y leaving the impression on the minds of the people that he does not drink alcoholic liquors, while X lets everybody know that he drinks.

Please answer through the Advocate and oblige a seeker after the truth.

Your Bro. in Christ

* *

Really, X and Y, as described in the above are both so bad, so far from the life that Christians are required to live that it would be difficult to tell which is the worst. Neither of them is on the road to heaven while engaged in such a course as that. X who gets drunk publicly, lets all the world around him know that he will freely and deliberately violate the law of God whenever it suits him to do so—that he is willing to risk his well being here, and hereafter, for the sake of momentarily gratifying his appetite. Y really commits the

crime of drunkenness, and at the same time acts the hypocrite about it and tries to create a false impression upon society. and thereby involves himself in falsehood and deception. But we are not disposed to undertake to say which character is the worst in the sight of God. Both will certainly fail of heaven if they persist in such a course. The one who drinks to excess at home, and acts and talks so as to endeavor to create the impression that he does not drink, commits two very great wrongs, according to the word of God. The one who gets drunk publicly and openly, not only involves himself in drunkenness, but places himself as a stumbling-block before others, and his example and influence are likely to cause others to fall, and the Savior teaches that it were better for a man to be cast into the sea with a millstone about his neck, than that he should cause others to offend, that is, to do wrong, to depart from the truth.

It would be healthy for any congregation that has such members, to go to work in earnest and correct such courses of life, and if they cannot, the sooner they get rid of them the better, and not allow them thus to injure and degrade the cause.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: If a woman be married to a man and leave him for the cause of fornication, and marry again, but marry in her maiden name, can she be taken into the congregation or not?

Yours in the one hope,

J. A. LEE.

We are inclined to believe the loose-ling spoken of when one party is guilty of fornication, permits marriage, though many think not. We cannot see that taking her maiden name at all affects the case. There is no law on that subject, if a woman ceases to be a man's wife, we do not see why she should wear his name. We think the congregation should receive her, if the first marriage was broken by the adultery of her husband.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S.: You will please give me the meaning of the word *Raca*, as found in the 22nd verse of the 5th chapter of Matthew. Answer soon and you will oblige,

Yours affectionately,

H. L. R.

It is an Aramæan term of contempt; meaning a worthless fellow: shallow-brained.

E. G. S.

Church News.

Brethren L. & S.: I would say to you that Kennamer's cave is a thick-settled place and almost ever since it was settled it has been deluded by the doctrine of the Primitive Baptists' God's eternal decrees, foreordination, fore knowledge, eternal purpose Election, Reprobation, Grace of God in the heart; born of the Spirit, the final perseverance of the saints, and whom he will he hardens.

For perhaps forty or fifty years this cave has been drenched with the above and the like expressions.

It so turned out three or four years

ago, that Bro. Bacon and Bro. V. Y. W— went there and preached a few times. John's successors (as they claim) locked the door. A few began to "see men as trees walking." They went to work, built a house, and in a year they had fifteen members.

I began to visit them a little over two years ago, visited them monthly perhaps twelve months, with but little appearance of any more breaking ranks and leaving Satan's army, I tried to exercise patience and like Noah keep preaching as I had opportunity. At last I found that while all apparently was still, a goodly number had been and were still reading. The result was, last Summer eight more noble soldiers came out on the Lord's side.

And now I would say that if any of the preaching brethren are passing on the M. & C. R. R. and will get off at Woodville, about four miles south they will find a few brethren and Sisters as true to the cause as they will find in any country, and they will be glad to see any preaching bro. and they would not send them away empty. They claim no treasury but the one arranged by the God of heaven for them to help to fill.

May the God of Jacob be with comfort and strengthen them is my prayer.

Truly your bro. in the blessed hope of immortality.

JOSEPH WHEELER.

Drug Cove, Ala., Feb. 16th.
1874.

Bro. Lipscomb: We reorganized our Sunday School at this place yesterday, and we as a band of brethren

and sisters, are determined by the aid of Divine Providence, together with our own weak efforts, to go forward in the discharge of our every duty, and show to the world that we are in deed and in truth the followers of the immaculate Son of God.

By the grace of God, our lights shall so shine, that others seeing our good works, will be constrained to "come over and help us." Any advice that you may see proper to give us as regards the duties and obligations that are obligatory upon the scholars and teachers of a Sunday School, will be gladly received and most highly appreciated by us.

Brother T. B. Larimore preached for us yesterday, but the weather was so unfavorable that he could not preach for us last night. Bro. L. has been called upon by the brethren of Memphis to deliver an address to, or for the benefit of the Bible Association of Shelby County in the City of Memphis, March 1st, at 8 o'clock A. M. in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. He preaches in this place the fourth Lord's day in each month. As Bro. L. has been, I hope he will ever be, the means of accomplishing great good in the name of the holy child Jesus.

May the blessings of God rest and remain with you both now and forevermore.

Yours in Christ Jesus,

R. M.

Colliersville, Tenn. Feb. 2nd, 1874.

The religion of Christ will always make honest, truthful, and virtuous men out of all who will embrace it, and live according to its divine requisitions.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

The Deacon's Excuse.

I preached at the L. Academy at 11 o'clock, ate dinner and hastened across the hills, through the swamps, along dim paths and plain roads to the mountain Academy to fill an appointment at 3 P. M. I stopped at the deacon's to ask the way. He gave it quite satisfactorily and cheerfully. As time was an object, I tarried not for words but rode off with the inquiry. "Have you been to meeting to-day?" I could just hear him answer as distance drowned sounds behind, "No, I wanted to, but had company." I would not attempt to say how often I have heard this offered as an all-sufficient apology for an absence from the post of duty. It was, upon this occasion, given with as much confidence as if sufficient to satisfy heaven and earth. Of course, I, whether pleased or not, must receive this excuse and make no complaint. The brethren at church who looked anxiously for the complaisant absentee and delayed business in all probability for his coming, must not prefer a charge, for pure religion from a human standpoint "is to neglect what the Lord has commanded and look after the comfort of those who like yourself are guilty of negligence and go about to get a good dinner on Lord's day." That is to say, some persons seem to think the whole duty of man lies in entertaining neighbors, but make no ado about

strangers. But here is a trouble, will this excuse be received by Jehovah, when men come to judgment? Let us turn over and read the parable about the marriage supper. What does it mean? God has a son, he has made a gospel feast and invited man to come to it. If he does not come, He is displeased, and if he is not fixed for it, He is offended. Do you understand from this that the great master of the feast will not tolerate indifference or negligence? He certainly means by the wedding garment a prepared character, one attained from the Lord. That is a pretty illustration of the life the Christian lives. Our life is hid with Christ in God, when we have on this garment—the new man. But the man that comes to the wedding, comes to the Lord's table among other things and there seems to be little difference in not coming to the wedding supper at all, and showing great unconcern when you get there. 'Tis generally admitted, I believe, that actions speak louder than words, when persons have not only the heaven-granted *privilege*, but are *commanded* by Him that has all power in heaven and earth to eat the loaf, and they do it not from petty excuses, what do such actions say? I do not claim any extraordinary power of interpretation, but it requires no great skill to read them out as follows. "Lord I have company, whose presence I enjoy more than I do remembering, or showing the Lord's death, and I show this choice by staying away to day to be with them, in preference to going to the house of devotion." "Lord, I could go on to-day to serve you, but I might hurt the feelings of

my dear friends. I had rather hurt your feelings and wound my brethren than to insult these welcome visitors by leaving them or asking them to stay during my absence. Lord, the question of benefit comes into my mind once in awhile, and I confess I could gain more with you as my friend, but then it is such a nice thing to be popular. Besides, you are so indulgent, I can safely throw myself up on your mercy. In other word you do a credit business. The time for liabilities to fall due is in the distance, therefore I can take more privileges. Thus, it appears to me, conduct talks. Men had rather follow the lusts of the flesh than Jesus Christ. They had rather keep the teachings of men than the commandments of God. They will please men when it would take no more to do the will of our heavenly Father. Christ died for our sins. This was kept before the world for four thousand years by bloody sacrifices, types such as the paschal lamb, the scapegoat, Isaac's burnt offering etc., etc. For eighteen hundred years it has been God's will and man's privilege and duty to show this death. Thus has God arranged that this most important event in man's history shall be kept prominent before man, as it has been represented in every slain beast since Abel stood beside his altar. 'Tis a part of the business of God's people to do this great work. What a great matter to be shown by man. What great negligence when it is not done by those who can do it.

Read Exodus, 12 and 13. Here is an institution of God to be kept up in memory of the deliverance of the children of Israel from bondage.

It was to be done so their children should make inquiry about it. It was to them a letter published for instruction. It was attended to, strictly by the Jews until Christ hanged upon Calvary's cross. Now "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." 1 Cor. 5: 7. The cross, the death, the streaming blood, the suffering should be displayed public y, and when our children and friends ask us, what meaneth this then we could hold up the gospel of salvation. We generally tell the world they can if they choose leave the house when we come to break bread. I doubt if we had not better invite them especially to stay during this service and be impressed with the gospel in symbol.

It is not a remembrance of the way God saved Israel from wicked Pharaoh and the Egyptians; from servile bondage, disgrace and ill-treatment, but bringing to mind how God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life—'tis redemption from sin, the grave, hell. To do this in remembrance of our crucified Savior, or to show the sorrowful death of the Lamb of God, is to honor the Father and Son—then it is worship. There is but one kind of worshippers that God seeks or accepts—those who do it in spirit and truth. God has not said, on the first day of every week you shall break bread, but 'tis said "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup,

you do shew forth the Lord's death till he come." This was written for those whose spirits are enlisted and who speak the truth when they say. I believe with all my heart that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. This kind do not ask how few times I can do a thing and please God? But their inquiry is, do I please every time I do it? Then they go forward zealously. We are under a law of faith, a law of the Spirit of life. I understand from this that our spirit is addressed and being engaged, by faith we are all the while like Abraham standing ready to march whithersoever God by his word directs. Or rather, we are ever marching and watching for orders from our captain. What we do is the measure of our faith and at the same time shows the temperature of our Spiritual life. Open the book, then we find the disciples met on the first day of every week to break bread. There are fifty-two of these first days in a year. Fifty-two is the full measure of faith in this particular, fifty-two is the beating of a healthy pulse, fifty-two is the proper temperature of Spiritual life. Faith like the compass looks out which way to go, the Spirit stretches the last link of the surveyor's chain in going but does not leap beyond bounds cut by the word.

Think of the chosen generation, peculiar people, holy nation, royal priesthood sitting at home entertaining Sunday gadders. What law of faith does he keep in so doing? What law of the Spirit of life thus makes him neglect so much for so little? How can he stay away from the house of devotion thus and worship God in Spirit? How can he

worship in truth when the word of truth teaches him to do something else. I know some persons whom Sunday visitors never go to see. Why? Because they well know they would be invited to go to church (a place they do not wish to visit) and if they refused to do so, they would then be told they *must* excuse these servants of the Lord until devotion is over. Faith ought not to be severed from the straight line of duty, when it is, you may know the current is weak. Did a general give orders to drill every Thursday, what would be the prospect of him who excuses himself from duty because he had company? Were you ever at roll-call? I have been there. Sick would do; but etiquette or good manners would never scratch out a cross mark. The head officer thinks nothing good behavior short of obedience. But 'tis not uncommon for man's invented manners to cross the path of duty to God. But the great roll will be called some day, when death and hell and the grave and the sea shall give up their dead. We will all answer then either to our glory and happiness or to shame and misery. There are frequent drills here. One is appointed for the first day of the week. Were the roll called many absentees there would be. It is called in heaven no doubt. Imagine yourself at the great roll-call, before the white throne and the judge who knows the secrets of your hearts. What excuse will we then dare give? Could we say to him who died for us, "Lord I wanted to go to show your death but could not, I had company." Oh what a little prop to support disobedience, neglect of duty, indifference

to things right. Are we willing to appear at the bar of judgment with it? Be not deceived, God is not mocked. For whatsoever a man soweth that shall he reap. For he that soweth to the flesh (that is does what the flesh desires) shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the spirit (that is does what the Spirit teaches and commands) shall of the spirit reap life-everlasting. And let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap if we faint not. Heaven is too great a possession to trifle away. God is mighty and good yet his mercy will not suffer us to do violence to his justice by mocking him.

the step that once thrilled them with pleasure, because that step has learned to reel under the influence of the seductive poison. There are women groaning with pain, while we write these words, from bruises and brutalities inflicted by husbands made mad by drink. There can be no exaggeration in any statement made in regard to this matter because no human imagination can create anything worse than the truth, and no pen is capable of portraying the truth. The sorrows and the horrors of a wife with a drunken husband, or a mother with a drunken son, are as near the realization of hell as can be reached in this world at least.

Woman's worst Foe.

Of the worst foes that woman has ever had to encounter, wine stands at the head. The appetite for strong drink in man has spoiled the lives of more women—ruined more hopes for them, scattered more for them, brought to them more shame, sorrow and hardship—than any other evil that exists. The country numbers tens of thousands—nay, hundreds of thousands—of women who are widows to-day, and sit in hopeless weeds, because their husbands have been slain by strong drink. There are hundreds of thousands of homes scattered all over the land, in which women live lives of torture, going through all the changes of suffering that lie between the extremes of fear and despair, because those whom they love, love the wine better than they do the woman they have sworn to love. There are women by thousands who dread to hear at the door

The *New York Observer* is one of the oldest religious Newspapers now published in this country. It is published by the Presbyterians, but claims to be unsectarian, and is one of the best general religious newspapers we have seen. One good thing about the *Observer* is, that it publishes no pictures, but news. Nor does it court patronage by offering chromos, as premiums. It declares the whole premium business demoralizing. Subscription price, \$3 a year. Address S. I. Prime & Co., 37, Park Row, New York.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Crusade of the women upon the whiskey-sellers.....	217
Elder G. W. Abel.....	222
Shall Christians withdraw from the disorderly?.....	223
Queries on Christian discipline.....	226
Words of comfort.....	229
Gossiping and tattling.....	230
Postponing Baptism.....	231
Church Union.....	232
Queries.....	234
Church News.....	234
Fireside.	
The Deacon's excuse.....	237
Woman's worst foe.....	240

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 11.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MARCH 12, 1874.

THE GREAT COMMISSION.

MATT. XXVIII. 19, 20.

Jesus says, "Go, baptize the nations, without special manner of doing it. Are we therefore to infer, from this silence on the part of Christ, that this matter was not determined? Nay we are not left to conjecture. It was simply unnecessary to state how, seeing that God, by example, had forever relieved this subject of doubt. And now for an illustration. Suppose a master-mechanic to have invented a piece of mechanism which is indispensably necessary in a region of country. He has had under his employ skillful workmen who have the model before them. He says to a number, Go, do this work, without stating how it is to be done. They depart, each to the task assigned. The time for investigation and settlement rolls round. They come, each with a specimen of his work, All right, save the work performed by the mechanic who labored in the west. He has made some changes. The master says, Why did you do thus and so? He replies, You

did not say how the work should be done. The master-workman says, Why did you not make it like the model? Now, I ask, would not this man justly incur the censure of the master in this departure from the direction as given by the model? He certainly would. Has not Heaven left baptism, as regards the mode or manner of doing, in this precise condition? "Go, baptize the nations," said the Master, but how is not stated by precept. The model is not silent, however, but ever and anon lifts its voice in giving direction. God, in one instance did the very same work which he now tells the disciples to go and do. Is it unreasonable to say that their work should correspond with his in its morality? Refer to Exodus xiv. 29. Moses says that the children of Israel walked upon dry ground in the midst of the sea. David says, in Psalm lxxvii: "The clouds poured out water." Paul says, in 1st Cor. x: "They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Is it not strange that, with so much of Heaven's light reflected upon this subject, any one

should contend for immersion, and more particularly that nothing short of the covering up of the entire body in water is scriptural baptism? The advocates profess to be acting under the Commission of Christ. Does the commission teach this? Which one of the disciples of Christ taught it? Did any of them ever teach it? To baptize is specifically enjoined upon the minister of the gospel. I apply for membership in an exclusive immersion Church. My experience has been heard, and the decision of this court of inquiry, is that I am converted and am entitled to a place among them, but this I cannot have without water-baptism. The minister assures me that nothing is Scriptural baptism but immersion. At this point there arises in my mind an insuperable difficulty in the performance of the act. Now, bear in mind that Jesus says to the minister, "Go, baptize." I begin the work, and wade to the depth of my neck. A question or two just here. I ask the administrator, Am I from my neck down baptized? If he says I am, then I ask for the scriptural authority to baptize myself, or any part of myself. If he answers No, it is not baptism (and which answer he is compelled to render), then I would inquire, Is it not a part of the immersion? Ah! is it not about nine-tenths of the work? If the work done by me be far the greater part of the act of immersion, and yet is not baptism because not authorized in the word of God, I ask the question, Is immersion scriptural baptism at all? And yet the minister stands beside the candidate and concludes the act by pushing the head under,

and says, I baptize you. Surely here must be some mistake in what you now state. I claim credit for the work performed by myself; you simply baptized my head, which you could have done without going into the water at all. If Jesus sends the minister to baptize, by what authority does he call upon me to help him? Suppose a minister preaches Christ and him crucified to a congregation of sinners. They are convinced that they need salvation. I see them approach to their teacher under Christ. They say to him, The cup of repentance is a very bitter one. We will drink a part of it, and you will please drink the rest. Help us in this matter; we are going to help you do the baptizing. Help us to believe. Would he not respond, Sirs, you must do your own repenting, your own believing? I have no right to help you do that which Heaven has said you must do. And did not Christ say that you were to do the baptizing? Have you any more scriptural right to ask help of us in the work of baptism than we have to ask help of you in the work of repentance? Again; who does the baptizing, if immersion be the only mode? I am sure the candidate does not, for two reasons. 1st. Because what he does is unauthorized. 2nd, He does not complete the work. He stops the wading process before the body is entirely covered. I am sure the preacher did not for he only pushed the candidate's head under. It occurs to my mind that immersion is rather a mixed affair. So highly important is this matter considered by its advocates, that we dare not presume to come to the table

of the blessed Lord without it. If our right to commune hinges on the mere act of water-baptism, and if our being qualified to commune here gives us any right or title to communion above, does it not follow that water-baptism, after all, is the great *desideratum*? Again; some contend that there is no salvation without it. The faith may be genuine, the repentance right; but no salvation without this third link in the chain. Let us see if this be true philosophy. If I hold out my hand, or perchance my head does not go under, is there any provision in this plan for the failure? Am I in a condition according to this plan, to be saved? I certainly am not. What a strange commentary my case would be upon Heaven's plan of saving, *minus* my hand or my head, or both!

DELTA.

Jeffersontown, Ky., Feb. 2, 1874.

The above we take from the Methodist paper of this city, under date of Feb. 21, and over a fictitious name, but published without note or comment by the editor, and we thereby infer that he endorses it. Indeed it comports with Methodism generally, on this subject. The action of baptism needs to be investigated abundantly yet, before it will be understood. The ingenuity of the sprinkling world is taxed to its utmost to get up something or other that will make sprinkling appear consistent, and to accord with the word of God. Sprinklers generally admit immersion but claim at the same time that sprinkling will do quite as well. The main point with them is, that immersion is not the only baptism. But

while they admit that immersion is baptism, still there is not an instance of it on record in the New Testament that they will admit to be immersion. Take what case you may, and they will attempt to prove by quirk or turn, that it could not have been immersion. We have no recollection of ever hearing a sprinkler admit a single clear case of immersion in the Holy Scriptures. This is another one of their inconsistencies, to admit that immersion is taught, that immersion is baptism and yet never admit that a single passage teaches it. Nor will they single out a single instance of water baptism, and say that the baptism of this passage most certainly without any doubt whatever, teaches sprinkling. Their arguments are always of an indirect, and negative character. Why will they not take some instance on record in the New Testament, where water baptism is undoubtedly alluded to, and prove that in that particular case sprinkling was undoubtedly done. If they can just find one undoubted case of sprinkling it is forever established. And until they do this, it is vain for them to try to establish it by the word of God.

If sprinkling is taught in the New Testament at all for baptism, then it is definitely and undoubtedly taught in some particular passage. But if it is, not a man among them will put his finger on a passage and say *this is it*. Will any Methodist divine single one passage of undoubted water baptism, and say this is sprinkling? We venture to say not one of them will do it. About the best showing they ever make for an argument in favor of sprinkling, is to

throw obstacles in the way of immersion, and try to show that immersion in any particular case would be an impossibility, and the whole force of the argument is if immersion is impossible or impracticable, then sprinkling is proved beyond all controversy. But there are some sophistries in the above, that we wish to notice. The writer takes the position in the first place, that the Savior gave the command to baptize the nations, but that he does not tell how it was to be done. We should like to know how the apostles knew what to do if the Savior did not tell them what to do. How could they know what the Savior meant by the word he used? If he had said *rantizing* them, the sprinklers would be loud in their claims that the word used is a specific word and definitely points out the manner of doing. Vain would it be for any one to talk about immersion, if Jesus had used the word *rantizing* instead of *baptizing*; and we claim, without any fear of successful controversy, that the word which the Savior did use, as definitely and specifically expresses *immersion* as *rantizo* expresses, sprinkling, and therefore since the word itself means immersion, it points out exactly and specifically what and *how* the thing is to be done. The command to sprinkle leaves no doubt whatever as to the manner of doing. So with the word *pour*, and so with the word *immerse*. And if the Savior had been speaking in the English language, he would have said *immersing* them, and this would have left no doubt as to what was to be done, or how. And this is virtually what he did say, and the Greeks so under-

stand him to this day. And consequently all the Greeks have been and now are, immersionists. Only the Roman Catholics, and the Protestants that have come out from them, and have brought that much of Catholicism with them, have ever practised sprinkling. Delta claims that the apostles already had an example of baptism for them to go by, given by the God of heaven himself, and that there is no immersion in the case, but that it was done by pouring, "the clouds poured out water." In this Delta alludes to the passage of the Red Sea, by the children of Israel. But if he would only think a little he would know the passage of the Red sea was never called a baptism till long after Jesus ascended to heaven, and that case could not possibly help them a particle. No one ever called it baptism till Paul wrote his first letter to the Corinthians. And evidently he only called it a baptism when looking at its results, or what was accomplished by it, and not particularly the manner in which it was done. Yet, so far as the action of baptism is indicated at all by this transaction, it was clearly an immersion. They "were under the cloud and in the Sea," and this would as plainly indicate immersion, as any thing in the Bible. But Delta brings in the 77th Psalm, which says the "clouds poured out water," as an explanation of the baptism at the Sea. But if he will only think a little he will see that in Psalms, the word *clouds* (plural number) is used, whereas, in every mention of the passage of the sea, the word *cloud* is used in the singular number. And moreover the cloud that was with the

children of Israel at the sea, was not a rain-cloud, but was a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night, and therefore no water connected with it at all. And besides, the statement that the children of Israel went through on dry ground would palpably contradict the idea that there were rain-clouds present, *pouring out water*.

In that case they would have been thoroughly drenched with water, which would in that respect have been equal to an immersion. At any rate, they would have been thoroughly wet. But we are told also, that they went through *dry shod*. This they could not do when the rain was literally pouring out upon them. But there was no rain on that occasion. The Psalmist was speaking of another occasion altogether, when he spoke of the rain *pouring out*. So, in no respect could this instance be of any service to the apostles in determining what they were to do, when commanded to baptize the nations. Why did not Delta speak of John's baptism, as a model for the apostles to go by. It is positively said that John baptized the people *in Jordan*, and it is quite evident that the apostles themselves had been baptized by John in Jordan, and with all this before them, they could be at no loss as to how the thing was to be done. Having themselves been immersed and having seen many others baptized in Jordan, in water, and doubtless immersed many themselves, and then commanded by the Savior to go and teach the nations, baptizing, *immersing* them, they could, under these circumstances be at no loss how it was

to be done, all that was necessary for them to do, was to use the word expressive of what they themselves had done and witnessed abundantly. It would be quite as sensible and consistent to leave the gospel of Christ, as recorded in the New Testament, and go back to the Jews from Egyptian bondage, to learn a plan of salvation by which, and how we are to be saved and thus leave the Savior out of view altogether as to leave out the baptism of the New Testament, and go back to the Old Testament, after something that had never been called baptism in any sense till after the Savior's time, to teach how baptism is to be performed. The man that will do the like of this, is hard pressed for argument. And indeed Delta proves that he is hard pressed, for he does not try to make a single direct argument in behalf of sprinkling or pouring, from the New Testament. He however tries to get up an inference on the subject, from the fact that the apostles are commanded to do the baptizing, and that therefore they must do the work alone, without any aid whatever from the one to be baptized. He claims that if the candidate does anything in the matter, the apostles could not then obey in full, the command given. That as the command is thus given to the apostles to do the baptizing, this prevents the candidate from doing anything—that when the candidate wades down into the water, he is partly doing what the apostles were commanded to do.

Never have we seen anything that was a more complete quibble than this. I wonder if he never read where the people are as positively

commanded to be baptized, as the apostles were to baptize them; and that they are therefore to put themselves into the hands of the administrator in such a way as to enable him to carry out the command to baptize him, and thus both be enabled to obey the commands given, to baptize, and be baptized. And there is no more practical way of doing this, than by going down into the water, as Philip and the Eunuch did. But he talks about wading down into the water, till it comes up to the neck, and then the preacher putting the head simply, of the candidate under the water, while the candidate himself, baptizes his own body, except the head. This is really trifling with sacred things. It is in our judgment, impious and wicked for men to talk thus about divine institutions, and commands.

We read of the very thing which Delta in his impious way tries to ridicule, in the baptism of the Eunuch. They *both went down into the water*. What is the word of God worth to a man, that thus ridicules its own positive declarations? He knows that no one ever wades into the water up to the neck to be baptized. Such a thing would defeat the very thing intended to be done. But let them walk down into the water to a proper depth, and there is nothing more convenient than for one man to baptize another, and thus both parties obey respectively the command given. The whole effort of Delta, so far as we can see, tends to bring one of Heaven's appointments into disrepute, and make it look ridiculous in the sight of men. If he wants to do away with immersion and establish

sprinkling, why does he not show by undoubted authority that the word baptizo does not mean immerse, but simply and only to sprinkle? Or, if he thinks pouring the proper action then let him show by incontrovertible testimony that the word baptizo means pour. But he does not make a single effort to do such a thing. We have never yet seen where any man, Methodist or any one else, has ever dared to translate the word baptizo by either of the words pour or sprinkle. This is a significant fact. It is, in reality a public acknowledgement to the world that the word has no such meaning. If it had, they would be forward and proud to so give it: yes, they would be loud and long in their appeals to the people, that the word itself means sprinkle. Yea more, it would be so translated all over the world, and trumpeted to the ends of the earth. There would then be no need of such ridicule, and misapplications of scripture as Delta gives, and Dr. Summers by publishing without comment, endorses. Whenever they will show, by unmistakable evidence, that baptizo means either pour or sprinkle, the controversy is then ended, and their point is forever gained. But while they acknowledge that baptizo means immersion and then try to bring immersion into disrepute by ridicule, they stand self-condemned in the sight of God and man, by acknowledging that the word teaches a certain thing, and the ridiculing the very thing they admit it teaches. We greatly desire that the time may soon come, when ridicule and sophistry will no longer be received for argument. Divine things are too sacred thus to tamper with.

E. G. S.

QUERY.

Bros. L. & S: I wish you to give me your ideas on the following passage of Scriptures. (Romans 9. "For the children being not yet born neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of him that calleth; it was said unto her the elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated.")

Please oblige and I will reciprocate.

T. D. BURCHANIS.

Humphreys Co. Tenn. Aug. 26, 1873.

Our ideas on these verses are expressed in the verses themselves about as plainly and simply as we know how to express them. It is undeniably true that before the children were born and had done any good or evil, God chose Jacob as the person through whom the seed should be reconciled, instead of Esau, the first-born. While the children were yet in the womb, they struggled and became the subject of prophetic teaching. God tells Rebecca, two nations are in thy womb, and two people shall be separated from thy bowels: and the one people shall be stronger than the other, and the elder shall serve the younger." Gen. 25, 23. He chose Jacob before their birth: that choosing is evidently a kind of prophetic declaration of what would be their character and destiny. He chose Jacob because he foresaw he would be more faithful to God, more steadfast in his purposes. Choosing depends upon character. We think

it probable Jacob was a much more unpleasantly tempered man than Esau. Yet he was true to his convictions.

The expression, "Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated," was not said of them before their birth, but in long years after their death, and was applied more directly to their families than to themselves. The Lord first uses the language through Malachi. In his expostulations with Israel he says, "I loved Jacob and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. Whereas Edom saith, "We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places, thus saith the Lord of hosts, they shall build but I will throw down; and they shall call them the border of wickedness, and; the people against whom the Lord hath indignation forever." -Mal. 1. 2 3.

The Lord prophesied the character courses and destiny of the children before their birth, chose Jacob, as a preferred one, no doubt because he saw he would trust God and his course would be in harmony with God's will. After several hundred years of trial with their families—Jacob's family retaining the memory and worship of God, Esau's forgetting God and worshipping idols God says, to Jacob, or rather to his family in reproving them for their sin, "Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated and impoverished for his idolatry and rebellion. He never said he hated Esau until after he rejected God. Love and hatred with God, are not passions, but they are based upon principles, and correspond much more nearly to approve

and disapprove or condemn than our use of the term. When God approves he loves, or blesses, whom he hates or destroys.

Paul uses the facts connected with these matters to show that God did not choose to bless the persons on account of their own deeds, devised by themselves, or works without faith, but on account of their trust and confidence in him, manifested by doing not their own work, but by submitting to his will. Hence he says, "the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness, because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law (without faith)."

Faith that does not lead to a humble submission to God's will, is never recognized in the Bible as a faith that benefits or aids the individual, but as one that secures condemnation. Then faith and the work of faith are never contrasted or ever disjoined in the Bible. On the other hand, faith made perfect by the works or obedience of faith, is put in contrast with works which do not spring from faith. He also clearly intimates God's right and power to deal as pleased himself, and that man had no right to complain or murmur at the workings of God's law. His character, none the less because of his power, guarantees that he will deal in justice and right.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S.: Is it consistent

for a brother who takes strong grounds that Christians should have nothing to do with the world however, to sue and collect debts. If I may use this privilege and not do wrong may I not use any other and not do wrong.

W. A. JOHNSON.

Perry County, May 20th, 1873.

We doubt if it is consistent to appeal to Cæsar to settle our difficulties, collect our debts &c. &c. It is right when the civil law is used to oppress us, to appeal to the protection the law gives, for Paul gives us an example of this in his appeal to Cæsar. It may be right to appeal to the civil government to protect us against the oppressions of the government. But if the government is not used to oppress us, I doubt much our right to appeal to the civil law for help. But we learn slowly in these matters and have become so entangled in our business and have so learned to rely on Cæsar, that we get away slowly and if we are not cautious we will fall back under his rule.

INFANT BAPTISM.

Bro. Lipscomb: In No. 8., current volume GOSPEL ADVOCATE your correspondent P. W. A. says: "you and your brethren are frequently challenging the world to produce a case of infant baptism in the New Testament. This I now propose to do, and ask as an act of justice that it be published in your ADVOCATE. I do not go to the household baptisms, or any others wherein it is supposed there were infants, but to a case in which we know there were infants."

He then gives the baptism of the fathers in the cloud and in the sea 1 Cor. 10, 1, as the example. Upon this you remark as follows: "we believe infants were subjects of this baptism, i. e., they were under the cloud and passed through the sea." It occurs to us, my dear brother, that this admission is rather liberal to say the least of it. The flocks and herds, pots and kettles, beds, and everything else belonging to the Hebrews, were under the cloud and passed through the sea, just as the babes were, yet you would scarcely say they "were in that baptism." Does your correspondent baptize his flocks and herds because such were under the cloud and passed through the sea on the occasion referred to? We suppose not. Then why baptize an unconscious babe because it was carried along just as everything else they had with them.

But you further say: "They were thus immersed. That whole baptism is figurative and is not the baptism of the New Testament. It is not the baptism instituted by Christ." Though this was not the baptism instituted by Christ if it was a figure, the fact must in some sense resemble it. If infants were in, and part of the type they must be admitted in the antitype, hence we had better baptize them. The premises admitted and the conclusion comes like a conqueror. The vital question is *were the infants embraced in the type?*

"They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." All who? All the fathers to whom Paul referred. Did these include the unconscious babes carried along without their volition or agency?

Paul says: "by FAITH they passed through the Red sea as by dry land; which the Egyptians essaying to do were drowned." Heb. xi: 29. Then those of whom he spake passed through the Red Sea by faith—*these were embraced in the type none others were.* Infants cannot exercise faith, hence they were not in the type, and are not in the antitype. Infant baptism was not thought of in Paul's day, hence he says no more about it than he does about the baptism of the flocks and herds belonging to the fathers. When he spake of baptizing either in the type or antitype, he spake of such as were the legitimate subjects of the rite—those who had faith—none others. Suppose we try the commission by the same principle of interpretation applied by your correspondent to his example of infant baptism. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark xvi: 15. Now "we know" just as certainly that infants are creatures in the world as "we know" they were with the fathers under the cloud and in the sea—will he say this commission contemplated them? If so, what next? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" ver. 16. Infants cannot believe therefore they must all be damned! Will he accept the conclusion? We guess not; yet it is a fair deduction from his manner of interpretation. When Jesus gave this commission he intended it to apply to subjects of gospel address, none others; even so when Paul spake of the fathers being baptized in the cloud and in the sea he had no allusion to unconscious babes, but spake of such as "passed through by

faith." While we know you believe this as firmly as any one, we think your response to your correspondent calculated to give him an unscriptural advantage not warranted in the example to which he refers.

With highest regards, in the Lord
T. W. BRENTS.

We thought we were sufficiently explicit in defining how far infants were subjects of the baptism. They were immersed i. e. they were resubjected to the physical action of being under the cloud and in the sea. The flocks and herds and vessels were, immersed or baptized just in the same sense. We stated that "the intent" essential to all service under Christ or God was lacking in the infant. No action where faith is absent can fully typify an action in which faith is prerequisite. No service under Christ is acceptable without faith on the part of the subject. We are glad Bro. Brents has given a fuller expose of the matter than we gave.

D. L.

Light, Trashy Reading.

There are very few things that exert so powerful an influence upon the young and rising generation, as the books which they read. It is natural for a child to confide in, and be influenced by what it reads, whether good or bad, moral or immoral. I remember vividly the impressions made upon my mind by the first books I ever read. Fortunately some of the first things I ever read, were of a purely moral character. One of the first books I read, was a book

containing a number of lectures to young men, on various topics. One of the leading ones, was the importance of religion. I do not now remember enough about what was said to know whether I could now endorse all that was said, but one thing I do remember, and that is that it made a very powerful impression upon my mind in behalf of the religion of Jesus, and those impressions have not yet all faded from my memory. And further, it was not my misfortune to get hold of scarcely any at all of the trashy, sensational reading that now floods the country; for which I am sincerely thankful. I shall ever consider this as one of the fortunate events of my life. When young people get into the habit of reading the sensational and love-sick stories that are thrown broad-cast upon society, and found in almost every newspaper and weekly paper in the land, they lose all taste for things that are solid, and practical, and useful. Some one has said, "Show me the company you keep, and I will tell you your character." So I may safely say, show me the books you read, and I can tell you your character. And we are thoroughly satisfied parents give too little attention to what their children read. Parents who would by no means allow their children to associate with the low, vulgar, and mean, yet allow them, without any apparent concern to constantly have and read such papers as the "Ledger," "Saturday Night," "Boys' Own," and a great variety of such papers, which are filled with sensational, and serial stories of love, and treachery, and such like things, which fill up their minds with the

very things they ought never to see. And when they have read these things for a time, they have no taste or desire for solid and substantial reading. To such persons, the glorious story of the cross of Christ has but few charms, and the stern, real, daily practical principles of Christianity are too dull, dry, and common place for them to think about. The art of printing has proved a great blessing to the world, but unfortunately it has been, and is now so used, as to prove, in many respects a great curse. But we should ever carefully guard against the evil. Parents should be just as careful as to the kind of books and papers their children read, as they are as to the kind of company they keep, or even more so, if possible. Not only is there danger of the minds of the young being set on things that are light, and frivolous, and utterly useless, but there is much of the popular literature of our time that is positively evil in its tendency, cultivating in the mind principles of retaliation and revenge, and mere animalism, that all has to be counteracted and overcome, if they are ever the humble followers of the Lamb. And besides, what shall be said of the thousands and tens of thousands of cheap novels, of every possible shade of character except good, which are flooding our country. You can enter no public places; steam-boats, railroad trains, or any sort of public places or thoroughfares, that these miserable yellow-backs do not abound. Children should be taught to fear, and avoid them as they would avoid poison. Avoid them as you would avoid the drunkard, the gambler, the thief, or the highway robber. Far less harmful to you is the man who steals from you, and robs you of your property, than he who perverts your mind, and robs you of your soul. Better lose everything earthly that you possess a thousand times told, than to have your minds utterly perverted, and disqualified for every thing useful and practical in life—disqualified for happiness, and for being congenial companions for the good and useful, and finally disqualified for immortality and eternal life. We take great pains to keep our children out of the company of vicious characters in society, and yet many parents without any concern whatever, allow them to keep constant companionship with books and papers, that gradually steal away from them all that is real, and practical and good, and virtuous, and fix in them dispositions of lightness, vanity, folly, and passion, and a sickly sentimentalism, that are as sure to work their utter ruin, as that they engage in them for any considerable length of time. There are none of the class of books of which we have been speaking that ever impress the minds of the young with the importance of daily, earnest, practical industry. But the tendency is to idleness, inactivity, absent-mindedness, and the cultivation of the vain hope that some good turn of fortune will show-er down wealth, and honor, and position upon them, without an effort upon their part. And these troubles and temptations are constantly on the increase, especially, in what is called refined society. And we urge upon every parent to watch for the interest and welfare of his children: But un-

fortunately, there are many parents, and especially mothers, who set the example. And there is no example, or influence on earth that is greater over children than that of their mother. And when she sets the example, in vain may others try to elevate the mind of the child above such things. A child generally thinks he has reached the standard of perfection, when he comes up to the standard of his mother. Therefore parents should be exceedingly careful not to set such examples before their children. But let them furnish for their children, something that is substantial, and real, and practical, and start them from the beginning in this character of reading, and they will soon derive a hundred times more pleasure from it than they will in reading fiction and trash; and besides, it will prepare them for usefulness here, and happiness hereafter. Let them read useful histories, and biographies. And by all means in the world, furnish them with correct, substantial religious reading. Cultivate in them as early as possible, a love for reading the Bible. There are histories and facts in the Bible, suited to every possible stage of advancement for children, if parents would take the proper course and make the necessary efforts to lead them into these things. And in doing this sort of work for their children, they are doing a work that will be a constant benefit to them and through them to society at large, while living, and thus also put them on the road to eternal happiness beyond the grave.

Closely connected with this trashy reading, is the practice of theatre-going, where they see only fiction

presented, that is calculated to give a false view and impression of human life. And besides, the manner and dress, and behavior upon the stage at theatres and such like, is of a demoralizing character. Especially so is the dress and behavior of that class of women that is connected with the stage. And yet, notwithstanding all these demoralizing influences of the stage, Christian parents often attend them, and allow their children to do so. And many young Christians, who think they are competent to act for themselves, habitually attend such places, not realizing the danger they are in. If Christians desire to pass safely through this world, and be prepared for the world to come, they must carefully avoid all these whirlpools, and pitfalls of ruin, which are scattered all along the pathway of life. The religion of Jesus requires purity and holiness, and we cannot possess such characters without making constant, and prayerful, and earnest efforts to avoid every thing in which there is the appearance of evil.

E. G. S.

The Gospel Plan of Salvation.

In answer to various inquiries respecting the appearance of this work we would say that the entire work is in type, plates cast, &c., except the index, which will be set up and cast while the first forms are being printed. The distance we live from Cincinnati has made the correction of the proofs a tedious business; but our anxiety to see the proofs ourselves before going to press and having only one mail per week, and only getting

12 to 20 pages at a time has delayed the work beyond our expectations. It being all in type now, however, leaves nothing but the press-work, folding and binding to do, and we are now on our way to Cincinnati to see about and expedite that if possible. We hope the book may be ready by the first of April at the furthest; of which however we will again give notice.

Respectfully,
T. W. BRENTS.

Nashville, Tenn., Mar. 3, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: Does a church commit an error in granting the use of her house to the Good Templars, when not otherwise occupied?

Yours,

J. M. BILLINGTON.

Old Lasea, Maury Co., Tenn.

If it creates difficulty, disturbance or hard feeling among the brethren, yes. If not, I do not see the harm. The Good Templars as a worldly organization, for worldly people, does no harm, but oftentimes benefits individuals. The house is not injured for Christian purposes, by this use.

D. L.

God's Love.

Nothing but the love of God, can save the wicked. It is a sense of the love of God for us, that first awakens our attention, and finally, turns our affections heavenward. So long as the sinner is taught to regard God as an avenger of evil—as angry with the wicked, and following him up to punish, and destroy; just so long will the wicked continue in wicked-

ness. Hence the virtue in the Gospel to save. The Gospel sets forth the fact, that God is a God of love, and this great love is manifested to the world, in the person of Jesus Christ. We see God in Christ—all love.

The Gospel is full of pleadings, as from the heart of a fond parent, to wayward, yet dear children. And who that has studied the character of Jesus Christ, but has been drawn to him. We see in Him all that ennobles, beautifies, and glorifies the human character, and every man, with any degree of ambition for good will strive to imitate him.

J. T. P.

Another Debate.

There will be a debate at Hodgenville, Ky., commencing April 7th, and continuing eight days, between the Methodists, represented by Presiding Elder Hays, and the Disciples, represented by Bro. J. S. Sweeney, of Paris. Elder Hays undertakes to prove that infants are proper subjects for baptism, and that in conversion the Holy Spirit operates *immediately* upon the sinner's heart. Bro. Sweeney undertakes to prove that immersion is baptism, and that baptism is for remission of sins. With the exception of one of his brethren, Elder Hays is the first debater we have heard of who is bold enough to deny squarely that immersion is baptism. It is more than likely he will tire of it in the two days he and Bro. S. are to talk about it.—*Apostolic Times*.

Bros. L. & S.: I find you did not get the money that I sent you

for your valuable paper. I am sorry to say to you that I can not send you any names but my own, for I live in a country that does not believe in our teaching. I do not hear the true gospel preached often, only through the Advocate, and I do love to read it, for it gives us the true gospel. It does me good to say to you, that my wife and myself read the Gospel Advocate a part of one year, and then rode sixty miles and obeyed the Gospel. So I will send you two dollars again for your good paper, as we can't do without it. I remain

Your brother in Christ,
W. D. HASTIN.

We receive many evidences of good accomplished through the Advocate, but do not publish them, desiring that the paper shall stand upon its own merits. The facts related here, of this brother and sister who went sixty miles to obey the Lord after reading the Advocate a short time, speak for themselves. And we wish to suggest to our brethren, that if they will take pains to put the Advocate into the hands of the friends of the world, many such cases as the above might be the happy result. Remember brethren, that in doing such work as this, you are working for the salvation of souls; you are working for eternity. Doing a work that will help to brighten your own crowns also, in the realms of bliss. Then brethren, think over your friends and acquaintances, and see if you cannot in some way put the Advocate into their hands. Many of them would subscribe for it themselves, if the matter was presented to them. Many brethren, and church-

es, as such, could pay for it, and have it sent to their friends, and thereby put the pure gospel of Christ into the hands of the people. Some are doing this already; who else will do likewise? You also see from the above, that this brother sends his money the second time. The first was lost in the mails. We take this occasion to say that our losses through the mails have been heavy this year. So we again ask our friends to send by Postal order, registered letter, draft, or express where they can do so.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S: The Mt. Olivet church, in Barren Co. Ky., feeling the great necessity of having the gospel proclaimed in destitute places, respectfully ask the churches of Christ around her, to co-operate with her in the good work. Glasgow, Zion, Bear Wallow, Salem, Gilead, Greene's Chapel, Christian Chapel, Knob Lick, Pleasant Hill and Refuge are requested to assemble at Mt. Olivet at 9 o'clock A. M. (Saturday) April 11, prepared to select an evangelist, and immediately begin the work. Brethren David Lipscomb, Dr. Barbee, Edward Smith, J. H. Smith, U. Wright, C. G. Morehouse and any other ministering brethren whom we have not named are requested to attend. All brethren attending will be kindly received and hospitably entertained. *A. C. Review* please copy.

I am as ever your brother in hope,
A. ALSUP, JR.

One of the editors of the ADVOCATE will attend the above meeting, if the Lord will.

MARK XVI: 16.

In the *Methodist Christian Advocate* of Feb. 21. 1874 we find an article from the pen of Eld. F. E. Pitts, headed "What is faith" from which we make the following extract:

"The world was ruined by a falsehood; it must be restored by the truth. Man was lost by believing Satan; he must be saved by believing God. Therefore it is absolutely certain that, whatever else faith may be, it is to all men a question of the last importance. Its importance stands alone, as God has made it the only condition, of eternal salvation. All other obligations divinely commanded are connected with or proceed from faith. The considerations are inexpressibly glorious, or inconceivably dreadful. On this side and on that, Eternal Truth has proclaimed, 'He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.'"

Upon this paragraph we beg permission to offer a few suggestions.

First, it will be seen that Elder Pitts quotes Mark xvi: 16 as "Eternal Truth"—some of his brethren call it a "*Roman Catholic forgery*." Would it not be well for them to hold a council and settle the claims of this passage among themselves? When it comes in their way in debate it is a *forgery*; but when needed to condemn the unbeliever it is *Eternal Truth*. Hence the passage is either *inspired*, or a *forgery* just as it may be necessary to serve the purpose of those who wish to use, or *reject* it.

Second: Why did not Elder Pitts quote the passage *as it is* in the proclamation of "Eternal Truth?" It there reads: "He that believeth

and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." He quotes it thus: "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." Thus he left out the words, "and is baptized," without any marks of omission just as though it read that way. Why not quote it all? Was it because he had just said, and wished to prove that the importance of faith "stands alone, as God has made it the condition, of eternal salvation," and feared that his proof would contradict his proposition? Did he fear that his reader would see that faith was *not* alone, nor the *alone condition* of salvation, but was connected with baptism, both of which are made conditions of salvation in the very proclamation which he quotes as eternal Truth, but from which he suppresses a part? Can he say, as did Paul: "I have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God?" Acts xx: 27. Did he not shun to declare the whole counsel of God when he left out one of the conditions in the proclamation of "Eternal Truth," and stated that God had made the other the alone condition?

Paul said he had "renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully: but by manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." 2 Cor. iv: 2. If quoting the language "He that believeth shall be saved," marking it in quotation without any marks of omission, when the Lord said "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," is not handling the word of God deceitfully then

will any one tell us how it can be done? Is this a manifestation of the truth? Nay, does truth ever demand such manifestations at the hands of its advocates? Whenever a doctrine can not be maintained without such deceptive handling of God's word is it not unmistakable evidence that the doctrine is false and not of God? Is it not a pity the Lord did not say "He that believeth and is saved may, or should be baptized if convenient?" Would not this have been an improvement?

Respectfully

T. W. BRENTS.

Richmond, Tenn. Feb. 25th. 1874.

Church News.

At Thorp's Springs in Hood Co. Bro. R. Clark has collected together a little band of brethren, and put them to work. They have no worship, but meet every Lord's day in one room of the College building. Three students of the College,—one young man, and two young ladies, made the good confession last Lord's day.

There is a rich field for Gospel labor in that country. The people are honest, frank and intelligent, with but little sectarian bias. The school there is steadily growing in favor; the attendance, notwithstanding the hard times, is good. It is the determination of the proprietor of AddRan College to make it worthy the patronage of the brethren of Texas.

The cause has here an occasional addition.

A. CLARK.

Ft. Worth, Texas, Feb. 17th. 1874.

Brethren L. & S: We have just closed another meeting at Nevill's Prairie, Houston Co, with five additions to the church by immersion.

The church is prospering—brethren all alive to the work, and we pray that they may continue in good works.

JOHN T. POE.

P. S. I have lately had two other confessions at at other points.

J. T. P.

Huntsville Texas March 3rd 1873.

Preaching Funerals.

Bros. L. & S.: Is there any authority in the Bible for preaching funerals? I cannot find any Scripture which in my humble judgment can be relied on as authority for the practice. Now if there is no authority in the Bible for preaching funerals, can it be right for Christians to preach funerals? The apostle Paul told Timothy that, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable, &c., that the man of God may be thoroughly" (not partially) "furnished unto all good works."

Then if there is no authority in the Bible for preaching funerals, the practice is not a good one. Hence, Christians should not preach funerals. What say you? Am I right? If not, please right me. I simply desire to know the truth. Please answer through the Advocate, and oblige

Your brother,

W. T. BREEDLOVE.

Woodlawn, Ark.

Brethren will have to tell what they mean by "preaching funerals"

before we can answer that question. If they mean to ask, Is there authority for teaching the word of God to the living on the occasion of the death or burial of an individual, we answer, there is abundant authority for doing it at all times, in season and out of season. If they mean, Is there authority to speak words of comfort to the mourning and sad hearts of the bereaved? We say again, authority is abundant. Weep with them that weep, mourn with those who mourn. If asked is it right to preach something unscriptural and hurtful then? We answer, no, nor at other times either. It is what is preached does good or harm.

D. L.

Woman's Work in the Household.

BY THE REV. THOMAS ARMITAGE,
D. D.

No subject has ever made my heart more sad in regard to Christian life than the thought that its great female power is so little developed, so generally lost to Christ. I do not know why it should be so! On the point of majorities, ability and opportunity for doing good there is not only an equal balance, but a large preponderance in favor of female labor in the Church of Christ, and this we find judging the subject by every standard which we can apply to it.

Woman is more indebted to Christ for all the blessings that crown her life than to any other source whatever.

No religion except Christianity gives woman her place in society, her equality of intellect, her heart quali-

ties and influence equally powerful. The Jewish nation and religion gave very little power to woman, but the Christian religion brings her out at once as its heart, and the source of its power, by tender sympathy with its Author in His work and words.

We cannot see our Lord Jesus' constant communication with woman in his works, conversations, journeys and in the difficulties of life, without feeling that it was a central point in Christ's work, that Christian work for women were in all his calculations. They always found perfect sympathy and a welcome haven in the presence of our Jesus. His wonderful tenderness of heart and gentleness of words and manners, from beginning to end, showed sympathy with woman, and attributes in His nature kindred to her nature.

We mark one crowning point, that is, the main thing in a woman's life is love, and the very essence of the gospel is summed up in that one attribute. There is nothing at all in a woman if she is not full of love. Love is her life, the standard of her character. Tell me the story of a woman's love and I will tell you the story of that woman's life. Tell me how it crystalized, what objects it was placed upon, how and when it began to develop, and I will tell you the difficulties she had to contend with; tell me the channels through which her love ran, the struggles in making itself known, and I will give you the standard of her character and conduct.

First, she seeks something to love and then to be loved in return. The strongest instinct of her nature is to love parent, husband, child. Some

universal love, some imaginary thing, something she desires more than realizes, on some distant object she paints the figure of love, on all the pages of life she reads the hieroglyphs of love. She must have an object to love; and when she pours out her love on others and gives out all the impulses of her affection, she is in harmony with the spirit of the gospel. The gospel is love, transparent, crystalized, immortal that goes out to seek and bring those who are not under its influence and power.

Now there may be honest differences in regard to woman's legitimate sphere of Christian work; but no one doubts her sway in the family, there she is monarch. The household is a parish, she becomes its priest; a world, and woman its preacher and teacher; a sanctuary where she offers her sacrifice daily. No man doubts that, and then the household becomes the sanctuary of life.

What would the family be but for the provisions of the Bible? God organized the family. He put special honor upon it, he guarded its purity, showered blessings upon its roof, brought all goodness to centre about its altars. There is nothing so permanent as this household God has so blessed; the great transactions of life take place at home. We are born there, we die there; there we first open our hearts to the insensible, subtle, controlling influences about us, to the traits and characteristics of others, and to the various things that make up the entirety of life.

In the home we begin to be all we ever can be on earth; hope is

first kindled there, fear starts, ambition is born, disappointment is met, growth is desired and development is felt there. Home is the sanctuary of life and all its institutions are sanctified by the authority of God. The church of God rests on the law of association. No man stands alone; it is impossible to take hold of these shaping influences alone. We need the power of society; in weakness it brings strength, in ignorance, wisdom, for isolation, unity; so in the church of God, one family is known on earth, one father, one elder brother, one brotherhood, one sisterhood, one hope of our calling and one central home to which we are aiming. We transfer this idea from the visible home to the hallowed sanctuary.

Jesus brought himself into perfect sympathy with home-life. Here we bear burdens and sympathize as in the larger church family, and there can be no deep, personal life in Christ apart from an intelligent concern in the welfare and condition of others. No man can constitute a family in himself; no man in the church can live and feel no solitude for others. In the family we learn to feel for the good of the whole, and there we learn an important lesson to take into the Church of Christ. In the different members of the family there is not one that is not needful to its perfection; some are less important, less vital, but all are of consequence in the making up of the unit. In the moral and religious sphere, female influence is overshadowing. The government, the physical, the fiscal support devolves on man; sympathy, moral and spiritual development, devolve on woman, and that overshadow

ows all other influences. Woman is the lamp that gives light to the house. If it is darkness, how dark the place! What is a home without a Christian woman in it? a Christian wife, sister, friend, to lift those around them into sympathy with God.

God knew well with what attributes to endow a mother when he gave a child to her care. I don't know how to define a mother's influence or love. There is a sort of charm, a talisman, a magic in it, a power that seems to have semi-almightiness, that reaches every heart of man, and it is doubtful whether there ever lived a human heart in all the tribes of Adam, in all the years of our race, that has not beaten responsive to the thrilling, binding power of a mother's love as to nothing else. There is an almost miraculous power in a mother's moral influence. In our blessed Redeemer's life we know not what influence his mother had. He spoke words and did deeds in behalf of womanhood that no man ever did, from his promise to Mary to his command to John to take her home and to take his place in her heart. We know she was intensely interested in his religious development when she took him to the temple at twelve years; and that he grew in stature and wisdom, and in favor with God and man. How she looked on his growth, the outcome of debility, how she fostered it by tenderness and guardianship, we know not; but such a generous, loving, wise mind must have been powerfully influential.

Most of the great men in the Christian Church owe their power to the efficiency of simple-hearted, gos-

pel-loving mothers. The souls of your household are put in your hands. You protect and educate the child, and you may be the instrument of his salvation, for it is peculiarly your honor to lead him to Christ. The salvation of the household, both physical and spiritual, hangs on your consecration. How can a woman best do this work? She should make it her great enterprise, her constant study. It should not be a mere impulse, a momentary enthusiasm. Women are too impulsive, too fragmentary in their efforts. They are sometimes so alarmed lest some one of their household be lost forever, it seems as if their hearts would break with grief. Then the ardor cools. There comes a chill, and absorption in other things. The salvation of your household demands the same study and effort you bestow on other things. You do not attend to the matters of food, clothes, medicine for your children by impulse. From the time the child is born till he leaves your roof, you study to know what you can do to make him all you desire him to be. Would you expend all your energy on secondary matters and leave his salvation to a passing impulse? You cannot begin too early to make your child's salvation a matter of daily thought, and you must pursue the work with heart consecration rather than intellect. You ask, What shall I do to save my wayward son, my thoughtless daughter, my Christless husband? How can I throw the arms of restraint about that prodigal brother? There is no infallible rule. Every case has its own peculiarities. You must adapt what judgment you possess to

pressing circumstances. You want to save a soul, therefore you must bring soul-power to bear on the soul that you desire to save. You do not want brain power, but spirit-force to conquer spirit-force. It is God's love that saves us. Get that love in your heart, and bring it to bear on the members of your household, and how can you fail? A woman must cultivate sympathy in the moral wants of her household. You love your child, and your child loves you. You sympathize with your child, but your child does not sympathize with you. The tie is severed. The child is where you were once. How can you create a sympathy between two minds so different—each at different stages of life? You must adapt yourself to his moral condition. You must look at time, eternity, and Christ as *he* looks at it; and when you are brought into sympathy with him he will soon kindle at your flame of affection, and you will be one in the desire for a common salvation. If we go to the child with sternness and dignity not adapted to his condition, we fail. It needs great wisdom in conduct, conversation, reproof, and instruction—wisdom as to time, frame of mind to be approached, and frequency of approach on the subject.

By constantly plying your brother or husband, to bring them to Christ, you throw them off, vex and annoy them, and leave a blighting influence. Sometimes you can work by silence, sometimes by a Christian letter. The woman who would bring her household to Christ must embalm her love in warm, tender, and earnest prayer. This will give her power to win the heart, and the same God who makes

you efficient can melt the heart you approach into tenderness and grace. Fix your heart on one, and when that one is brought it will give you a moral leverage to save another and another. Don't reject any sign of success; don't make the mistake that the child may be too young and tender to become the subject of divine grace. Hail the first light God gives you.—*Methodist.*

THE OLIVE BRANCH,

Is the name of a new paper, just started, at Sulphur Springs, Texas. The first number of which is on our table. It is to be published monthly, and contains eight three column pages. We here give a brief extract from one Salutatory of No 1 giving the object of the paper.

"The OLIVE BRANCH" will be devoted to Primitive Christianity; to the upbuilding of the Church of Christ; to the perfecting of the saints; to the edifying of the body of Christ. It will endeavor to bear some humble part in hastening the time when the nations of the earth shall all "beat their swords into plough-shares and their spears into pruning-hooks," and "hang the trumpet in the hall and study war no more." It shall labor to bring about a state of universal peace, purity, and prosperity; and to effect this happy result, it shall ever point to the Church or God as the means, and to the gospel Christ as the motive power! It shall exalt the Son of God as the Prince of Peace, the Light of the world, and the Great Physician of souls.

Death of Benjamin C. Sewell.

Died in the Lord, Feb. 20, 1874, at his home near Harrisburg Illinois, Benjamin C. Sewell, son of Stephen and Annie Sewell. He died very suddenly. He arose in the morning, apparently as well as usual, washed himself, and walked out a short distance from the house, and was soon heard by his family, uttering cries of distress, and they immediately went to his assistance. He complained of a terrible pain in the breast; he was at once conveyed to the house, and the best medical aid procured that could be had, but all efforts for his restoration proved unavailing. About one o'clock he expired, after several hours of most severe suffering. Such are the facts of his death, as we learn them from his son. He was fifty four years and twenty days old, when he died. For many years, he has been a disciple of Christ, and leaves to his family, and to his many relatives and friends the consolations of the hope of an eternal home in heaven. He leaves a widow, his second wife, and eight children, three by his first and five by his second wife, to weep for him. But they "sorrow not as those who have no hope." We were once a large family, but one by one they continue to pass over the dark waters of death, and the number beyond the flood is rapidly swelling. The father and mother lie sleeping side by side in the old country grave yard near their old earthly home. The children who have crossed the flood are sleeping some in one place, and some in another. The living ones are also scattered far and wide. And never-

more shall we all meet again, till we meet at the judgment seat of Christ. But thank to God we all have the hope that we shall meet, no more to say farewell, and where suffering shall be no more. Then let us who still live, wait with patience the days of our earthly pilgrimage, till our change shall come.

"A few more struggles here,
A few more partings o'er.
A few more toils, a few more tears,
And we shall weep no more."

E. G. S.

P. S. Those of the family who desire to know more of bro. Benjamin's last days, can find out by addressing his son Stephen E. Sewell, Harrisburg, Ills.

The attention of our readers is called to the published by Howard Challen, and written by our leading brethren, and deserving a large circulation.

The desire of power in excess caused the angels to fall; the desire of knowledge in excess caused man to fall: but in charity is no excess, neither can man or angels come into danger by it.

When a fault is discovered it is well to look up a virtue to bear it company.

The company of a good humored man is a perpetual feast. He is welcomed everywhere. Eyes glisten at his approach, and difficulties vanish in his cheering presence. Franklin's indomitable good humor did as much for his country in the old Congress as Adams' fire or Jefferson's wisdom. He clothed wisdom with smiles, and softened contentious minds into acquiescence,

To the Little Folks. No. 1.

"Well, here is Uncle Joe again. What has he been doing all this long while, that he has not said anything to us?"

I will tell you what I have been doing, but not now. I want to tell you now of a part of a sermon that was preached last Lord's Day, at Thorp's Springs, Hood Co. Texas. It was preached in the College building there. The chief burden of the discourse was the Union of Christians. The speaker said all ought to be in favor of this, because our Savior prayed, as is recorded in the 17th chapter of John, that all who believe on him through the word of the apostles might be one. Division is wrong. He told the disciples at Corinth that they were carnal, because of their divisions—that to be divided is to be carnally minded; and the same apostle, in another place says, "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. viii, 6. Party names are wrong. Paul would not allow the disciples to be called after himself, nor for Apollos, nor Cephas; and these persons were greater than any person or thing for which religious parties are named now.

These party names create and keep up divisions. The disciples were anciently called Christians, and ought to be so called now. They all claim

to be Christians, but they will add something to it by which they distinguish themselves as a peculiar religious party—such as Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, &c. Each party has something peculiar to itself, and, by the admission of these parties, themselves, these peculiarities do not constitute any part of the Gospel, nor constitute Christianity; for a man can believe and obey the Gospel and be saved, without believing in the peculiar doctrine of either the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian church. And so, a man may become a Christian, without being a Methodist, Baptist or Presbyterian. But he cannot be a Christian and disbelieve the Gospel. Hence, the doctrine of none of these parties, as such, is the Gospel. Neither are their peculiarities Christianity. Then why not lay these names and their peculiarities aside. It could be done.

The preacher supposed a case, by which to illustrate the condition and practice of the religious parties. Let us suppose, said he, that three preachers, one a Methodist, one a Baptist, and the other a Presbyterian, agree to hold a union meeting—that is, unite their efforts together at one time and place—to convert sinners to Christ. The Methodist lays off his Methodist coat, the Presbyterian lays off his Presbyterian cloak, and the Baptist lays off his Baptist Jacket. They all commence a meeting with great zeal. They preach powerfully, they exhort warmly, and pray devoutly. The meeting continues several days and nights. The result is thirty sinners who are claimed to be converted to Christ—pardoned of their sins. Now what are

they? Ask the Methodist, are these thirty persons Methodists? "No, not yet." Are they Presbyterians? No. Are they Baptists? No. Then what are they? "They are converted persons." Converted to what? "Converted to Christ." Then, they are Christians, are they? "Yes thank the Lord." Ask the Presbyterian and the Baptist, and they will both answer as did the Methodist. Now they cannot be Methodist, Presbyterian or Baptist without doing something else; something more than to become and be Christians—adding to Christianity something that does not belong to it. If these persons are Christians, we can count thirty Christians. But suppose they now embrace something else. The three preaches each sets out his party bench, and invites those who want to join his church to take a seat on his bench. Each bench receives ten of these converts. They attach themselves to these several religious parties, subscribe to their creeds, and take upon themselves, respectively, these several names. Now what are they? Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists—ten of each. Can you add the three tens together now? Now what would ten Methodists, ten Presbyterians, and ten Baptists, added together make? Can you tell, my little folks? Many, or all of you have studied arithmetic, and you know that numbers must be reduced to a common denominator before you can add them. You cannot add 2 bu. and 3 pks. Two and three make five; but five what? five bushels? No. Five pecks? No. Then you cannot add them till you reduce them to a common denominator. Four

apples and five oranges added together make what? nine apples? No; nine oranges? No. Don't you see they will not add? Well, six Methodists and four Baptists make what? ten Baptists? No, indeed. Ten Methodists? No. Then add five Presbyterians to these six Methodists and four Baptists, and can you tell what it will make? No indeed. Then how shall we add them? Tell me, little folks:

"By reducing them to a common denominator."

Ah, that's right. Proceed:

"Well we will cancel"

What, you will reduce them by cancellation. will you? Well, I suppose that is as good a plan as any. Proceed and let us have the result.

"Well, we will cancel Methodist, Presbyterian and Baptist; and that leaves Christians only. Then, ten Christians and ten Christians and ten Christians make thirty Christians."

Very well done. But are you sure you have any authority for this?

"Of course, Did not these three preachers lay aside, the one his Methodism, the other his Presbyterianism, and the other Baptistism, and unite together in a meeting, and convert these thirty persons to Christ—claiming that they had made Christians of them? Now, Uncle Joe, we think it a great pity these preachers did not try to keep these people Christians instead of making something else of them. And we also think it is a great pity, that when these preachers laid aside their party peculiarities, and united for the conversion of sinners to Christianity they did not let their party peculiarities stay laid away, and continue la-

boring together for the conversion of more sinners and to keep the converts all in the Christian fold." I think so too.

UNCLE JOE.

Bro. D. L.: Please give me some information. On Saturday before the 4th Lord's day in March, I attended a meeting at Liberty Church in Coweta Co., where my membership is. This church has been in existence for 18 or 20 years. On that day there was a clerk appointed. There has never been one there before. We do not read of clerks in the days of the Apostles. Therefore I opposed it and received a reply, you strain at a gnat, and swallow a sawmill. If we are to have clerks in the church, I am in error and would like to get out. I hope you will not fail to give me some information through the Advocate. If we are to have a clerk in the church, Liberty has been out of her duty a long time, if not she is out now.

Your Bro. in hope,

J. M. L.

Carrollton, Ga.

There are some things indifferent in these affairs. No man can be appointed to a duty until there is a duty to perform. A church ought to keep a record of its members and its actions. Some one must do this. Our latter day style, gives the name clerk to him who does t is work. We do not see the wrong in calling him thus. But if a brother objected or was offended, I would call him a servant of the church to do its uniting and keep its records. A servant is a deacon. This would be a writ-

ing deacon, a deacon of proceedings. We would never give offence to a brother in as small a matter as that. We suppose Liberty church has kept some account of its own life—and work during the 18 or 20 years of its existence. The person who kept them was not called clerk heretofore. He was nevertheless a Clerk, because he did the work of a clerk. We would have still left him without the name if it had offended or been offensive to my brethren.

D. L.

Good Words.

If you can say a single good word to help any poor, struggling mortal along, say it now. Don't wait until he is dead, add then begin to prate about the good he did, the good that was in him &c.

I protest against the custom of cursing, or man while he lives, and singing his praise after his death. All our good works will do no good then. His battles are all ended here, and our encouragement, no longer needed. The living need our influence—our help, and our love.

J. T. P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The great commission.....	241
Query.....	247
Isant Baptism.....	248
Light, Trashy reading.....	258
The Cospel plan of Salvation.....	252
God's Love.....	253
Another Debate.....	253
Mark xvi: 16.....	255
Church News.....	256
Preaching Funerals.....	256
Woman's work in the household.....	257
The Olive Branch.....	260
Death of Benjamin C. Sewell.....	261
To the Little Folks.....	262

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 12

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MARCH 19, 1874.

Memoirs of Jesus.

JESUS HAVING PRAYED FOR HIS DISCIPLES NOW CROSSES THE BROOK KEDRON,* ENTERS THE GARDEN OF GETHESMANE,† AND THERE PRAYS THREE TIMES FOR HIMSELF.

The scene grows in interest, as the gloom of night deepens. We do not know positively, where Jesus stood, while praying for the unity and sanctification of his followers; but we conjecture that it was not far from Olive Mountain; for the Brook Kedron, which he now crosses runs through a narrow valley between the City and the Mountain.

*The Bible Union's Primary Reviser of John translates the Greek, *Cheimarron ton Kedron*, "Brook of the Cedars;" but he recommends a change in the original from *ton to tou*, so as to be rendered "Brook Kedron."—He also writes a long note; to show that the discourse of the Savior was delivered on the way from the City to the said brook, Kedron.

†Horne, Vol. II. p. 425. says "Gethsemane. [Geth-sem-a-nee.] a garden beyond Kedron, at the foot of Mt. Olivet; so-called from the wine-presses in it. * * * It is described by recent travelers as a small plat of ground, with a low hedge, and an enclosure of stones; no verdure growing on it save six or eight venerable-looking olives, which have stood there for many centuries."

John informs us, that "Jesus, [after] saying these things, went out with his disciples beyond the Brook Kedron, where there was a garden." In this garden, the same writer says, "Jesus often met with his disciples;" and Judas, (who was now coming on apace, with "a band of soldiers and attendants, from the Chief Priests and the Pharisees,") was well acquainted with "the place." (John xviii. 2, 3.)

The solemn procession, consisting of Jesus and eleven disciples enters the garden. I have seen a beautiful picture of this garden. But very likely it is not a correct one. There were no photographers in that day, nor were there any distinguished Judean artists, that we read of, to paint the scenes of Gethsemane. So each one must form in his own imagination a picture of that small enclosure of ground near Olive Mountain, where Jesus experienced unfathomable grief, and suffered inexpressible agony, on account of the sins of mankind.

John has omitted saying anything about what took place in this lonely garden, as narrated by the other

evangelists. † It was not necessary, in the judgment of the Holy Spirit, by whom John was inspired to write, to repeat what had been already three times fully narrated.

Having finished his consoling discourse to his disciples, and offered up that memorable prayer in their behalf, Jesus, who is Son of Man as well as Son of God—human, as well as divine, begins to feel most sensibly the weight that is lying upon him; and he seems as though he would almost sink beneath the burden of the sins of the world.

“He said to his disciples :

‘Sit here, till I go yonder and pray.’”

Then, taking Peter, James, and John with him, to a place, we suppose, some distance from the entrance “he began to be in dismay and anguish of soul, and said to them :

‘My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow, even to dying! Stay here, and watch with me.’”

Then he went forward a short distance,—“a stone’s throw,”—and, falling with his face toward the ground, he prayed saying :

“My Father, if it be possible, take this cup away from me. However, not as I wish, but as thou wilt.”

Then an angel of heaven appeared to him, for the purpose of strengthening him. “And, being in agony, he prayed more earnestly. And his sweat was like great drops of blood, falling to the ground.”

Here we may pause, to indulge in solemn reflections. What agony that must have been which caused

the blood to ooze through the pores, and fall in drops, profusely, to the ground! Was it the dread of death, which occasioned this extreme agony? Even with the aid of the strengthening angel, he was sorrowful even to dying! Why, not only martyrs innumerable laid down their lives cheerfully on the Altar of Christianity; but even criminals frequently have met tortures and death with apparently more courage and fortitude! There must then, have been some extraordinary occasion for that profound sorrow and extreme mental distress which we are contemplating.

Yes, says the Prophet Isaiah: “Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed; he was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised on account of our iniquities; the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.” (Isa. liii, 4, 5.) That Christ is meant in the predictions of this chapter of Isaiah, plainly appears from an examination of the following passages in the Christian Scriptures: Matth. viii. 17; xxvi. 63; xxvii, 12, Mark ix. 12; xiv. 61; xv. 5, 28; Rom. i. 16; iv 25; 1 Cor. xv. 3; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Peter ii. 24; iii, 18; Acts viii. 32, etc.)

We need not here speculate on the “doctrine” of “vicarious atonement,” nor discuss the question, whether Jesus suffered instead of us, or endured in the garden and on the cross the punishment that was due to our sins; nor need we descant on the theory, that Christ, by suffering the guilt of the whole world to be thrown

† Matth. xxvi. 46; Mark xiv. 32-42; Luke x xii. 40-46.

upon him, removed the otherwise insurmountable barrier, between "offending man" and the "offended God." But we may rest assured, that Jesus "tasted death for every one; (Heb. ii. 9.) and that, he, himself, bore our sins in his own body on the tree." (1 Pet. ii. 24.)

We may also regard the guilt of the world, (which could not legally be removed without superhuman sacrifice) as the real cause of Jesus' intense suffering in the garden and on the Tree.

Let us now return from this digression, and observe what further transpired in the garden.

"Then, arising from prayer, and coming to his disciples, he found them sleeping in consequence of grief; and he said to them:

"Why are you sleeping? Was it so, that you could not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, lest you come into trial. The Spirit is willing but the flesh is weak?"

O the weakness of human nature! The flesh is the source of all our weakness. The soul should be made strong by Spiritual exercise, and much self-denial and humiliation, that it may be able to overcome the weakness of the flesh.

"Again he went away a second time, and prayed, saying:

"O my Father! if this cup cannot pass away from me, unless I drink it, thy will be done."

Now he seems more resigned. He does not appear to agonize as much as before.

He returns to his disciples, and "finds them sleeping again; for their eyes were heavy. Then he left them and went away again and prayed

the third time, saying the same thing."

Did not the Father hear the prayer of his Son? He certainly did, and sent an angel to strengthen him; or, as Clarke says, "to sympathize with him." But he only answered it according to the proviso in the prayer, "if thou art willing."

It was natural for Jesus to pray as he did, though his spirit was willing to suffer, and though he knew his prayer could not alter the decree of God, that he should die for men. The flesh, in which his God-like spirit was incased, revolted at the idea—the bitter thought, of that cup of bitterness, anguish, and intense suffering, which Jesus saw plainly he must shortly drink.

"He now comes to his disciples," and, in the spirit of meekness and resignation, "says: 'Sleep on, what time is left; take your rest. See! the hour is drawing near, and the Son of Man is delivered into the hands of sinners. Rise up; let us be going. Look! my betrayer is at hand!'"

The thrilling moment has arrived; but Jesus is prepared for the worst. He is ready to die. Calmly he goes forward to meet his captors. He does not fear them, nor does he attempt to escape their grasp. His disciples slowly follow him, trembling, no doubt with fear of consequences.

CAPTURE OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE.

Before arriving at the place where the victim of priestly malice was awaiting his approach, the false-hearted Judas gave a signal to the crowd, saying:

"The one whom I shall kiss, is he: hold him fast."

Brave captain! Pressing on at the head of that valorous (?) crowd who "armed with swords and clubs," in order to seize the gentle, unresisting "Prince of Life," ventures to betray his Master with a deceitful pressure of the lips, which he calls a kiss! Jesus was hardly done speaking to his disciples, when Judas came up to him and said:

"Hail, Master!" and kissed him.

Then Jesus said to him:

"Friend, for what purpose have you come? Do you deliver up the Son of Man with a kiss?" "Before Judas could reply," says Fleetwood, "the band (who had fixed their eyes on the person he had kissed,) came up and surrounded Jesus."

John is particular in stating, that besides "weapons," the crowd were supplied with lamps and torches, and that, "Jesus, therefore, knowing all things that were coming upon him, went forward and said to them:

'For whom are you searching?'

They replied to him:

'Jesus, the Nazarene.'

Jesus said to them:

'I am he.'

And Judas also, (who delivered him over to his enemies,) was standing among them. When therefore, he (Jesus) said to them, 'I am he,' they went backward and fell to the ground.' Again, therefore he asked them:

'For whom are you searching?'

And they said:

'Jesus, the Nazarene.'

Jesus replied:

'I told you that I am he. If therefore I am the person for whom

you are searching, let these (Disciples) go away.'

[He said this,] "so that the remark might come true, which he made in his prayer: 'I lost none of those whom thou gavest me.'"

Nothing daunted at the evident miracle performed here, the Priests imagining, perhaps, that Jesus was possessed of some demoniacal power, causing his enemies to fall down backwards, rallied the mob; and, as some were about to seize the defenseless one, some of the disciples standing near, said:

"Lord, shall we strike with the sword?"

Without waiting for permission, "Simon Peter, having a sword, drew it, and striking [ar] the High Priest's servant [whose name was Malchus,] he cut off his right ear."

It may appear strange that Peter did not strike at the leader, Judas, the Man of Kerioth. but perhaps he was disguised; or, possibly, Peter struck at him who was most forward, or first, in taking hold of his blessed Master.

However this may be, Jesus calmly says to Peter: "Put thy sword again into his sheath: the cup which my Father has given me,—shall I not drink it? For all those who take up the sword will perish by the sword. Do you not think that I can now pray to the Father and he would presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how, then, will the Scriptures be fulfilled, [which

[Acts iii. 15.—According to A. Campbell, this should be "author of the Life," that is, the Eternal Life.

‡ Probably the Scriptures to which our Lord principally refers, are Ps. xxii, lxix, and especially Isa. liii, and Dan. ix. 35-27. Christ shows that they had no power against him but what he permitted; and that he willingly gave up himself into their hands." (Clarke on Matt, xxvi. 54.)

prophesy] that it must be so? Let this suffice!

Then he touched his [Malchus's] ear, and healed it." "In that same hour," says Luke, "Jesus said to the crowds:

'Have you come out as [though it were] against a robber, with swords and clubs, in order to take me? Daily I sat among you in the Temple, teaching, and you did not seize me. But this is your hour, and the power of darkness.'

At this moment "they laid hands on him and took him, and the disciples fled."

We may here pause to observe,

I. That the crowd is restrained for a time from seizing Jesus, till he has made some remarks appropriate to the occasion.

II. That a second miracle, (to which the crowd paid no attention,) was performed on the ear of Malchus in order to avert the danger of violence to the apostles and to show that Jesus' mission was one of love, not of vengeance or violence.

III. That Jesus voluntarily allows himself to be captured; for he virtually said to those who were ready to fight for him, that, by simply praying to his Father, he could be furnished with twelve legions of angels, which Clarke computes to be perhaps seventy-two thousand. How insignificant the small force commanded by Judas, compared with this angelic host! But the Scriptures must be fulfilled, and he offers no resistance.

IV. He states an important fact, when he says: "Those who take up the sword will die by the sword." The employment of carnal weapons,

whether justifiable on the part of nations or not, would certainly prove destructive to the interests of Christ's spiritual kingdom. Witness the results of the Crusades, in the Eleventh and twelfth centuries. (See the histories of those centuries.)

THE YOUNG MAN WHO FLED.

A circumstance of secondary importance, but forming part of the sacred narrative, is thus related by John Mark:

"And there followed him a certain young man, who had a linen garment around his naked body. And he left the linen garment, and fled from them naked." (Mark xiv. 51.)

Clarke thinks this may have been the gardener; and J. Newton Brown, who added some notes to Fleetwood, guesses that it was Mark, as this Evangelist is the only one who mentions the circumstance. But it matters not to us who it was, except to gratify our curiosity.

To conclude the narrative of the capture:

"Then the band of soldiers and the officers, with the attendants of the Jews, took Jesus and tied him, and conducted him first to Annas, the father of Caiaphas, who was the Chief Priest that year. (It was Caiaphas, who had given counsel to the Jews, that it would be advantageous "for one man to die for the people." (John xi. 50, 51.)

We may suppose that Malchus, after having his ear healed by the Merciful One, stood back, while others performed the office of captors. And we may imagine we see those vicious fellows busy, tying cords around the arms of the inoffensive, non-resisting Jesus, who, like Samp-

son could have broken the cords as easily as "flax burnt with fire." (See Judges xv. 14.)

But his hour had come, and he meekly goes along with his captors, being led "like a lamb to the slaughtering," and "like a sheep, dumb in the presence of his shearers, he opens not his mouth." (Isa. liii. .) Jesus becomes expressively silent from this time on, even during his trial.

W. PINKERTON.

Waynefield, O. Feb. 26th. 1874.

Matthew 19. 12. Once More.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: In Advocate No. 4. p. 90; you seem to have misunderstood me. I said a physical act could not produce virtue in the heart. If man has not power to keep his desires in the way God directs—he will not be counted a sinner unless he once had the power and by a willful abuse of his faculties lost it. In that case, the Bible makes no provision for his salvation. "His eyes full of adultery and heart waxed gross"—he "cannot cease from sin," I grant that such an act (Emasculation) might lull the heart to sleep in the absence of temptation. But a physical act can not purify the heart. Now, sir, I think a man may have a good heart and yet mistake his mere desire for lust; this is precisely what Origen did, but he learned to distinguish between a necessitated desire and a wicked purpose of heart and ever lamented the act. Every state of the sensibility is necessitated, but the will is free. If a man desire a forbidden thing, this is the temptation. If he purpose to have it contrary to law, this is lust. If he cru-

cify the flesh and obey the law in spite of desire this is virtue. All our faculties are proper, and right, and the man that destroys none of them, but exercises all in harmony with God's law, stands upon a plane that the Eunuch can never reach, and possesses a degree of virtue that the eunuch cannot attain. "If eunuch is figurative in one place it must be in all." Christ says: "let the dead bury their dead." Is the word *dead* literal both times here? In Genesis Potiphar is called a eunuch, this is certainly figurative. I cannot at present accept your definition of the word. Mr. Webster says, "Eunuch—a male that has been unmaned." Now the class of eunuchs, so born were *never maned at all*. And the 3rd class, never unmaned themselves, but remained single as did Paul. "Christ affirms it and you are willing to teach it and bear the consequences." In my humble opinion, if the proof you offer is the best that you could produce, you had just as well have believed and been silent. In Mark 7. 20, 23. the evil eye is distinguished from Adultery, and therefore I think has no reference to "this same thing." James 4. 1-9 compd. with Isah. 1, 16-20, teaches to cleanse the faculty, not cut it off, and to cut off the sin. The apostles never gave a command upon this subject; there is no New Testament example of it; the church in one solid phalanx differs with you—still you are content to teach it!

Christ says: "blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he is tried he shall receive a crown of life." Is it not wrong for

a man to disarm himself to keep out of this fight? True I shall not willingly seek temptation where I know my weakness, but in the natural course of things I shall be tried often and sorely; but I shall "count it all joy," for Christ "will not suffer me to be tempted above that I am able to bear."

In fraternal love,

J. J. W.

Centre Point, Ark.

We do not care to discuss this question further. But we cannot refrain from making a few short comments on some of the positions taken as bearing on other subjects as well as this. 1st. The writer, it seems to me, makes the heart and the lusts or fleshly feelings one. The Savior did not think so when he said, "the Spirit is willing but the flesh is weak. Paul did not think so, when he said, "when I would do good evil is present with me." "In me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing, for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." That is, the heart purposed good, but the fleshly passion was so strong that it overruled the heart; if this is continued, the heart finally is corrupted. But if the flesh is crucified, the heart remains pure. If he cannot control the fleshly desire God gives him the privilege of destroying it, that the heart may not be overcome and corrupted thereby. Nothing but a pure heart toward God and earnest faith and anxiety to keep the heart pure, it seems to me, could cause a man to pluck out the right eye, cut off the right hand or destroy any other member of his

body. If that does not give evidence of faith and desire of living pure I would not know how to find it. As to whether a man is more virtuous who overcomes the temptation than he who removes the cause of temptation at immense sacrifice to himself, I pretend not to say.

As an offset to my statement that the Eunuch in the three cases stated must all be figurative or all literal—our brother quotes, "let the dead bury their dead," as a singular expression, when a moment's thought would have shown, there is not a single feature of likeness between them. He was not describing in this instance, who were dead nor how they died. The first rule of interpreting language is, "The common, literal meaning of a word must be used unless an absurdity results." Now in this example this is the case. In the other, there are three distinct affirmatives in connection as to how Eunuchs are made. We affirm, that if one is literal all must be literal. An example in English literature where such is not the case unless it be a pun or play upon words cannot be produced. It would destroy all certainty in the meaning of language.

He objects to my definition and gives Mr. Webster's, and yet does not accept Mr. Webster's definition of the term. Our definition is the true one, Mr. Webster to the contrary notwithstanding. Our Bro. really adopts ours although saying he cannot accept it. For Mr. W.'s will not apply to the first use of it. He like the Savior calls those eunuchs who do not come under Mr. W.'s definition.

I did not speak of the evil eye in

Mark 7. 20. I said that plucking out the right eye, cutting off the right hand, in Mat. were figurative and pointed to this very thing. But grant they did not. It means something. Suppose it the literal eye or hand, how is it lawful to destroy some member of the body that leads to sin? If it is right to pluck out the right eye when it leads to sin, why not equally lawful to excise or destroy any other member of the body. I say the reference to the eye or hand is not literal because the eye itself, the hand itself, is the seat of no passion, no lust. They are mere instruments, that the passions and lusts use. I never claimed that any one gave a command to mutilate the body. Christ gave the liberty to do it when the passion cannot be controlled and is liable to corrupt the heart or to unfit it for heaven, as here. We do not know exactly what our brother calls the church. I do not think I ever heard one of our own brethren contend this expression was not literal. When I received the first note of inquiry on the teaching of the Scripture on this subject, there happened to be as many as five or six teachers, as eminent and learned as we have in Tenn., in our office. I read the question and asked what it meant; without a dissenting voice they agreed with me. The church that spiritualizes the meaning out of the Bible may be against me. Those who accept it as the plain teachings of God to man, that man may understand it and obey it, will, nine out of ten, agree with me, I think. I could adduce many more reasons, but I have no desire to pursue the investi-

gation further, so will only say, if to cut off a man's hand, pluck out his eye, or emasculate himself is not enduring and withstanding temptation I know not what is. It is true he frees himself from one temptation that is too strong for him by doing what Christ has given him permission to do. This privilege of destroying the tempting member, is one means that Christ has provided through which we may avoid temptation that we cannot bear. He does not deliver us from temptation, when we refuse to use the means he places in our reach to avoid the temptation. It is right the whole body should be disarmed, every member, rather than be led into sin thereby that corrupts the heart. Much more is it right to destroy one member and not that the whole body be cast into hell.

D. L.

HEALTH HINTS.

CONCERNING SEWAGE.

It has been established by modern science that filth and fever occupy to each other the relation of cause and effect; or, to express it more exactly, filth, in its various forms of sewage sewer-gas, surface water, and decaying animal and vegetable matter is the cause of a vast amount of disease. It acts both as a predisposing, and as a determining cause. In small quantity it lowers the general health of a family or of a community, taking the color from the cheek, and the elasticity from the step, destroys the tone of the system, and in this way predisposes its victim to attacks of definite and active dis-

ease; while in larger quantity it produces the most fearful of maladies. Cholera, typhoid and typhus fever, dysentery, and many other similar diseases are produced by using water, or breathing air, contaminated with filth. Whence comes the filth, do you ask? It comes from *sewers* which discharge their fetid and seething contents into lakes and rivers from which our water supply is obtained; it comes from *cesspools* whose contents find their way into wells and springs, or whose overflow comes to the surface, and poisons the air with its noisome emanation, which literally "smell to heaven"; it comes from *storm-water* which washes the surface of the ground, and passes without impediment into wells and springs, and other sources of water supply; it comes from sinks and barnyards; it comes in the form of *sewer-gas* which frequently forces itself through inefficient traps and defective waste-pipes, and spreads its sickly odor through our houses.

Let me give a few cases in illustration. At a young ladies' seminary in Pittsfield, Mass., a few years ago, there occurred an epidemic of typhoid fever; sixty or seventy of the inmates were attacked almost simultaneously. The city and surrounding country were at the time nearly or quite exempt from the disease. Circumstances pointing so strongly to some local cause, an investigation was made, and the fact disclosed that a communication had become established between the sewer and the well from which the institution was supplied with water.

The Millbank Prison, London, had been noted for years for its epi-

demics of typhoid fever and dysentery. Its water supply was from the Thames. It having been suggested that there might be a connection between these frequent outbreaks of the disease and the water used by the prisoners, an artesian well was sunk and the institution supplied from it. With the advent of pure water, fever disappeared.

Dr. John Ewens, of England, relates the following case: "In the Spring of 1854 or 1855, (a very dry season), an epidemic of typhoid fever of a very severe character, appeared in the hamlet of Whatcombe. It was entirely confined to the inhabitants of the houses which obtained their drinking water from a well, (situated immediately opposite the doors of the three cottages,) the mouth of which was much below the level of the surrounding ground, and consequently easily admitted the flow of refuse matters, thrown out of the houses, into the well. Adjoining houses which obtained water from other sources were free from disease and the neighboring village of Whitechurch, with which there was constant communication, was absolutely free from typhoid, with the exception of two men who worked at Whatcombe, and were accustomed to take their mid-day meal at a cottage near the well, and doubtless drank of the water. Suspicion soon fell upon the well, which being examined was found in a very impure state."

In the *London Lancet* for November 26th, 1870, occurs the following: "In Islington at a certain dairy the milk-cans were washed with water taken from a tank communicating with the drains, and a

little water of course remained behind: there was no charge of gross admixture of water with the milk. The dairyman himself died of typhoid and of one hundred and forty families supplied with the milk, seventy contracted the disease. The majority of the cases occurred in close proximity to the dairy; but in one long road, a mile and a half from the dairy, there were three families thus supplied with milk; two of these had typhoid in them, and they were the only houses in which the malady occurred." Hundreds of similar examples have been collected during the last few years both in this country and in Europe. It has also been observed that in towns where improvements have been made in the drainage, and in the disposition of refuse matter, there has almost always been a very marked decrease in the death rate. In Cardiff, England, according to the report of Dr. Buchanan, the death-rate was lowered thirto-two per cent., and at Newport by the same amount; while in both these places the mortality among children under one year of age was very greatly diminished. Public improvements in nine English towns were followed by a falling off in the death rate, from typhoid fever, of from fifty to seventy-five per cent.

In fact it has been shown beyond the possibility of doubt, that refuse matter by its presence in water, and by its noxious effluvia in the air, not only produces great deterioration in the general health of any community exposed to it; but it is also the direct cause of fearful mortality. No town or village whose sinks and sewers discharge their contents by the

roadside, as they do in so many instances, or whose wells and cesspools are located side by side, as they so frequently are, can lay claim to any general healthfulness, or exemption from epidemics; and it is the first duty of those having the interests of any such town or village in charge, to have enacted and enforced such laws as are necessary to remedy the evil.

It is extremely difficult in many cases to decide what disposition should be made of sewage; but every one should see to it that the air he breathes is free from its effluvia, and that the water he drinks contains no trace of it. As a general rule it may be laid down that *all vile odors are poisonous*; and whatever gives rise to them should be considered as a nuisance and abated. Wells should be located as far as possible from cess-pools and sewers, and should be so built as to afford every possible means of protection against the ingress of foreign matter. To construct such a well is not difficult. Commencing at a point three or four feet from the well, the wall should be laid in cement, and its outer surface covered with a coating of the same material. The wall should be carried a foot or so above the level of the ground, and the excavation exterior to it should be filled with earth well packed down—not with loose stones as is usually the case. If the water is to be brought to the surface by means of a pump, after the wall has been brought up three or four feet the pipe can be placed in position, the well arched over at this point, or covered with a strong curbstone, and the remainder of the excavation filled

in with earth as before. There is an impression that wells require ventilation: they require it only when they contain organic matter whose putrefaction would otherwise become apparent, and a well built as above described would, under all ordinary circumstances, contain nothing of the kind; neither would it require clearing. In all places thickly inhabited the water should be subjected to a careful analysis, whether it be from wells, streams or lakes. In no other way can those who use it be sure of its purity. Such an analysis, of the well-water of London disclosed the fact that it was composed principally of filtered sewage; and could the water used in many of our towns and villages be subjected to similar tests, much of it would be found unfit for use. It is the first duty of every householder to see to it that those under his charge are protected from these fruitful causes of disease, and that from his premises there go forth no contributions to these causes. It is the first duty of every physician when he is called upon to combat the diseases thus produced, to point out the cause and to insist upon its removal. He will often find in houses where the arrangements are supposed to be perfect, that there are vile odors in the bath-room, or that the children have been making mud pies with putrid filth. He will often find that the overflow pipe of the cistern terminates in the cesspool, and that nauseous gases have through this channel been absorbed by the water of which the family make daily use! He will often find dampness and decaying vegetable matter in the cellar.

Morality and religion suffer in no small degree from these causes, and it is the duty of every minister to wage war from the pulpit upon these forces, which are such mighty allies of evil, and so resistless in their power to degrade. Let the Church work with half the zeal in the cause of sanitary reform that it manifests in combatting other forms of sin, and it will in a short time remove from the earth a greater obstacle to its growth and influence than all the forces of infidelity combined.

Cleanliness is next to godliness—and necessary to it. In order to make men Godly, the conditions of godliness must be supplied; and these conditions coincide at many points with those of bodily health.

It is a strange circumstance that man, in his search for the causes of things, has nearly always attempted to connect events transpiring under his very eyes with causes far removed beyond the power of his observation. In nothing has this tendency been stronger than in his efforts to trace the causes of disease. Fever and pestilence were for many ages supposed to be caused by the shafts of Apollo, or to be sent from heaven as the punishment for sin. Modern science, however, with its exact methods of investigation and its rigid exclusion of everything "not proven" from its conclusions, has found that cause and effect are generally near neighbors to each other, and that disease is in most cases produced by that which is near us, even at our very doors; and could the teachings of science be faithfully acted on for a few generations, the average length of man's life would be doub-

led, some of the chief sources of his sufferings and the greatest obstacles to his progress would be removed and the Golden Age be hastened, which has in all time been the dream of the poet and the theme of prophecy.—
M. D. In Chris. Union.

The Law of Sin and Death.

Dear Bro. Pessimus: Had I the time it would give me great pleasure to exhaust this subject; but it is out of my power to be very full or definite. The subject I think is a very easy and simple one; the reading itself ought to give entire satisfaction, see, "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death"—Why is the first (law) called the law of the Spirit? Because it is peculiar to and given by and in the dispensation of the Spirit? Why is the later (law) called the law of sin and death? Because sin is the author of it—lust conceives and brings forth sin and the end or consequence of sin is death. James i: 14-15. The apostle speaks of walking after the Spirit, and after the flesh. To walk after the Spirit, is to obey the law (or teachings) of the Spirit. To walk after the flesh, is to obey the law of sin, in other places called the works of the flesh—see Gal. v: 16—In the 6th chapter of Paul to Romans, he speaks to a considerable extent of the rule or dominion of sin, see also 7th chapter, 22nd verse, for I delight in the law of God after the inward man (evidently this law is the law of the Spirit) 23rd verse. But I see another law *in my members*—(this law is certainly not the law of Moses) war-

ring against the law of my mind (or of God) and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. That the law of sin and death is a highly figurative expression we admit, but that the apostle does speak of the dominion of sin—of a law dwelling in his members—of sin that dwells in his members, is too plain to quibble over. The law of sin and death and the body of this death (or that must die) are not identical, but the law of sin dwells in this body that must die. Paul, 1st Cor. 15th chapter, tells how he would be made free or delivered from that body of death. In Rom. 8: 2, he tells how he was made free or delivered from the law of sin that dwelt in that body. You insist that you are right in calling the law of Moses the law of sin and death from the fact that under it sin was made known. Well think you they would have known righteousness without this law. I know the apostle says he would not have known sin, except the law had said, thou shalt not covet, so by the law of God we learn what is righteous as well as what is sin and I see no reason in this for calling the law of Moses the law of sin and death. Again you think that if the apostle had not intended us to have understood him to mean the Mosaic law, when he said the law of sin and death, he would have explained himself in 2nd verse thus—"for what the law of Moses could not do," etc. I remark Paul almost always when speaking of the law of Moses, calls it the law. The law of Moses—in so many words is seldom found—see how many times, and we will not wonder, when

we consider rightly the use the apostle had for this phrase in this and other Epistles. This language is to the Jewish members of the church that understood the law to mean the law of Moses—but any other law spoken of in connection with it needs qualifying or defining, as for instance the law of the Spirit of Life—the law of sin, etc. Now dear Bro., try your interpretation. Read 8: 2 of Rom., “for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law (of Moses,) for what the law (of Moses) could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin condemned sin in the flesh,” etc. Don’t you see at once it is altogether wrong? Just think, if you can, of God’s giving or making a law that was so weak that it could not make the apostle free from itself. But I forbear, hoping you will profit by re-reading and studying the subject. I would love to say more on this subject, but I cannot consistently with other obligations. May God our Father bless us all and direct us in truth and righteousness is the prayer of

Yours in Christ,
N. B. GIBBONS.

Waxahatchie, Texas.

QUERIES.

Bros. L. & S.: I hope you will give an explanation 1st of 16: 18 of Matt., (latter clause of the verse) and “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” You gave an explanation to the first part of the verse, in answer to B. B. Batey, Jan. 16th,

No. 3 for 1873. 2nd, of John 12: 31, and 14: 30.

Please answer at your earliest convenience through the columns of the Gospel Advocate, and oblige

Your brother,
A. J. FARRELL.

Guntown, Miss.

There are two ideas prevailing concerning this expression. One is that death or the grave shall not prevail against the subjects or members of the church. That is, they will be raised or resurrected. But this is true of others as well as the church or its members. The evil will be raised as well as the just. Then it would mean nothing to say, The gates of hell shall not prevail against it, meaning the members should be raised while all others would be raised too. Many learned men take this position, but it seems to me to take all meaning or force out of the words of the Savior.

Hell means destruction in its broadest sense. “The gates of Hell,” is a figurative expression of course, as there are no literal gates. But it signifies that the bounds of destruction or ruin shall never encompass this church of which he is speaking. It shall never be brought to ruin or destruction. The style of this announcement is such as to declare plainly, that this alone of all the institutions of earth, will never be destroyed, will never come to ruin. All others will be encompassed in ruin, involved in destruction—this one will stand forever.

The two passages, John 12: 31, read, “Now is the judgment of this world. Now shall the prince of this

world be cast out," referring to his near approach to death. 14: 30, "Hereafter I will not talk much with you, for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me."

The "Prince of this world" refers almost universally to the wicked one. It may refer here only to the worldly ruler, who would judge and condemn him. It declares the Prince of this world was judged, tried, proved, his power tested. It was done in this way: His power was exerted to its utmost stretch, when Christ was crucified. Then his power ended. Christ submitted himself to the utmost stretch of his power, yet he overcame it. The prince of this world carried him to the grave, he could do no more. Christ was master of the grave. He overcame the grave with all its powers, he showed his superiority over them in might and authority. He cast out the powers of the world, showed his superiority to them, their weakness and impotency. Paul speaking of this trial says, "Having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." Col. 2: 15. His death and the struggle in the grave, the trial and test of his power or superiority over all other kings, potentates and powers of this world.

In him earthly governments or their rulers had no part. He came not to build them up, but his resurrection inflicted the wound that will yet prove their death.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S.: Were the disciples at Antioch called Christians through scorn, or derision; or is it the new

name that was promised, or that was to be given to the Lord's people?

"And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory, and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." Isaiah 62: 2. Rev. 11: 17, etc.

J. B. U.

Galatia, Saline Co., Ills.

We have never yet thought that the name *Christian* was given by the enemies of Christianity. Such however has been, and still is, the understanding of a large proportion of the religious people of the world, some renowned for learning and talent have, and do now occupy this ground. We think differently however, and will give some reasons why. We will look a little carefully at the passage in Acts 11: 26. To get fully the connection, we begin with 25th verse.

"Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul. And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people, and the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." In this passage, it is very plain to every one who thinks for a moment, that the pronoun *they*, relating to Paul and Barnabas, is the subject of the verb *assembled*. Paul and Barnabas assembled themselves, with the church. The verb *taught* also has the same subject. Paul and Barnabas *taught* much people. No one can doubt but that Paul and Barnabas did the teaching. None would venture to claim that the enemies did

the teaching spoken of in the passage. And if we had a literal rendering of the whole passage, it would be just as clear that Paul and Barnabas did the naming, as that they did the teaching. The verb rendered were called, is active in the Greek, and we know of no sufficient authority for rendering it passively in this place. It is in the same mood and tense with the verb rendered *taught*, and in the same voice, and same construction. And we have no doubt whatever, but that Paul and Barnabas are the subjects of this verb, and that they did the naming. And if they did, certainly it was done by divine authority. We here give a literal rendering, or sort of paraphrase of this passage, putting in the words that are to be understood, to complete the sense. "And it came to pass, that a whole year they (Paul and Barnabas) assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people; and it came to pass that they, Paul and Barnabas, called the disciples Christians first in Antioch." We have no doubt whatever, but that this is the true meaning of the passage. We cannot for one moment believe the Lord intended to leave a matter of so much importance as the naming of his people so indefinite and obscure as our common version leaves it. If any one can show, by undoubted authority that the paraphrase we have given here does not present the true idea, then we may have to yield the ground here taken, but not till then. We are just as certain that Paul and Barnabas did the naming, as that they did the teaching, or that they assembled themselves with the church in Antioch.

And further, we think the naming spoken of in sixty-second of Isaiah, is the naming spoken of in 11th of Acts. The gospel had then been carried to the Gentiles as well as the Jews, and therefore, when the two were united into one people in Christ, so that there was one fold and one shepherd, then comes in the new name. And we believe the mouth of the Lord gave it. The name Christian is so expressive. It means, as is admitted by all, a follower of Christ. This is just what we all ought to be, and no one who is a follower of Christ, can object to being called by that name. This is a name upon which all could unite, and be one people. And it is certainly a divine right that the Lord has given us, to be simply Christians, and nothing more; and we ought to be satisfied with nothing less. If a man can live and die a Christian, all will be well in eternity.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: Please say to me (in a private letter, or through the Advocate,) what you think of the average tendency of "The Bible Looking-Glass?"

A Methodist lady, who is an agent for said work, asked me to subscribe for it. I declined (for the present at least,) stating that while a number of the illustrations, by symbol and otherwise, were strikingly true; yet I supposed that John Bunyan's theory of conversion would appear, to a greater or less extent; judging from the prospectus. (I have not yet seen "The Looking Glass.") I said to the aforesaid lady, that John Bunyan's system of conversion required

the sinner to come to Christ, by working under a law of bondage, and that if Paul was right, he (Bunyan) was wrong. Paul said Christ took "the handwriting" out of the way, nailing it to the cross. I also stated, that "the law of works, (the law of Moses) was made, for one nation, and the law of Christ, (the Gospel) was made for all nations! Jew and Gentile must now come to Christ through the Gospel.

As ever,

W. T. BUSH.

Salado, Bell County, Texas.

We have never seen the work referred to. We doubt the good influence or the correctness of the teaching of the great mass of Bible pictures and Scripture illustrations. They are usually mere catch penny concerns. The greater portions of them are crude misrepresentations and are seldom offered for sale save in remote rural districts. They are gotten up to strike the fancy of these people, so they will buy them. This making them so they will sell is a point much more important than making them correct representations.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S.: In Matthew 13th chapter and 19th verse, the Savior in expounding to his disciples the parable of the sower, said, "When any one heareth the word of the kingdom and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart." I have failed to understand how the seed was sown in his heart, when he could not understand the word of the kingdom. Please answer through

the Advocate, and give me some understanding, while it may be that some others are in the same condition with me, and would be enlarged with the same like understanding.

Yours in the one hope.

W. E. B.

Buffalo Valley, Putnam Co., Tenn.

The word understand means properly something more than to perceive what is said. It means to take in the full import of a message, to see its connections and results—its importance. Many at this day hear the word, perceive what it says, but they fail to realize its true importance to their well-being, the heart does not appropriate it, but is taken up with other things. The word men frequently perceive but do not understand. They hear the words, know the meaning of each word and the sentences, still do not understand. A heart is said sometimes to be an understanding heart, and sometimes not. That is, when a heart is open and unoccupied with other idols and affections, that the word of God finds ready entrance and due consideration is given it, and its due weight is given it. When it is so filled with the love of this world, the love of honor, power, riches, pleasure, that it cannot appreciate the true character of the word of God, its importance to the well-being of man and the world, it is a heart devoid of understanding. It is only the good and understanding heart, that bears fruit.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S.: Please pardon and answer the following interrogatories: If a brother remains absent from the

assembly of the disciples and breaking the loaf on Lord's days for the space of five or six months without giving a legitimate excuse, when it is asked for time and again; is it sufficient to justify the church in withdrawing from him? I know the elders of the congregation should visit and talk to him, and find out if possible the cause of his absence, and if he is under a burden, help him to bear it and admonish him to be faithful in attending the ordinances of the church, "in breaking of bread and prayers," etc. But suppose said elders should fail to discharge their duty toward their absent brother. What should be done in such a case as either of the above? Please answer and oblige

Your Bro in Christ,
ELIAS LAND.

Prairie Plains, Tex.

I think persistent neglect of duty and privilege after proper effort to bring the delinquent back to duty, legitimate ground for saying, publicly, the church does not approve or countenance the course of this brother and for humbly uniting in prayer that he may see his error and be saved.

If the Elders do not do their duty, they ought to be prayed for, earnestly and faithfully, and some of the younger ones ought to do the work. It ought not to be left undone on a point of etiquette. It is the Lord's work.

D. L.

Teaching the Colored People.

Brethren L. & S.: As I desire

to make the best use of my time in teaching Christianity to such of the more destitute of my people as are willing to hear and receive the truth, and as the facilities for meeting them so as to properly address them are unfavorable, will you allow me through your columns to ask our brethren who are doubtless interested in the salvation of the souls of all the people, if they will co-operate with me, and open their meeting-houses when it can be done without interrupting their regular meetings? Let as many of the brethren as can attend the meetings that they may know whether or not such meetings should be maintained. As this is designed for information I trust that it will meet many responses through the Advocate and the *Historian*. Let us hear from the brotherhood on this important subject.

DANIEL WADKINS.

Nashville, Tenn., Feb. 23, 1874.

We think the foregoing worthy of consideration. The teaching of the colored population is a question that ought to appeal strongly to the hearts of every Christian. Their facilities for knowing the truth are not good. They are naturally disposed to over-much religiousness or superstition. All proper efforts should be made to direct that religious feeling properly. No people can have stronger claims upon Christians than the colored population at our own doors. It is a misfortune in my judgment, that the colored population ever attempted separate religious organizations or separate worshipping assemblies. I think the

whole course unscriptural. Difficulties might have arisen in their worshipping together: prejudices would have come in conflict.

These prejudices are not stronger than existed between Jew and Gentile in the beginning of the Church of Christ on earth. The difficulties arising would not be greater than did arise then. No apostle recommended separate church organizations or worshipping assemblies for the two parties, but showed the power of the Christian religion to harmonize the discordant races in one church. We believe it should have been done again. The whites who came into the country to use the blacks for selfish ends, encouraged the forming of separate churches that through these organizations they might control the blacks. The white members of the churches in this country, when themselves not guilty of a narrow and unworthy prejudice against church association with the colored members, gave way to a cowardly fear of the prejudices of others.

The negroes needed the care, the counsel, the oversight, the instruction of their white brethren. These can in no way so effectually be given as in the same churches and assemblies with themselves. They were members of the same churches and were encouraged to attend all the worship of the whites while slaves. Their presence would certainly be no more contaminating now than then.

But they are separate and must remain so as a whole for the present. They must be taught now in separate assemblies or the freedmen go without teaching. This teaching where competent teachers can be found

among themselves, can no doubt be more effectually done by their own color than by the whites. But they are without houses in which to meet.

It seems strange that any Christian heart yearning for the salvation of the souls of all human beings could throw obstacles in the way of their teaching. We learn that white brethren in some places refuse the use of their houses at times when unoccupied by themselves. This is usually done out of deference to what is supposed to be a popular prejudice and for fear of driving some few persons away from an attendance at the church. We do not hesitate to say, that such a foolish and unchristian prejudice should be vigorously and eagerly trampled under foot, and all persons who are driven from the church because the house is used by the humblest of God's creatures, in teaching and learning the Christian religion would bless the church by leaving it. Christians should be eager to show they have a different spirit from these. There is a positive spirit about the religion of our Savior. There is an emphatic course of life toward all men, especially the lowly and despised of earth. If our profession does not inspire this spirit and prompt to that action it makes hypocrites of us.

Our colored brethren are no more perfect than we are. I sometimes think that we expect or demand more of them than we do of ourselves. One mis-step sometimes cannot be forgiven in them. Much more allowance should be made for them, because their opportunities have not been so good. A few centuries ago, they were in a very abject state of

barbarism. They were through the institution of slavery brought into contact with the whites and elevated to a state of comparative civilization and enlightenment. In the providence of God they were freed. It is our Christian duty as it should be our ambition and desire to encourage, instruct and elevate them.

Bro. Wadkins pursued a course at one time we did not approve, in mixing up with politics. He had the same privilege that others did. Just as much right as any white Christian in the land to engage in politics. He took the side that was natural he should take. That seemed to him and the masses of his race to promote their interest. White Christians did precisely the same thing. He was no more to blame than they. I think more pardonable because not instructed. He has now quit all meddling in political affairs. He for awhile travelled around North, and begged help to preach, and like most of his white brethren who do the same, spent the money before he got to the preaching field. He has now concluded to quit this and just preach what he can, relying upon his own labors, his brethren and the Lord for help. I think he ought to be encouraged and helped.

Brethren should certainly open their meeting houses to the colored brethren. If the houses are too fine for this, they are entirely too fine for Christian purposes. The brethren, especially the elders of the congregation should attend their preaching. It would do them good, encourage them, by showing that they care for them, and would excite a kindly feeling. If they find the meetings are so con-

ducted as to do good, a little help in the way of means would do both giver and receiver good. It would afford opportunity for making suggestions, and enable them to supplement what might be lacking in the colored teacher's instruction. Above and better than all, we would be doing as Christ would do, and in doing this we become like him.

D. L.

Church News.

Dear Bro. Sewell: I write you this note that you may know something of the progress of our Lord's cause in this quarter of the earth. As I wrote you last, I am devoting half my time with the church in the city of Cairo, Ills. during my last visit to them I immersed three noble souls (upon a confession of their faith) into Christ.

The disciples seem much encouraged. I entertain encouraging hopes of much good being accomplished there.

Bro. Sewell, can't you make a visit to our country? I feel sure that good would be the result.

R. B. TRIMBLE.

Mayfield, Ky., March 1st, 1874.

Embracing the second Lord's day of March we held a meeting of four or five days at Locust Grove Ky. some seven or eight miles from Bowling Green, resulting in seven additions to the few disciples in that neighborhood. There have been only a few brethren and sisters in that community for a long time. But those few seem now much encouraged and have agreed to come together as

a church, and meet regularly at Rich Pond Station, to worship the Lord, Bro. B. F. Rogers, who is now teaching school at the Station, and who also is a proclaimer of the truth, will lead them at the present in the good work. Bro. Rogers is an earnest man, faithfully devoted to the Cause, and is exerting a very fine influence in that community. We trust the few disciples there have a prosperous and happy future before them. And if they continue faithful, no doubt many more will be won to the cause of truth, and will stand with them upon the firm "foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner stone."

E. G. S.

Obituaries.

Departed this life on Lord's day the 32nd of Feb. 1874 sister M. C. Wisenbaker, at Valdosta Lowndes Co. Ga. at the age of 79 years and two months—she had been a devoted member of the Christian Church for more than fifty years, in addition to the Bible, a constant reader of the Christian Baptist, and Milenial Harbinger, at the close of the war she was broken up at her home in Effingham Co., her native place, and soon removed here where she spent near the last nine years of her life, a constant reader of the GOSPEL ADVOCATE. She has left five daughters and two sons, 42 grand children and 32 great children, to mourn her departure but none will mourn her loss more than the poor and afflicted around her. A large experience in sickness, together with the means she had, enabled her to relieve the sick and supply the wants of the poor, to some extent which she did with a liberal hand, she survived her consort eleven or twelve years, who lived a most exemplary Christian life. She quietly and peacefully fell asleep in Jesus without an apparent struggle.

JOHN C. WALDRAM.

Valdosta Ma; ch 6th 1874.

B;os. I. & S.; It becomes my duty to make known the death of our aged and beloved brother Miles P. Murphy, which took place on the 5th of Jan. 1874, he was 65 years one month

and 15 days old. His death was very sudden he being apparently as well as usual until a very few moments before his death, he had been a member of the church for many years. He left a wife and eight sons and two daughters, who have our earnest sympathy. They are all except one members of the church of Christ. O may this stroke serve to draw our minds from earth, may it cause us to live more humbly, more prayerful, may we draw nearer to God that he may draw near to us, we may have the consoling influence of God's promises in the Gospel.

HARRISON NORTH.

Mauvy Cy, Tenn. March 6 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: It becomes my duty to record the death of our Bro. Isaiah Jordan. He died at his home near Hebron Church of which he was a member, in Rutherford Co. Tenn., on the 28th Feb. 1874, aged about fifty-two years. Bro. J. lived with the Baptist friends many years of his life, but became dissatisfied with their teaching, and by long and careful study, and through great opposition by loved ones, he became a member of the Church of God in which he lived a contented and happy life until the day of his death. Bro. J. left a large family to weep when he was called to go. Mother—children—your father, husband sleeps, but

Asleep in Jesus, blessed sleep;

From which none ever wake to weep.

A calm an undisturbed repose,

Unbroken by the last of foes.

Asleep in Jesus O how sweet

To be of such a slumber mete,

With happy confidence to sing

That death has lost its venom'd sting."

B.

Cainsville Wi'son Co. Tenn.

Brethren L. & S: Will you permit me through your paper to call the attention of the brethren wherever your paper may circulate to the Christian Colony and College set apart by Bro. Dr. Fisk of St. Louis, in Christian County Mo. It is prepared to furnish brethren cheap homes in South West Mo. in a mild, pleasant and healthy climate, rich soil, pure clear water, and with good Christian Society with good educational facilities. From the progress of the colony there is a strong probability that we shall have

a strong and flourishing colony. Many brethren from all parts of the country are going there and getting homes. Any one desiring further information on the subject will address me at Madisonville Hopkins County, Ky., enclosing stamp and I will answer promptly.

Fraternally,

W. H. GOODLOE.

Madisonville March 1874.

MEETING HOUSES.

The brethren and sisters at Lebanon Tennessee are now making an effort to erect a house of worship at that place. There have been members of the church of God there for many years, but they have never had a meeting house of their own. Sometimes they could get a hall, and sometimes they could not. They now desire to put an end to these troubles, by erecting a house of their own. Bro. W. A. Corbin is an agent of the brethren to solicit funds for them. We hope the brethren of Wilson County, and elsewhere who are in a condition to do so, will lend a helping hand, for they need a house very much. The brethren also at Spring Place, in Davidsn County Tenn., are making arrangements to build them a house this coming Summer, and we hope they will be able to succeed, for a house is very much needed at that place. They have no house there in which they can meet with any certainty, except their own private houses. They have been shut out of houses there once or twice, and we hope they will build a house of their own, and thus have a house in which

they can meet regularly to serve the Lord, and in which they can present the gospel to their neighbors.

E. G. S.

To the Little Folks. No. 2.

In our last talk I promised to tell you what I have been doing for some time past. I cannot tell you *all* I have been doing, but chiefly, I have been laboring for the little folks. I have long seen the need of the right kind of schools in Texas, and I have been laboring to establish one of as near the right kind as I could. I am well convinced that our schools ought to be entirely under Christian government; and that Christians ought to take great pains to establish and support such. There is no more important work than training up the little folks in the way they should go.

"Uncle Joe, do you think Christian parents ought to send their children to a school taught by Christian teachers, in preference to any other?"

I do, most assuredly, where the teachers are qualified. If they are not qualified their brethren ought to tell them so, and advise them to resign the school into the hands of teachers who are qualified.

"My Ma says she is going to send us children wherever it suits her convenience and taste, no matter what kind of teachers there are."

I think it is a ruinous policy to sacrifice the proper training of the young to our convenience and taste. The children of parents who do this are not apt to be devoted Christians when they become grown.

"If it is such a good thing, why do

we not have more schools under the charge of Christian teachers?"

Because the members of the Church of Christ have not properly appreciated such schools. The various religious parties and those under their influence refuse to send to a school under the charge of a member of the Christian church, on account of his religion. Many of his brethren fail to see the obligation they are under to support his school—send when it suits their taste or convenience; and the Christian teacher is starved out, and has to quit teaching.

"Uncle Joe, you said you had been laboring for the little folks in school matters. What have you done?"

I have established as near the right kind of school as I knew how, and was able to. I have purchased a fine College building and have supplied every department with good and experienced teachers—all Christians.

"Where is your college located?"

It is located at Thorp's Springs, Hood Co., Texas. These Springs are called sulphur, but they have other minerals in them, and the water is noted for its healthful properties. They are resorted to by a great many people for their health. The village is small, and the morals of the society are good. The law prohibits any spirituous liquors being sold at this place. It is in the midst of a very rich, beautiful and healthy country. There are fine springs of pure water and beautiful running streams, clear as crystal. It is in a retired place, free from the bustle and vices of a railroad town.

"You have found a nice place. What is the name of your college?"

It is called AddRan Male and Female College.

"La! Uncle Joe, what a funny name. Where did you get it?"

The name is singular. I will tell you how it came. I had a dear, lovely little grand-son, who left us and crossed the cold Jordan of death when he was three years old. Don't call me partial when I say he was one of the loveliest and best of little boys, for this is what every one said of him who knew him. Well, his name was AddRan. He got this name by taking a part of his father's name and a part of his uncle's, and putting them together, so making one new name. It is one word with two capital letters, but it is difficult for me to get the printers to understand it; they generally put a space between the Add and the Ran, and this ought not to be done.

"It is a singular name; but, Uncle Joe, I will never call it a funny name again. Since you have told me what you have about it, I will love that name."

It rejoices my heart to see so many little folks, and a good many that are not very little, coming from different parts of the country to this college to get an education. I think the instruction they get here will be well calculated to prepare their minds to receive Christ. We want to do a work here that will meet with approval beyond the shores of time.

"Don't you think if the Christian churches *owned* the college it would have a greater patronage?"

I doubt it; indeed I think the college can be managed with more harmony and success as individual property than the property of the

churches. If it be meritorious I shall expect it to be patronized. If not, it ought not to be. I want it to stand on its merits. I am determined that all possible shall be done to make it deserving.

"I am so sorry for some children whose parents are so poor they cannot send them to school, and some who have no parents, and can't go."

Yes, such demand our sympathy and our aid. If the poor would do their duty to themselves, and others would do their duty towards the poor, they would be provided for. Our blessed Savior teaches us to remember the poor. We managed that four months tuition of the present scholastic year in the college should be free. It is our intention to do this every year if we can. Besides this, we propose to teach the children free of charge, of preachers who devote their whole time to preaching the gospel. We desire to do all we can for the destitute, while we are doing for others; but how much we shall be able to do, depends upon the patronage and support we receive—which must come chiefly from our Christian brethren.

While our labors are for qualifying youths to fill the different useful business callings of life, it will be our aim to teach them and influence them to choose "that good part which shall never be taken away from them."

UNCLE JOE.

If you wish success in life, make perseverance your bosom friend, experience your wise counsellor, caution your older brother, and hope your genius.

SOCIAL LINES AND CHRISTIAN WORK.

BY R. CORDLEY.

THERE is a very common feeling, "uttered or unexpressed," that every church has its own stratum of society on which to work, and must not expect to cut the planes of social stratification. We are told, by actions oftener than by words, that people of similar culture, similar position, and similar tastes, will go together, and that is a waste of time to attempt to override this great law of human association. Churches often explain their want of growth by referring to the character of the people about them. "There are none of our kind of people around us." So it is no uncommon thing to see a refined and cultivated church membership, enough, one would think, to leaven a whole community, in the midst of a large non-church going population, and yet scarceily making a convert a year. And they seem perfectly satisfied about it, and are surprised that any one should expect them to grow. If the truth be known *they do not want to grow out of such materials.* This feeling, cherished, perhaps, unconsciously, has more to do with their lack of growth than the character of the community itself. They long to grow, and pray for growth; but they are hoping for an *imported* growth. They pray that God will send them some good, live Christians to settle among them and strengthen their hands. And they will write to the Eastern papers urging Christian families to come and settle among them. Their longing for growth does not include a longing for the salvation

of these masses among whom God has thrown them and whom he expects them to leaven. These are the Gentiles who, at best, can only be "hewers of wood and drawers of water." These are the Samaritans, with whom no good Jew has any dealings,

But these church members ought to remember that if God had anything to do with their location, he sent them there for some other purpose than to form a mutual admiration society, and to congratulate each other on having "all the best families in our church." He did not send them merely to attract others like themselves to the same place, but that they might transform that very people among whom their lot is cast. If they were as anxious to give Christ's salvation to those about them as they are to attract kindred spirits to come among them, they would not long remain barren and unfruitful. When Paul's soul was stirred within him on seeing the whole city given to idolatry, he did not send to Jerusalem for a colony of saints to come and settle in Athens, but he went out upon Mars' Hill and preached Jesus and the resurrection to those very idolators, and the church of Athens was the result. Let such a church as we are describing feel that they have a mission to that very people by whom they are surrounded, and use their refinement and talent and social power in opening their hearts to the Gospel, and there would soon be a transformation that would astonish and startle them.

Social distinctions are very strong, and the barriers of diverging tastes are very high and hard to cross. But to allow them to set limits to Christ-

ian work and bounds to the proclamation of the Gospel is to make them stronger than the love of Christ. The Catholic puts his church above all things else, and there are no social distinctions in Catholic churches. When we place Christ where he ought to be, at the head of all the objects of our thought, then, "the rich and the poor will meet together," and we shall lose sight of every thing but the fact that "the Lord is maker of them both." Men blend joyfully together when the leading purpose of their spirits is the same. If wealth, or culture, or social standing is first in our hearts, then on this basis shall we select our companions. But if Christ be first, then Christ and his work will determine our associates

MIMICKING OTHERS.—A wise man said, hundreds of years ago, that "he never could have a good opinion of a child who makes it his study to raise a laugh by mimicking the manners, the looks, or the defects of others;" and he gives an excellent reason for it: "A child, to have true genius, should, in my opinion, 'be good and virtuous. I would rather see him a little slow and dull than with a bad sort of smartness.'"

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Memoirs of Jesus.....	265
Matthew 19, 12 once more.....	270
Health Hints.....	272
The Law of sin and death.....	276
Queries.....	277
Teaching of the colored People.....	281
Church News.....	283
Obituaries.....	284
Meeting Houses.....	284
The Little Folks.....	285
Social lines and Christian work.....	288

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 13.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MARCH 26, 1874.

How to Become a Christian.

If we form our conclusions on this subject from what we see and hear among the different denominations of our country, we should be led to conclude that there are many ways of attaining this one grand end. But regarding a subject of so much importance as this, we should never be satisfied without a thorough study of the Scriptures. That all things necessary to be done by the sinner in order to become a child of God, are contained in the New Testament, no one at all familiar therewith, and who fully believes it, can for a moment doubt. Jesus began in the early part of his ministry to speak of the manner in which people were to become his followers. In the sermon on the Mount, he gives us to understand that if we would enter into the kingdom of heaven, we must do the will of our Heavenly Father. This at once indicates in a very strong light that there is a heavy responsibility of doing the will of God that rests upon man in this matter. The responsibility of doing the will of God rests upon man while the giving of that will, and

the bestowal of the blessings promised to be given upon that obedience, are from God. And that there is a sufficiency contained in the word of God is abundantly evident from the following plain passages. "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, shall be likened to a wise man that built his house upon a rock; and when the rain descended and the floods came and the winds blow and beat upon that house, it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." No matter what may be said by men of modern times about the inefficiency of the word of God, nor how much contempt they may express against what they call a mere book religion, the man who learns and does the will of God is infallibly safe. All the storms of time can never harm him. And every intimation on the part of man that the word of God is powerless in the sinner's conversion is a palpable contradiction of this passage, from the Son of God himself.

The religion of Jesus is a plain, sensible matter that has to be learned and done, not "got." Jesus said "Take my yoke upon you, and learn

of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart and ye shall find rest to your souls.' Mat xi. 29. Here we are informed that we must come to the Savior and *learn* of him. We cannot go to him personally now, as the people did when he was personally on earth, but we can go to his word through his apostles, and learn from him through that channel, the same as if he were here personally. We can be a disciple of no one, except by following his teaching. Jesus Christ has left on record a glorious system of instruction, and when we study this, and follow its divine directions, then we are his disciples: not otherwise. Again our Savior said, "And if any man hear my words, and believeth them not, I judge him not; for I have not come to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the words that I have spoken shall judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting; whatever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." John 12, 47-50.

So men may understand and believe the word of God if they will. "If any man hear my words and believe not." We may hear his words and believe, or we may hear them and believe not. But at the same time we may be well assured that we shall be judged by this word at the last day. This being true, how highly important that we should seek to understand the word of God and fol-

low what it requires of us. The word of God is sufficient to save or condemn us, according as we follow or disregard its requirements. We know it is sufficient to lead us to salvation, for Jesus says in the above passage, "And I know that his commandment is life everlasting." Such declarations as this, from the Son of God himself, should give us confidence to read and study the word of truth, with an assurance that we can understand it, and through it obtain everlasting life. Eternal life is the highest attainment that mortals of earth can possibly make. And yet all this can be attained through the word of eternal truth. We are not dependent upon some sort of direct impulse for eternal life, but upon the word of God, which in his abundant mercy he has given us. And without studying and following the word of God, we can have no promise of salvation. For Jesus says, "whoever therefore shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." No matter what else people may claim in the way of direct or secret influences, they need make no calculation of salvation unless they embrace and obey the word of the Lord. Indeed we know not what could be more offensive and impious in the sight of God than to distrust and disregard his word and trust to secret influences. If the word of God is not sufficient to lead us unto life and salvation, then what is? Paul says of the word of God, that it "is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword. "The word

"quick," means *living*. The word of God then is not powerless, and dead, but is living and powerful. But unfortunately the people have a way of making the word of God of no effect as they did in the days of the Savior. Said he, "thus you have made the commandment of God of none effect, by your tradition." Mat. 15, 6. In those days the people had crowded out the word of God, and had filled its place by their own traditions, and their own wisdom. He mentions the command of God to the child, to obey its parents, and tells them they had made that command void, by substituting the commandments of men in its stead. Just as the people at the present time are making void the command of God, by substituting in their stead the doctrines and commands of the people to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." But the sinner is often told that he *cannot believe*, but that at the proper time the Lord will give him faith—that faith is the gift of God, and that the sinner cannot exercise or work a gift. And thus the word of God is set aside by the doctrines and commandments of men.

Again; when the sinner does believe in spite of the doctrines of men, and asks what to do, he is commanded to pray and be prayed for, and that through this means the Lord, in his own good time will speak peace to his soul. But is this what the word of God says to such enquirers? Nay verily. To just such Peter, by inspiration said, "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." Acts

2, 38. Now why will not men give this answer to such characters at the present time? Why is it, that in the religious revivals so-called, where the object is to convert sinners and thus make Christians that this [command of God is never used? We have no recollection of ever hearing it quoted to mourners in a "get religion" revival. But why will they not quote it? Why do they instead say something that never was by inspiration addressed to such characters? We cannot tell why it is so, but we know it is so. And in all such cases, the word of God is powerless, because it has been made void by the doctrines and commandments of men. And we may safely say this is the reason why the word of God is having so little effect upon men, and why it is regarded as a dead letter. By the infidel the whole is set aside, or made of none effect. By many religionists of modern times, all that portion of it that seems not to accord with their theory of religion, is set aside, or disregarded. And by one means and another, the pure word of God is made void among many of the people. There are comparatively few in the present generation, who are willing to just take the word of God alone for their guide in all things. On one occasion Jesus said, "blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." So then those that hear the word of God and keep it, have the blessing of God, and that is enough.

God's blessing is worth the universe beside: so that those who carefully observe the word of God, need have no fears. Again, Jesus said to

the Jews who believed on him, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Heaven's truth will make all free from sin that will obey it. Those who commit sin, are the servants of sin. But when they obey the truth, they are freed from that servitude. But the doctrines and commandments of men cannot make men free from sin: They can displace the word of God, but they cannot fill its place. James, when writing to Christians said, "Of his own will begat he us, with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." Jas. 1, 18. When these people were made Christians, it was by the word of God. In the same chapter he says, "Receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." Here the word is said to be able to save the soul. It is by no means a dead letter, if it is able to save the soul.

But again Peter says to Christians referring to the manner in which they were made Christians, "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a true heart fervently: being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." All these people had purified their souls in obeying the truth, in obeying the word of God. And in so doing they were born again by the word of God. And among these people to whom Peter wrote, we doubt not were some of those who first obeyed the gospel

in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost and at Solomon's portico. And this is proof positive that a simple obedience to the word of God, to the gospel of Christ, will make Christians; will accomplish all that is meant by the expression "born again, born of water and of the Spirit."

One of the greatest difficulties we have in teaching the people how to become Christians, is to induce them to look with confidence to the word of truth, as being amply sufficient to make them the "sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty." The people are still waiting for a sign from heaven. They are waiting for and expecting direct operations from above, to make them the children of God. And while such is the case, the word of God will be to them as an idle tale, as an antiquated legend that is supposed to have pertained to former days, and to have no power now. And we therefore think that we can never benefit the sinner, until we can induce him to look with full confidence to the word of God as sufficient to lead him with infallible certainty into the kingdom of God on earth, and ultimately to a home in heaven, if strictly followed. The whole cause of ruin to the Jewish people was, that they would not obey the word of God—they would not hearken to observe and to do all the commandments and statutes of the God of Israel. They refused to hearken; they walked in their own ways, they went away backward. While they obeyed the word, they were a prosperous and happy people. When they disobeyed, they suffered the punishment due to such disobedience. And we may be assured the same principle will hold

good with us. If we obey the truth, God will bless us. If we refuse the truth, he will punish us with an everlasting punishment. Having thus briefly presented a few passages, showing the power and sufficiency of the word of truth, in order to inspire confidence in the word of God on the part of any of our friends who may chance to read this article, we propose hereafter to direct attention to a number of those passages which teach us specifically how to become Christians. For we have nothing to present but the word of the Lord, that we have one particle of confidence in, as being sufficient to benefit one human being in matters of religion. But just so certain as the Bible is true, just that certainly those who put themselves fully under its guidance and control will be saved. And there is no other ground of safety. We can by no other means defend ourselves from the assaults of error, than by the word of the living God.

E. G. S.

his Church or body and when it should be perfected, then all these gifts, parts, should be done away; have we the perfect law or have we still to look to our overseers; if the overseer gets the sincere milk from the perfected law—can't each member do the same thing? Brother, I have been taught that we have but one lawgiver; one shepherd, one overseer; and we must follow him and him alone; am I mistaken, is it yet in earthen vessels? or has life and immortality been brought to light through the gospel? James tells us that he that looks into the perfected law, (not overseer) etc., shall be blest; if the child of God will not obey his Father he would not obey a dozen overseers. Once more: What is the overseer's duty? Is it his duty to watch over the congregation, that is my duty too; is it his duty to sing, pray, etc; mine too. But I have said enough. Please let us hear from you again on this (at this time) very important subject.

Quinsville, Wilson Co., Tenn.

OFFICERS AGAIN.

Bro. Sewell: After reading you in the Advocate on the subject of Bishops, Overseers, I wish to ask a few questions. 1st, Suppose the overseer teach an error; would he be accountable in our stead? You say, submit yourselves to the one having rule over you; had we not better have a Pope, one who claims to be infallible? I know the Lord did place some in the Church (in the early day) as it pleased him, but I do think I have heard you teach that that was for the perfecting of

The foregoing was addressed to Bro. Sewell. But as I have taken a long file of queries, that have been accumulating for a year past, to clear up, answering such as seems profitable to answer, passing others into the waste-basket, I will make a response to this. In the first place, our brother intended no discourtesy I am sure, but it is not courteous to make ugly or offensive comparisons or intimations. And on account of these many questions go unanswered, many articles unpublished. Bro. Sewell is just as far from desiring a Pope or placing popish authority in the

hands of any one as is the writer of the foregoing. If his arguments tend to that evil it was perfectly legitimate to show so, and would have been respectful. We think it would be much better to submit to one who does not claim to be infallible. One who recognizes his liability to be wrong will be guarded and less liable to be wrong than one who claims he cannot err. A man who has overweening confidence in his own judgment, is more liable to be wrong than one with less confidence. Simply because he does not exercise the same caution. As a rule, the men who are certain they cannot err are the men who always do err.

Our brother thinks because a teacher may teach wrong, it is wrong for us to submit to the teachers. On the same ground, because a parent is liable to teach a child wrong, the child should not recognize the authority of the parent; the wife, of the husband; the younger of the Elder. The truth is, all these commands given concerning these relations on earth, are given, subject to the modification of the first, great command, "Thou shalt serve the Lord thy God, with all the soul, with all the mind and with all the body." The overseer in the church has authority only so far as he conforms to the will of God. When he transcends that, it is wrong to obey him. So with the child and parent—the husband and wife. Because it is wrong to obey a husband contrary to the word of God, it is not therefore wrong to obey him in accord with the law. So of the overseer. If it was necessary in ancient times to have overseers to see the word of God attended to, it is

equally so now. The law of God is the limit of authority and obedience. It cannot run into popery.

We are just as certain that every church needs overlookers now as that they did in ancient times. Whatever was needful in the way of workers and servants for the perfection of the saints then, is equally needful now.

Then, they depended upon inspiration of individuals for instruction and guidance, now they go to the completed, written word. The necessity for overseers then and now is, that all do not study that word as they should nor engage diligently in the work of the Lord. Some persons whose duty and work are to watch over, instruct and admonish, see that all study the word of God and then do it.

Such persons are just as essential in the church as they are in the family. Some must look after the wants of the poor, the sick, the infirm. We have never known persons who denied that such persons were needed in the congregation of the Lord. The question of doubt and discussion is, how do they get into these works, and what is the nature of their authority.

On some phases of these questions, we have had doubts and difficulties. Some say they grow up into this work; others, they are elected and appointed to it by the church or its teachers. We never knew one who denied the necessity of having individuals whose special duty is to do the work or see that it is done. I am inclined to believe, that both plans of getting into the work, are recognized in Scripture. Churches were left without elections or appointments for a while—the work was placed

before them, and then they were left, each one under the Bible, to develop his natural tastes and talents. After awhile the teacher went back to see if all the work was performed as it should be. If it was, I think no interference with work was ever proposed, by election, appointment, ordination or otherwise. If that work or any part of it, was neglected, they set in order the things *wanting*. That is they caused the church to select certain individuals whose character suited them for the work neglected, to do that work. "They ordained Elders in every city," means simply, they placed the Elders to the work to which they were adapted in qualities of mind and heart, giving each his proper position in the church.

We do not believe that there is a fixed model given in the Scriptures, of just so many officers, that must in all cases be conformed to. Certain work of God's church must be done by the church. So long as that work was all done, without election and appointment there was no election or appointment. When any part of it was neglected, some one was appointed to do that which was neglected. These appointments had reference to the special work, rather than a permanent office of the church.

The first instance of appointment under apostolic sanction illustrates this. The affairs of the church proceeded for some time without appointment. It was found the Grecian widows were neglected; seven men were then appointed to see to this work. They were not appointed permanent officers, but to attend to these neglected Greek widows. When this work passed away their office

was gone. These individuals instead of remaining at Jerusalem, as permanent functionaries of the church, went abroad preaching the gospel, as did other disciples at the persecution.

I think the primitive example a good one. Let the church develop the taste and talent of its members. When they perform the work in this manner, let well enough alone. Whenever anything is lacking in the work appoint some one to do the work. When the work is done, and the necessity for the office passes away, let it cease. If the work is a permanent one, the appointment becomes permanent.

The question of authority and the meaning of office and officer are the difficult questions. The words office and officer are of doubtful and double meaning. We believe if the terms were wholly eschewed and ignored the difficulties would vanish. The word officer is never in the Scriptures applied to a member of a church of Christ. The word office but once or twice and there it is very doubtful if it be a proper translation. The word service in each instance would give a clearer idea. But men are frequently appointed to service as well as to office. When any service is needed in the church that is not voluntarily performed, some must be appointed to perform the service. Office may mean merely service. It may mean more than service. An officer in civil and ecclesiastical affairs generally conveys the idea of authority to do work that could not be done without the authority. General Grant can do things as President, that would be criminal in him to perform out of the office.

The same idea of office obtains generally among the ecclesiastical bodies of this age. Our Baptist friends who claim to be clearer of this than others, think it is a crime for one of God's priests to offer thanks at the Lord's table, or even hand around the bread and wine, without first being inducted into office. In this sense we have never been able to find the idea of office or officer as connected with the church of Christ, in the Bible. In the sense of a specific service or one appointed to perform special services, as we have before indicated, we have no more doubt than we have of the existence of the Bible. Nor have we a doubt that among these appointments was, and ought still to be that of looking after the general instruction, department and interests of the members and the church, in other words, overlooking the character and work of the congregation. If this is done well by the natural development and voluntary work of the members, why change? If it is neglected appoint certain brethren after the apostolic model to do this work. . . This is their work or service. Their authority extends not a whit beyond the teachings of the Bible. Just as a husband, parent or master's authority does not reach beyond the limits of Biblical authority. The members are to submit to them just as the child or wife is to submit to the parent or husband, "in the Lord." There is no more difficulty about that than this.

The trouble as I have seen it with churches, is they will not select according to the directions of the Spirit, but from some worldly considera-

tions. Those thus selected, take the worldly view of office and officer, and endeavor to carry out their views in this spirit. Evil only results from this course. And the church is better off left to the chance development of some natural taste and talent for overlooking and caring for the general good. We have grave doubts if ever hands were formally imposed, save for imparting spiritual gifts.

The miraculous gifts of the early church that inspired men, that they might look after the affairs of the church have certainly ceased. The necessity for looking after them has not. Then, before the Scriptures of the New Testament were given, these elders, overlookers in doing this service learned through the inspired teaching given directly to them, how to conduct affairs. Now they learn by studying the same inspired teaching as recorded in the Bible. The service of teaching, admonishing, encouraging, strengthening, reproving and warning, must still be done. So long as the service is needed, so long must some person or persons do the service. Whether he grows into it by the general consent and recognition of every member or is appointed to do it depends upon circumstances.

D. L.

Tennessee Penitentiary.

My connection with this institution as chaplain began March 11th, 1872, and by legal limitation ended March 15th, 1874. Thus for two years it was my pleasant duty to hold out regularly to those unfortunate men the bread of eternal life. The

result shows that the work was not in vain. During my ministration I baptized 83. Rev. Drs. Kelley and Hargrove of the M. E. Church South received into the membership of the McKendree church about 20. Rev. Dr. Jones of the Baptist church a few.

Very soon after I began, I organized a congregation in the Prison, and thereafter attended to the Lord's supper every Lord's day; preaching in the forenoon, and in the afternoon working in the Sunday School and teaching them music. There seems to be as much sincerity of religious profession among many of these men, as I see elsewhere. As far as human observation can determine such matters, great moral reformations have been effected in the lives of many, by our labor.

My duty calling me more closely to my profession—declining to apply for reappointment to the Chaplaincy—on Sunday evening 15th inst., with emotions of sadness and sympathy, I bid them an affectionate adieu, amid many expressions of kindness and tears—fondly trusting that in the end of life's pilgrimage, disrobed of their "stripes of disgrace," and cleansed by the blood of the Lamb, that we alike may have the gladdening welcome, well done, good and faithful servants enter into the joy of the Lord.

As touching my retirement, I subjoin an article from the daily *Republican Banner* of this city, and a letter from the Prisoners. The *Banner* says:

"Last Sunday morning Dr. W. C. Cook preached his farewell sermon at the Penitentiary as Chaplain, as

his term has just expired, and he is not an applicant for reappointment.

In the afternoon he was present at the Sunday-school, and took occasion to say a few parting words to the teachers and prisoners. He called upon all to witness that he had had the interest of the Sunday school ever at heart; that he had acted in a most liberal spirit towards ministers of other denominations, in inviting them to occupy his pulpit, and that he had endeavored, to the best of his ability, to discharge the duties of his position. His remarks were very earnest, and listened to with profound attention by the entire audience.

Rev. H. S. Bennett, one of the Superintendents of the School, then read a letter from the members of Dr. Cook's prison church and others, expressive of their sincere regret at his retirement, of their appreciation of his faithful services and of their personal regard.

Rev. H. S. Bennett and J. O. Griffith, Esq., Associate Superintendents of the Sabbath-school, each paid a tribute to the liberality and cordiality of Dr. Cook towards the teachers of the school, and stated that their intercourse with him had been of the most pleasant nature.

Dr. Cook retires with the best wishes of the officers of the Penitentiary, of the prisoners, and of the teachers of the Sunday-school."

PRISONERS' LETTER.

We, the members of the Christian Church, and many other true and faithful Christian hearts, hereby desire to express our deep-felt sorrow at the departure as chaplain, of Dr. W. C. Cook. In bidding him a pray-

erful adieu, with our hearts' fondest and best wishes, for his future happiness and success in the great cause of Christ, we must say with both joy and regret that in him we feel and know that we lose a true and faithful friend in all that is right; an earnest and devotional chaplain; a quiet worker and an humble yet zealous servant of God. This is proven by the seed he has sown here, among such unfortunates as we, and the fruits that have already been produced. We speak this from experience, both joyful and sad, the sentiments of many hearts, that have been comforted by him, through his ministry, and now, while compelled to give him up reluctantly—we desire a hearty welcome and earnestly request, that he meet with us in church and Sabbath-School labor, often as circumstances, convenience &c., will admit, and will heartily welcome him. Receive this the last prayer of your true, though unworthy friends, and followers of Christ.

MANY PRISONERS.

Nashville, March 14th, 1874.

In conclusion, I would thank all the officers of the prison, the Sunday school teachers, and prisoners for their uniform courtesy and cooperation extended me while in the discharge of religious duty.

W. C. COOK.

REPLY TO BRO. RAMSEY,

AS FOUND IN THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE
OF JANUARY 29TH, 1874, AND NO. 5.

Dear Brother Ramsey: Your answer to my queries has set some of

our McMinnville brethren to thinking, and I must say with them, that it is the best production that I remember to have seen on the subject.

I must say that I commend you for your course in withdrawing from the Court, after doing all that you could to get an agreed discharge. We should do nothing that would give us a bad conscience, though we save much money and much severe criticism. See 1st Tim. i: 5-19. But we should use all the means in our power to enlighten our consciences, and act from an enlightened conscience.

I have seen the day that I could neglect the assembly of the saints on the first day of the week for the purpose of saving money and for pleasure, without any remorse of conscience. But I could not now: since it has been written on my heart, "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is, but exhort one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching. For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." Heb. x: 25, 26.

While I admit that your answer is worthy of our careful consideration, I am by no means satisfied that I should not vote nor serve as a juror. And inasmuch as brother E. G. Sewell calls for some one to show where you misconstrue the Scriptures, I propose to offer such criticism as it strikes me should be made for the good of the brotherhood generally.

1st, you insist that we pervert the teaching of the 13th of Romans, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher

powers; for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God," etc., including the 6th verse. But you fail to show to my satisfaction what is taught. You however admit that God ordained these rulers, but not for his approved subjects; then what means the language, "For he is the minister of God to thee for good?" Then Paul says that all things work for their good, and certainly you are mistaken when you say that they were not for the use of his approved subjects. But how do these rulers benefit the Christian? They protect him in person and property, enable him to live in peace and quiet, and to worship God, with no one to molest or make him afraid.

We admit that these rulers have turned aside from their true mission. As in the case of crucifying Christ by Pilate and punishing Christians. And even in these cases it was more the pressure of the mob or outlaws than their own dispositions. There was, evidently, a want of moral courage on their part, in that they did not do right and refuse to hear the mob (outlaws).

Their offices were good, created by God, it was not the office but the abuse that worked evil, to the Christian. Some members of the church do wrong, but we are not on this account to condemn the church, neither should we condemn government because some governors do wrong.

It is not the church that makes men do wrong, but Satan ruling where Christ should rule. So it was not the government that made Nero do wrong, but Satan and his ministers ruling him where the law should

have ruled him. But you intimate that a Christian could not as an officer punish an evil-doer. I insist as a Christian he is to resist not evil, suffer long and remain kind, not to take vengeance in his own hands; God will avenge us. He has ordained the officers for the punishment of evil-doers, see Romans xiii:4. Now if a Christian should be an officer and refuse to execute the law he would become an offender of God's law.

It is true as you say, that the Scriptures do not tell us how to select our rulers. But I understand the reason to be, that there are so many forms of government, that no general rule would apply in all countries; therefore none is given. Hence we have such directions as "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man (not devil) for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well." 1st Pet. ii: 13-14. Again see the 17th verse, "*Honor the king.*"

And again Titus iii: 1st verse, "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." This appears to me to be sufficient direction. For example the wife is told to obey her husband; that is sufficient without going into full detail. The one general command is sufficient. But if he should command her to bow to an image made with hands she is not to obey, from the fact that his command conflicts with the superior commands of God. So it is not right that the two come in conflict; but if they should, then obey God. So if the govern-

ment call on you to vote or serve on the jury obey. But if they call on you to fight in a war or to cease preaching in the name of Christ, we are not to obey either of these commands. For wars come of our sins and the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, as you have well said. But you seem to think that we would be troubled to tell which was the Lord's side in an election and anticipate a trouble in getting all to vote on his side. I think that your difficulty just here is imaginary. All intelligent thinking Christians know that he is not on the side of the dishonest man nor is he on the side of the man who violates the law of his country by treating for votes. The Christian man, I understand, is truly a free man; thinks that every one should vote on his own judgment—he therefore takes care of himself on election days, letting others vote as they please. He votes as he understands for peace, but if war should come, he is under no obligation to fight.

But you at one time seem to admit that we are subjects of these governments; and then have us making war on them, in another place, which to my mind is not very consistent. And then again, you affirm that no one can be a citizen of two kingdoms at the same time. If you mean that one could not be a citizen of the United States and Great Britain; or the kingdom of Satan (which is a kingdom of darkness) and the kingdom of God (which is a kingdom of light) at the same time, I agree with you, for they are opposed to each other. And that he must renounce allegiance to one before he can be a

citizen of the other. But should a citizen of the United States desire to become a Christian he would not have to renounce allegiance to the United States government; by no means, it only makes him a better citizen. The church and State government are not opposed to each other; but contrariwise, the church is dependent on the State government for protection, and the State is dependent on the church to civilize, moralize and ennoble its citizens. You insist on a literal construction of the passage, "Render to Cæsar the things that bear his image:" Do you know any one who when he gets money bearing the image of any one, goes and gives it to the one whose image is found on the money? It strikes me that to be consistent with your interpretation of this passage that is just what you would have to do. I learn from the passage that we owe some things to Cæsar and some things to God, and that we should render to each their due. Our highest and best energies are due to God. Other duties come in after, such as our duties to our families, country, neighbors, etc. Now Bro. Ramsey, I am surprised somewhat at you in your answer to my query on praying for rulers. You say, pray that the Lord put it into the hearts of rulers to rule well—why not pray for the Lord to put food into the mouths of the destitute, and then give them nothing, one is as consistent as the other. When I pray for rulers I understand that I must contribute something, if I can, to secure that end, and when I pray for the poor, I understand that I am not to turn a deaf ear to their cries. For

example, our sectarian preachers pray for the conversion of the sinner, and fail to give him the teaching necessary to his conversion; for this we condemn them. But if you are consistent, they are, as I think. I agree with you most heartily, when you say Christians should keep out of law. That they should suffer wrong and still be kind. Still I insist that the law is necessary and without it the *man of God* would be deprived of much peace of mind.

But you propose that if I can show that the political governments of this world do not belong to Satan, that you will yield the whole controversy. Remember that your proposition is, that they now belong to Satan, and not that they did in the time of our Savior's personal ministry. I believe that I shall be able to show it, and I hope that you will be able to see it, and if you should see it, I am sure that you will yield at once.

I will admit for argument's sake, (but not as a fact) that they were the kingdoms of Satan, at the time that our Savior came to earth.

"Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." Rom. vi: 16. When the Savior came into the world all had gone out of the way and there was none that did good, no not one. See Romans iii: 10, 11 and 12.

God ordained the government and made the people for good purposes; but they had been perverted (turned from the right to the wrong) and become Satan's.

From the above quotation from

Paul, we conclude that inasmuch as all had yielded themselves servants to Satan they were therefore his, not only the government but the people.

Then the government imprisoned and hung good men, and released bad men. But how is it now? Just the reverse is true. Now good men are protected, not imprisoned, not hanged; but bad men are.

Now, Bro. Ramsey, if it is Satan that is to-day protecting good men, and religious assemblies and punishing bad men, has he not turned to God since the primitive days of the church? We are sure that he is not trying to suppress evil-doing, and we know that our government is. It is obvious, therefore, that the governments are not now Satan's. It would have been prudent then in a good man to have refused to serve as a juror: but how is it now?

We admit that our rulers do many things that are wrong: still their purpose is to do right. So the purpose of the true Christian is to do right. Yet we know that he is not without sin.

But now, Bro. Ramsey, I propose to be a little more pointed, though none the less courteous. Why do you, in the brief space of twenty-eight lines, and in three, almost identical propositions, use the phrase, "active participant?" 1st, "But he has nowhere in the Bible given one word as to how his servants shall conduct themselves as *active participants* in a government of human mould." 2nd, "But not a word as to how a man shall conduct himself as an *active participant* in a political government." 3rd, "But nowhere furnish

him with a single word as to how he shall act as a ruler, and *active participant* in a human government." (Italics are mine.) May it not be inferred that you see trouble ahead and wish to avoid it by the qualifying phrase, "*active participant*." By this language you admit there is a participation in human governments, though not *active*. But does participation imply inactivity? Is there no action even in paying tribute? Was there no active participation when Peter went afishing for the money to pay the custom for himself and Master? You must know that there can be no such thing as inactive obedience. Then, if we obey human governments that obedience must be active and your effort at a distinction where there is no difference, only weakens the force of your argument. Then our support of human governments, so far as it may go, must be active, that we may have "praise of the same."

But if there were any doubt about this reasoning you have acknowledged the point when you say a Christian may be a husband, a wife, a servant, a master. A Christian may sometimes wrong his brother or be wronged *may be a subject of earthly human governments because the Scriptures thoroughly furnish him with directions for his guidance* in these things." And this comes between two of your propositions denying *active participation*.

But in your zeal to make an argument out of the temptation of Christ, you say the kingdoms of the world belonged to the devil or else Christ was not tempted, which proposition you require me to admit, and then

you triumphantly ask, "Can a man be a citizen according to any laws human or divine of two governments at one and the same time. "Does he not renounce allegiance to the former the very moment he vows allegiance to the latter." Now, my brother, you have answered for me that a Christian may be a subject of an earthly human government because the Bible furnishes him directions therefor. Surely Bro. Ramsey is good authority against himself.

But you do not stop here—you undertake to prove, and you "stake the whole matter in controversy," upon it "that these political governments are the kingdoms of Satan." Then admitting for the present (and a second time) that you proved it, you have proved that a *Christian* may be a subject of Satan's Kingdom and is bound to render obedience to his Satanic majesty. "Because the Scriptures thoroughly furnish him with directions for his guidance in these relations." "Behold the dilemma into which bro. Ramsey casts himself."

You draw a picture of what you think my position would lead me to, and then you ask: "Now where is the authority and what the directions in this important matter."

Now to show the fallacy of your reasoning when you insist that I shall show the authority of the Lord for my course followed with the quotation just given, I will ask: did you sell me the bay horse "in the name of the Lord, that is by his authority?" "Now where is the authority and what the direction in this important matter?"

Now it seems that you must see

that your logic is as fatal to yourself as to me, and that if we wait for a positive law in every case of human action, it would be next to impossible to agree about any specific act. Can you give a positive law for our correspondence? If not, then it is wrong by your theory.

And again—by what authority did you refuse to serve as a juror when Christ and his apostles enjoin obedience to rulers? Cæsar has jurors as well as coins. Christ said, "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." You are a Christian and an American. The law of Christ requires obedience to the government of the U. S. and of Tennessee. Now I ask in all candor; in refusing to act as juror did you not violate the laws of both kingdoms, or rather of three governments?

Remember, my brother, that you have called for a "thus saith the Lord" for my conduct, and it will not do for you to offer anything less for yours. If you fall back on inferences from general laws you will of course allow me to draw my own inferences. Now I can show a specific law for voting as easily as you can a specific law against it. Tell me the chapter and verse authorizing you to purchase and use a "sulky cultivator," rather than the ancient plow made of a forked limb; and then perhaps I can cite the passage directing me to vote for A. B. against C. D.

I now ask your attention again, to your position that a man cannot be a citizen of two governments at the same time, and that when allegiance is avowed to one there is necessarily a renunciation of allegiance to the other. Paul was a Jew, a Roman

and a Christian and did not cease to be a Jew or a Roman when he became a Christian—so far from renouncing allegiance, he appealed to Caesar in order to escape the fury of the Jews. My brother surely can see from this that over-zeal for a pet theory has led him into this error.

But this is not the only error of this kind to be found in your article. In order that you might have a broad and firm basis for an argument, you take the ground that the devil really possessed all the kingdoms of the world or else there was no temptation of Christ. And so positive are you that you are right, that you ask: "Now my brother, are you not bound to admit the truth of this proposition?"

If Bro. Ramsey had stopped here I might have been inclined to assent (and indeed I have so far admitted it that I might meet some points in your argument, but now I give another view,) but so anxious were you to cut me off from every possible plea for voting, you must needs tell me: "Now I think your great error my brother, consists in locating the sovereignty in the people. God gave man dominion over the fowls of the air, the beasts of the field and the fishes of the sea. But he never gave him dominion over himself or his fellow-man. Original sovereignty belongs to God alone. He possesses it by right of that exclusive lordship inherent in him as the Creator of all things." Now, my dear brother, what becomes of your theory that the devil had a perfect right to the kingdoms of the world, to dispose of them as he chose, and that therefore his offer to

Christ was a real temptation? You now say "Original Sovereignty" was in God, who never gave man control of himself.

Then you plunged into the awful conclusion by which you wished to frighten me. "If not, then the Savior was not tempted and therefore the Bible is mistaken for it declares he was tempted."

From this there is no escape, unless you say (and I know you will not) that Christ did not know that original sovereignty belonged to his Father, and that the temptation was the result of ignorance. Now we know that Satan deceived Eve, and may he not have been playing the same game, that he had so often succeeded at.

But now, Brother Ramsey, if original sovereignty belonged to God (which is true) and these kingdoms were really the property of Satan at the time he made the offer, how did the Sovereignty change hands? Did God, as your proof-texts would seem to show, resign his control into the hands of Satan, or did Satan, as the more powerful, conquer the kingdoms? Upon the first hypothesis, God would be chargeable with the sins of mankind, while upon the other, neither man nor God would be to blame, but the devil only; because by superior power he had won control of the human family.

Upon one horn or other of this dilemma bro. Ramsey is obliged to hang or else abandon his position, that God did not give man "dominion over himself or his fellow man."

That man has dominion over his fellow man brother Ramsey's own proof-texts show, "The

Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men and giveth it to whomsoever he will." "He removeth kings and setteth up kings," "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," &c. Furthermore, without dominion over himself, or self-control, man never could have sinned or been justly punished for sin.

In self-sovereignty lies the whole theory of moral accountability. Then we are forced to the conclusion that having control of himself delegated from the original sovereignty of his creator, man has duties to perform in the two kingdoms in which he is placed—has temporal and Spiritual duties to perform; that these duties do not conflict—that in the Bible are found laws, general and specific, to control him, and that specific laws leave him no option, while general laws open a field for the exercise of his own judgment and volition. If the volition is in harmony with the general law, his actions are correct, if not, then sin lies at the door.

Judge Hickerson is right in wanting good men on the jury, and if he can get that kind, the good need have no fears of being hurt.

But if he is not to have good men on his jury, we shall fear the decisions of his Court—they may become the instruments of unrighteousness.

But I think he could safely excuse all who have conscientious scruples upon the subject, and still find enough good men to secure just and righteous decisions.

Your true friend and brother,

H. L. WALLING.

BAPTISM.

"And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

I like the word baptize: all baptism is immersion but all immersion is not baptism. All the hosts of Israel, together with their flocks and herds were immersed in the cloud and in the sea, but they were not all baptized unto Moses; only those were baptized into him who believed in him as their divinely appointed leader.

There is just as much authority in this passage for animal baptism as for infant baptism.

Baptism is the obedience of faith; where there is no faith there can be no baptism. The immersion of an infidel is no more baptism than the immersion of a rock; neither is the immersion of a baby—the sprinkling of no one is baptism.

A. CLARK.

 Woman's Work.

Brethren L. & S: I wish to know if a sister has a right to take charge of a class in a Christian Sunday School, also give us your views on 1 Corinthians 14 Chapter, 34 and 35 verses; also 1 Tim. 2 chap. 11 to the 15th verses. Please answer through the Advocate and you will oblige a sister.

S. B. S.

I certainly think every sister that is capable should take charge of a class old or young on Sunday and Monday too to teach the Christian religion. That godly woman of old time, Priscilla, did it. Beside she

travelled from place to place, a fellow-helper with the apostles, hunting, seeking classes of one or more to which to teach the word of God. Study the examples and allusions to female teaching in the Old and New Testament and away with all such ridiculous nonsense! The Scriptures referred to prohibit women usurping authority in the church or becoming the authoritative teachers of the church. They forbid woman doing anything immodest, unwomanly or that is calculated to throw her out of the place God has appointed her, and for which he by nature has fitted her.

But in all social duties and privileges, and teaching young and old she is just as much under obligation to work for Christ as men.

It is strange women are so afraid of offending against the teaching of Paul in these passages and are yet so indifferent to his teaching in reference to dress and display.

Can any tell us why these Scriptures are regarded with so much more of awe and sanctity lest they be violated, than this? Do our inclinations not have as much influence over us as the word of God?

D. L.

 Church News.

Brethren L. & S: I write you this short letter to inform you, that I have just returned from a trip in the upper part of Houston County, preached Saturday at eleven o'clock, Bro. Kile at half-past three. At 10 o'clock Lord's day to a well-ordered congregation, and mostly brethren and sisters. Bro. Kile followed with an exhortation, after which we broke

the Loaf with about forty members, who seem to be in a harmonious living condition, with their faithful leaders, old Bros. Kile and Wilson, who attend them regularly.

We then went to the town of Grapeland, where we met a very well-ordered congregation, to whom we preach'd from 17th and 18th verses of the 6th chapter of Romans. Bro. Wilson followed with a feeling exhortation, and I think left a lasting impression which will, I trust, result in good. I must acknowledge that I never met a more devoted and determined brotherhood anywhere. May the Lord aid them in the good work and may they continue to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth, is the prayer of your brother in the one good hope.

Yours in Christ,

NATHANIEL DAVIS.

Crockett, Texas, March 12, 1874.

Bros. L. & S: For ten years I have been trying to get a congregation started in my neighborhood, and I am happy in saying since I wrote we have a congregation of nine members, all the heads of families but one. I think by doing our duty we can accomplish more. I intend (if I have the money to furnish myself) to see that all the male members take the **ADVOCATE**.

Yours truly,

R. H. GARDNER.

Gainsville, Ark. March 7th.

We have a good little congregation here, at West Mountain Church, some thirty members, meet every Lord's day, and break bread and inquire after each others' welfare, to

know if any are sick or in want, and to encourage each other to walk the road that the apostles laid out. Occasionally Brothers Stirman and Matthews call by and give us encouragement to hold out faithfully. We hear of encouraging news in different parts of Texas. May the Lord's blessing be with you and all.

W. MCPRIDGEON.

Upshur Co. Tex. March 9th, 1874.

I have just returned from Bro. Farrow's in Ellis County, where I preached three discourses, and had two additions from the Baptists.

Yours as ever,

ELIJAH ELGAN.

Hutchins Dallas County Texas, March 10th. 1874.

Brethren L. & S: On the 8th of March, 1874, Brother Larue, and Bro. George Sweatt, commenced a meeting at Fair View School house in Warren County and continued until Tuesday following; the result was, one young lady confessed the Savior and was baptized into his name.

Brother Larue is quite an old man but is a very impressive speaker Brother George Sweatt is growing old, and the silver locks on his head show the frosts of many winters, but he is battling very near all of his time for the good of souls, instead of the dollar, and I might say in his plain way of teaching, is doing much good.

Our meeting was well attended by the Sectarian world and much *prejudice removed. We are but few in this part of the Lord's Vineyard, and f any of our preaching brethren come

this way, they will receive a hearty welcome.

Your bro. in the one faith,
R. H. HOLLAND.
Bowling Green Ky.

They Know and Do Not.

The Lord said on one occasion, that "he that knew his duty, and did it not, should be beaten with many stripes." This calls up an occurrence which took place at a country church not long since. The congregation had assembled for worship, the emblems were present for the occasion, but the preacher failed to arrive on time. There was, however, an old brother present, who was well taught in the Scriptures and who is ever ready to admonish, advise, and direct young preachers, and who should by all means be preaching himself. All expected the good old Bro, to attend the table in case the preacher did not arrive. Near the time for the preacher to arrive, the old brother arose and took the basket containing the emblems, and while he thought himself unobserved, slipped the basket in the pulpit. The preacher did not come, and the congregation were allowed to disperse without attending to the Lord's Supper at all. The old brother knew his duty, but did it not, how shall he escape the stripes?

Again, we know several young men well versed in Scripture, good education &c, who feel they should preach, yet for fear of opposition they fall back. and never develop their talents. They know their duty &c. Again—I know members of the church who have allowed the love of money to swallow up their love of

God, and to acquire money have gone into the accursed trade of whiskey-selling. They know their duty, but they are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.

Brethren, you cannot deceive God, neither can you deceive yourselves. You know that God's blessing is found alone in the path of duty. Not long since I noticed a call from some bro. in Ky., for some preacher to settle in a certain town on the Mississippi River, and aid a few brethren there to build up a church. Such preachers were advised to address Sister——. As I was just then looking out for a location, I wrote to Sister——concerning church, members, country, &c. In due time I received an answer from her husband, answering my queries as far as possible, and stating that his wife (Sister—— whom we were advised to address) was at that time in Ky. soliciting funds to build a church. "And" says he, "as you may possibly move here, I may as well tell you, that I keep a bar-room. The people will drink, and I am willing to sell."

It is hardly necessary to add that I did not go to help build a church there. These know their duty, &c. God will bring every work into judgment.

J, T. P.

DRESS.

"In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broidered hair or gold or pearls or costly array; but (which becometh women professing godli-

ness) with good works." This is the language of the inspired apostle Paul, and we see no reason why this teaching should not be as binding on Christians as any other teaching of the apostles. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." What Paul teaches us in regard to what our adorning should be, and what it should not be, is profitable for instruction in righteousness, and it is our duty to receive this instruction and be doers of the word and not hearers only. The Apostles never gave Christians any counsel which was not necessary for their good and for the advancement of the cause of Christ. Hence the injunction of Paul for women to adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety, is necessary for their good, and there is something to be gained by obeying this injunction. But the adorning of brodered or plaited hair (as Peter has it) and of gold, and pearls, and costly array, is not the adorning which Paul calls modest, nor the adorning which he says becomes women professing godliness; for he plainly says for them not to adorn themselves in these things. So when Christian women array themselves in costly fabrics, and wear gold or pearls, and have their hair brodered, they are not living up to the teaching of the apostles; and consequently they damage the cause they have espoused by disregarding a part of the teaching of those inspired teachers whom Christ sent to instruct them in righteousness. We think we can mention some of the evils which arise from a disregard of

the instructions of Paul and Peter in this matter.

It is customary in the present day for women to pay a great deal of attention to the adorning of their persons, and various styles of dressing are introduced which are thought to be very becoming (but which add nothing to health or comfort.) As soon as these styles become popular with people of wealth and honorable position in the world, many women professing godliness seem to think it incumbent on them also to follow these fashions, although it requires a great deal of their time, and we think it safe to say, twice as much money as it would take to dress in a neat and becoming, but simpler style. And for what do they do this? Not to glorify God, or to serve him better; for his ministers have told us that such things do not become His servants. Then it must be that because such things are highly esteemed by the world, or to gratify their own love of display: but the Bible tells us that the things which are highly esteemed among men, are abomination in the sight of God, and also that the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, are not of the Father, but of the world. The Bible also teaches us not to love the world, neither the things that are in the world, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." When persons devote the greater part of their time and means to following after the world, it looks like they love the world, as they have little time left for good works. If they sow to the Spirit at all, they must sow sparingly, and may expect to reap as they have sown. The

house of worship is one of the places where women usually wear their finest apparel and costliest ornaments, and on account of so much display in the church we sometimes hear it remarked by intelligent people of the world that there is too much pride in the church. It is plain to them that those who call themselves christians, are following after the world in these things more than after Christ. Hence they lose confidence in them, and on this account have less respect for the religion which they profess. Again, there are persons who have not the means to keep up with the fashions, but who have a kind of pride, or self-respect which some think commendable and because nearly every one who attends church dresses fashionably, they do not like to go there looking so much plainer than others; and if they do go, they do not feel at home, and perhaps are hindered from worshipping on this account. We sometimes hear such remarks as these. "I have no hat but an old one that is entirely out of style, and I don't like to go to church looking so much out of style, when I know I have got taste, if I only had the means to gratify it. It makes me feel cramped to look worse than anybody else at church." Again, it is sometimes the case, that if a woman is willing to appear at the house of worship in a plain garb, that her husband is not willing she should do so, looking so much plainer than others; and he is tempted to turn infidel as he has not money to get his wife such things as others wear. Although this is very wrong and weak in persons, still it is human nature to be weak, and it is the duty

of the strong to bear the infirmities of the weak. Even if it was not against the teaching of the Bible (which it is) for those who have the means, to adorn themselves by wearing of gold, and putting on of apparel if it makes others who can not afford such adorning, feel worse and less at home in the church, or cause any one to respect the cause of Christ less (and we are not guessing at this, but we are sure this is the case) it would be their duty to lay aside their own desires for the sake of others, for whom Christ died, as well as for them. They should have that love for their fellow creatures for whom Christ suffered death, even if they are weak in the faith, to be willing to give up their own pleasure for them. Otherwise they would not be walking charitably; as the Spirit teaches us to walk. But if Paul taught men to pray everywhere lifting up holy hands, he also taught that women should adorn themselves in modest apparel with shamefacedness and sobriety; and if he did not tell us exactly what would be dressing in that way, he told us what would *not* be dressing in that manner, and knowing the meaning of the words used by Paul, we can understand our duty in this matter as well as in others. Then let us lay aside all the vanity of the world, and let us do all things for the glory of God, and not for our own glory; and by so doing, it will be ours to hear the King say in that day when all nations are gathered before Him, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty

and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me;"

A SISTER.

Obituaries.

Dear Bro. Sewell: I have just read Bro. C. W. Sewell's letter to you expressing his sympathy in the loss of your dear little child also your own article concerning it, with an intensity of feeling that I would not perhaps under other circumstances. And why? Because I too have just deposited in its final resting place all that was mortal of our own little afflicted babe, Addie Pauline, aged two years ten months and one day.

When three months old she had an attack of brain fever, and was never well afterwards, and finally died March the 6th with whooping cough followed by Meningitis. For over two years constantly, almost night and day had we watched over it, and did all in our power to render it comfortable in its afflictions. Fully convinced that had it lived it would have ever been helpless, yet so deeply was it enshrined in our hearts that the loss is a severe one. It seemed to realize that it was entirely dependent, and to see the confidence with which it looked to its parents for every thing, so aroused that tender passion that always exists in the parents heart, that I had pretty well lost sight of every thing else in my deep solicitude for its welfare. I miss its little form, yet rejoice that it is freed from its sufferings. My dear brother how could we ever give up our little ones if there was no hope of meeting in a blissful home above. I feel humbled and subdued under the affliction that has come upon us. I feel now that there is a strong chain binding me so securely to heaven that I can more easily draw my affections from earthly things.

Yours in hope of Life
J. D. FLOYD.

Flat Creek Tenn, Mar. 8, 1874.

Died of Consumption, July 3rd 1873. Sister Martha, Butler. She wife of Constant B. Butler. She was born Feb. 6, 1811, and was baptized by Willis Hopwood, about forty years ago, and since that time has lived an exemplary member of the body of Christ, and died triumphing in the faith of the gospel, so that the surviving members of her family will not sorrow as others who have no hope, but will be cheered by the happy consolation that her sufferings are ended here, and happiness in store for her in the future. Greatly will she

be missed by the family, the relatives and friends, and by the church. But if they will serve the Lord faithfully on earth, they may meet her in heaven.

C. B. BUTLER.

Rienzi Miss.

NOW READY.

THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION.

This long looked for work is now ready, and has been ordered direct from Cincinnati to agents, as far as the first edition would go in supplying the orders received, but as one and a half editions of the work were sold in advance of publication all orders could not be supplied until a second edition could be published, which will not be more than four weeks behind the first. While agents are delivering the books sent them will they please obtain as many additional subscribers as possible to be supplied by future delivery, (say about the first of May next.)

Will agents please let me hear from them immediately, that I may know what they are doing, and propose to do. Agents are wanted for the sale of the work every where, where there is not one already.

Address, T. W. BRENTS,
Richmond Bedford Co. Tenn.

Floral Guide.

Vick's Floral Guide No. 2 is out, containing some good items of information relative to vegetables and flowers, and their culture, with some rather spicy articles and a pronouncing vocabulary of botanical names.

What Post Office?

We want the Post Office address of W. D. Hastin, or M. E. T. Hastin as no office was given when money was sent.
E. G. S.

Advertisements.

Please notice the advertisement of the Howe Sewing Machine, now running in our paper. The Howe Machine is generally conceded to be a good, reliable machine. My family are using one, and it does good work. See also the advertisement of the Gospel preacher, by bro. B. Franklin, a book of 20 sermons, one of bro. Franklin's best and plainest works. The book also can be had at our office, at the same prices as in advertisement.

E. G. S.

To the Little Folks. No. 3.

We are floating down "the rapid river."

"What river?"

The river of time—down to the ocean of eternity. We are going one after another, in quick succession. Shall we meet again? How many of the little folks will "gather with the saints at the river that flows by the throne of God?"

"Uncle Joe, I hope all the little folks will gather there."

It would be a joyous gathering. But what are you doing to secure such a meeting? Are you curbing your ill tempers and trying to get others to do the same? Are you cultivating kindness towards your associates? Bud, don't you want to meet Johnny at that beautiful river? Wouldn't you feel bad if he should have that black bruise on his eye when you meet him there?

"I didn't aim to strike Johnny."

It is a great pity you struck towards him, How much were you

trying to curb your ill temper when you struck? Not much, I should think. Wouldn't it be dreadful if you should be controlled by your evil passions and become so bad and wicked that you could not gather with the saints at the river? The next time you feel that you are getting angry, pause and reflect. Think whether you may not do something that would exclude you from the number of those who will be at that gathering. Try to remember the golden rule you so often sing about. You ought to remember how much help and encouragement you have from your kindred and friends to do good. Your case is much better than that of poor little Emma. You know she wanted to obey the Savior and become a member of his body; but her father would not permit her. Don't you feel sorry for the poor little girl? I do; and I feel sorry for her father, too. Poor man; he is "dropping down the rapid river;" but will he "gather with the saints at the river that flows by the throne of God?" If he should be so fortunate, wouldn't it be dreadful for him to miss finding his little Emma there?

My little folks, be careful not to let the god of this world lead you astray. Be diligent in good works, so that when you grow old you will be immovably fixed in righteousness. How lamentable it would be to let your grasping after the things of this world cause you to forsake the religion of Jesus. We little think how far we may be led astray. We may embark in speculation to make money, cut ourselves loose from the association and counsel of brethren, take the advice of wicked

men; invest our money to get great gain; fail in the speculation; and then become soured at our best friends; forsake the cause of Christ entirely; speak evil of his church and his people; and finally renounce Christianity entirely and become scoffers.

Be you steadfast, abounding in the work of the Lord. Cultivate a good spirit among your associates. Be careful not to let your angry passions lead you astray. Be kind, be gentle, beloved; and then you "will gather with the saints at the river that flows by the throne of God."

UNCLE JOE.

Dress in Church.

Is it of any use to protest against the prevailing custom of making our churches on Sunday, exhibition rooms of the latest fashions in wearing apparel? We expect to see displays of the fineries and fooleries of dress in the drawing-room, the concert-room, and places of amusement or entertainment, for they are worn for exhibition, and even in the street some women have the vulgar pride of wearing apparel only suitable for indoors, and not always there; but when the house of prayer is made thus to minister to the weakest of vanities, weakest because a rich dress is merely a matter of purse, and depends on neither culture, nor brains, nor rank, it is time to protest.

Vanity, snobbery and silly rivalries are despicable anywhere; but in the church they are disgusting, and should be intolerable; nay, more, they are contrary to every rational

idea of religious propriety. In the world people may look at the dress; but in the church God has to do with the heart; there is no distinction there. But where is the true idea of worship, when more attention is given to the adornment of the body than to the needs of the soul?

We have seen young ladies "join the church," and in soft voice "renounce the world," clothed as for the ball-room rather than as followers of "the meek and lowly Jesus," and pray for God to "be merciful to us miserable sinners" in toilets prepared at great cost of time and money for that very purpose. The glaring inconsistency of this course, pursued to a greater or less extent in all our churches on the Sabbath, is a rockery, and also a sorrowful reality, and we only wish that some of our leading women of position and wealth, true Christian women, would, after considering the matter seriously in its relations to God, their own hearts and their fellow mortals, institute a reform.—*Selected.*

When we are alone, we have our thoughts to watch, in the family our tempers, and in company our tongues.—*Hannah More.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

How to become a Christian.....	289
Officers Again.....	293
Tennessee Penitentiary.....	296
Reply to Bro. Ramsey.....	298
Baptism.....	305
Woman's Work.....	305
Church News.....	305
They know and do not.....	307
Dress.....	307
Obituaries.....	310
Now Ready.....	310
Advertisements.....	311
To the Little Folks.....	311
Dress in Church.....	310

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 14.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, APRIL 2, 1874.

Action of Baptism Again.

Mr. E. G. Sewell: Some time since I sent you a communication with regard to the meaning of the Greek verb baptidzo, in which I cited you to some passages in the New Testament, which, in my opinion, demonstrate that baptism was sometimes performed, in the days of the apostles, by pouring, and that baptidzo sometimes means to wash. You were kind enough to publish in your paper of Feb. 19th, an extended reply to my communication, for which please accept my thanks, and allow me to congratulate you on the fairness and candor thus evinced, in giving publicity to the views of those who differ with you.

It seems to me that you have fallen into several errors in your reply, and with your permission I propose to point them out. You insist that the Savior used baptidzo in its figurative sense, when he promised his apostles that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost. If this be the case, the promise was only figurative, and would have had no actual fulfillment; but the apostles were really baptized

with the Holy Ghost. Peter shows by his allusion to the circumstance that they were thus baptized and I see no better reason for supposing that Peter uses figurative language, when he says the Holy Ghost fell upon those at the house of Cornelius, than that Matthew does the same, where he says, the Savior saw the Holy Ghost descending like a dove and lighting upon him. But you say, "the room was filled where they were sitting." Now if you mean by this that the room was filled with the Holy Ghost and if you are correct, then the apostles were of course immersed in the Holy Ghost, and if both of your positions are correct, viz., that the Savior used baptidzo in its figurative sense, and that according to his promise he baptized them by filling the room, where they were, with the Holy Ghost, you have proved too much, for you have proved that immerse is the figurative meaning of baptidzo. Neither view is correct. The word is not used in its figurative sense, and the room was not filled with the Holy Ghost, but with the noise. The ordinary version accords with this view, for the pro-

noun, it, clearly refers to noise, Acts xi: 2, and in the Greek text the word echos, (noise) is the subject of both verbs, egeneto (came) and eplerosen (filled) or if pne (wind) is the subject of eplerosen then the wind and not the Holy Ghost filled the house.

Now the fact that the house was filled with a noise, or wind, proves nothing with regard to the manner in which the Holy Ghost was applied to the apostles, when they were baptized with it. Nor does the fact, that they were filled with the Holy Ghost, prove that they were immersed in it, for there is a wide difference between being filled with anything, and being immersed in it. You attempt to make a point against pouring for baptism, by saying that the word Spirit is the object of the verb pour, while the apostles were to be the subjects of the baptism, and I suppose then if you were to tell some one that you sprinkled the floor with water, and he were to tell some one else that you said you sprinkled water upon the floor, you would accuse him of misrepresenting you, because you had made the word floor, the object of the verb sprinkle, and he had represented you as making the word water, the object of the same verb; and because too he had represented you as saying you had sprinkled water, when you had said you sprinkled the floor. The point might be considered as well taken if phraseology were the matter in question, but not so if we are trying to ascertain the idea intended to be conveyed, for we all know that sentences may differ in their phraseology and yet convey precisely the

same idea. But again you say, if the pouring constituted the baptism it was the Spirit, and not the apostles, that was baptized, for it was poured, not the apostles. I don't suppose any one claims or ever will claim that the act of pouring alone constitutes baptism, nor have I ever understood you and your brethren to claim that dipping alone constitutes baptism. If I have not misunderstood you, you claim, that to perform a valid baptism, you must not only dip, but you must dip into the water, and that you must dip some particular person into the water and that that person must have complied with all the conditions requisite for making him a proper subject for baptism, and the dipping must be done with the intention, on the part of the one baptized, of complying with the ordinance of baptism, for the purpose for which God ordained it. And in baptizing by pouring, you must not only pour, but you must pour water on some particular person, who has become a proper subject by compliance with the conditions requisite for making him such, and there must be on his part the intent to comply with the ordinance of baptism for the purpose for which God ordained it, and if you claim that the baptism is by dipping or immersing in the first case, why not say it is done by pouring in the second case? And when we are told that the Savior promised to baptize his apostles with the Holy Ghost, and in accordance with his promise, poured the Holy Ghost upon them, why not say the baptism was performed by pouring, especially as there was no immersion during the

whole performance, unless it be immersion in the noise which came about the time the Holy Ghost fell upon the apostles. And when Peter tells us that the Holy Ghost fell in a similar manner upon those at the house of Cornelius, and that this recalled to his mind the Savior's promise to baptize with the Holy Ghost, why not say they were baptized by pouring, and if the Savior baptized by pouring why should we hesitate to follow his example? In the beginning of your reply, you go back to John's baptism and endeavor to show that he immersed the people in the river Jordan, and because the ordinary English version tells us they were baptized in the Jordan, and that the Savior after baptism, went up out of the water, you infer that they would not have gone down into the river to have water poured on them, and therefore the baptism must have been done by immersion. Even if the ordinary translation is correct it does not establish your position, for the people could and doubtless would have gone down into the river to be either sprinkled or poured upon if John had required it. But the preposition *en*, which is there translated in, means also, at, near, and the preposition *apo*, which is there translated out of, also means away from, and we might with propriety read Mat. iii: 6, "And were baptized of him near Jordan," and we might with propriety read Mat. iii: 16, "And Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway away from the water," and this translation renders immersion exceedingly improbable. The Savior uses the same word to express John's baptism, that he uses in promising the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and as we know that the Holy Ghost baptism was performed by pouring, is it not then highly probable that John's baptism was also performed by pouring, and would it be doing any violence to the Savior's language to translate it according to what the event proves it was his intention to express? Translating it in this way and supplying people as the subjects of John's baptism, Acts i: 5 would read, "For John truly poured upon" the people "with water, but ye shall be poured upon with the Holy Ghost." Or, making it conform to English phraseology, it would read, "For John truly poured water upon" the people, "but the Holy Ghost shall be poured upon you." You do not say in so many words that baptidzo means to wash, but I gather from your argument that you accept that as one of its Bible meanings; but then you go on to say that no one can wash hands in the way sprinkling and pouring are done for baptism, for they do not use water enough to wash one little finger. Now, if I am not mistaken, A. Campbell was of opinion that it did not require much water to wash hands by pouring, for I think he endorsed the following translation of Mark vii: 3, "For the Pharisees and indeed all the Jews, who observe the traditions of the elders, eat not until they have washed their hands by pouring a little water upon them." Now I would not endorse that translation, and I do not pretend to hold you responsible for A. Campbell's opinions, but I introduced the translation to show you that it is considered correct, to

say that washing is done by pouring, and I desire to observe also, that if A. Campbell believed that people could be cleansed by sprinkling water upon them, (and one of the meanings of wash is to cleanse with water) he certainly had divine authority for thinking so, for the Lord himself has said it. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean." Ezek. xxxvi: 25.

You introduce the expression "Buried with him in baptism." The word used here to express burial is *thapto*, which means to honor with any kind of funeral rites, and while *katorutto* specifies burial by interment, *thapto* expresses at least three modes of honoring the dead, viz: by interment, by burning and by throwing a few handfuls of dirt on the dead body. This figurative allusion therefore proves nothing with regard to the mode of baptism. And you think too that the Savior's reference to his sufferings, under the figure of baptism, sustains the doctrine of immersion. But will you consider for a moment; that all the tortures he endured were applied to him? Those who arrested him, spat upon him and buffeted him and smote him with the palms of their hands. The soldiers placed a crown of thorns upon his head, and spat upon him, and smote him on the head with the reed, which, in mockery, they had placed in his hand for a sceptre. The cross was placed upon him, and he was compelled to bear it towards the place of execution, and the nails were driven into his feet and hands. Surely, if this figurative allusion proves anything, it proves the application of the water to the subject of

baptism. We think then we may safely conclude that the expression, "buried with him by baptism," and the allusion to the Savior's sufferings under the figure of baptism do not sustain the doctrine of immersion: that the narrative of John's baptism does not sustain the doctrine of immersion, while the Savior's allusion to it renders it highly probable that it was performed by pouring. We would say here, too, that we have not found a single example of baptism in the New Testament where even a strong probability of immersion can be shown, without accepting, as correct, a translation, which, to say the least, is doubtful; while we have found two examples of baptism, viz: at the house of Cornelius, and on the day of Pentecost, where the baptism was performed by pouring. Under these circumstances, we think it is claiming too much, to say that baptidzo always means to dip, to immerse, to plunge, and that baptism cannot be performed by pouring.

If a person, who was a proper subject of baptism, and who believed that pouring was the proper mode, should request you to baptize him in that way, would you comply with his request and receive him as one of Christ's disciples?

A. E. McLAUGHLIN.

Rosedale, Tenn.

The first thing we note in the above, is the statement that if baptidzo is used in a figurative sense when referring to the Holy Spirit, that that makes the promise of the Spirit itself a figure, and that then it could have no actual fulfillment. It is very easy to make assertions, but to prove

them to be true, is a very different thing. Indeed Dr., you certainly did not consider that very closely, or you would not have made the remark. The promise of the Spirit was made elsewhere to the apostles in plain, unfigurative language. Jesus said to the apostles, "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive," etc. Jno. xiv: 15-17. And again, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he shall show you things to come." Jno. xvi: 16. Again in Acts i: 8, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and you shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." In these passages, there is a plain, unfigurative promise of the Holy Spirit to the apostles. These promises all indicate that the Spirit was to come to them, and be in them, to teach them, and guide them into the truth. Then there are several words used to indicate the manner of its coming: In one place, we are told that the Spirit was "poured out." In another place, we are told that the Spirit "fell on them." In another, "Hath shed forth." These words *fell*, *shed forth*, and *poured out*, all have reference to the manner in which the Spirit came to the apostles from heaven. And the words *fell* and *shed*, would come just as near expressing the action of baptism, as *pour*, and then Dr., you would have baptism by *shedding*, and baptism by *falling*, and either one as scriptural as *pouring*. But the word *baptidzo*, when used in promising the Spirit does not signify the manner of its coming from heaven, but its effect upon them; that is, it refers to the inspiration of the Spirit when received by the apostles. They were to be endued with it; they were to be filled with it. And this enduing or filling, or inspiring is what the baptism refers to. And since the word *baptidzo* means to immerse, to overwhelm, it just means that they would be so completely overwhelmed by the power of the Holy Spirit, as to be guided into all the truth, and enabled to speak it in all languages; all of which came to pass with the apostles. Literal baptism, was immersion in water. And you know Dr., that this was not done when the Spirit came upon the apostles and Cornelius. Hence, the word *baptizo* in this case was figurative, and not literal, referring to the overwhelming power or inspiration of the Spirit. You say moreover, that the Spirit did not fill the room, but that only the sound filled it. This is another one of your assertions without proof. The context of the passage shows plainly that the Spirit itself accompanied the sound; and that it was actually present in the room is certain, for the apostles were in the room, and they were filled with it, and its miraculous manifestations were seen upon them in cloven tongues, like as of fire. And for you to affirm that the Spirit did not fill the room, but only the sound, is, in our judgment, a contradiction of the

word of God in the case. But we did not, and do not now rely upon the fact that the Spirit was in the room as an argument in favor of immersion, but only mentioned it as a fact, and showed that if you take the pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles as an illustration of the action of baptism, you ought to follow the example, and have your candidate where you can pour your water in, till he is overwhelmed as they were.

We distinctly stated before, that "the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the wonderful overwhelming of the apostles in the miraculous powers of the Spirit, the result of which was speaking with tongues, performing miracles," etc. This you entirely overlooked, and attempt to make the impression that I used it as an argument in favor of immersion, which I did not do. I only used it to show that although you use that as an example of pouring for baptism, you do not in any sense in the world imitate it in the sprinkling and pouring done in modern times. Moreover, the distinction we made between the pouring out of the Spirit from heaven, and the baptism of the apostles in the room where they were assembled together, you have not attempted to respond to. That remains unanswered, and I need not repeat it again. What you say of the sentence, "I sprinkled the floor with water," scarcely demands a reply. Every one who knows anything of language, knows that the sentence is elliptical, and simply means, "I sprinkle water upon the floor." No one can literally sprinkle a floor. In order to do that, he must convert it

into small particles, and then he may sprinkle these particles, but he cannot sprinkle a floor. Neither can any one sprinkle a man. He may sprinkle or pour water or dust upon a man, but cannot sprinkle or pour a man. So then if you can prove that the expression "baptize you with water," is a correct translation, and then can prove that baptizo means to pour or sprinkle, then you will have gained your point, but not otherwise. But as yet, you have done neither, and more than that, I venture to say, you will not undertake to do either. You will not say that the expression, "with water" is correct, nor will you venture to say that baptizo means either pour, or sprinkle. If you are willing to take either one of these positions or both, why not take them at once, without so much circumlocution. For until you do this, all that you have said on the subject amounts to nothing in the world. If you will take these positions squarely, then we can have some straight-out work. Will you do so? But you use the word baptize so indefinitely, that no one can tell what you do mean by it. You say, "baptized by pouring." Pouring of course means *pouring*, but what does the word baptize mean in that expression? Does it mean pouring too? If it does, then you simply have "poured by pouring," which would be a very awkward expression, to say the least of it. Will you say the word baptizo means *sprinkle*? Then you have "sprinkled by pouring," which would be an impossibility; for sprinkle does not mean pour, nor does pour mean sprinkle. But suppose it means immerse; then you

have "immersed by pouring." This, to say the least of it, would be a very senseless expression. We cannot tell therefore what you mean. If you will tell us what you mean by the word baptize, or whether you mean anything by it or not, we would know better how to take your statements. A failure on the part of Pedobaptists to define what they mean by the word baptize, is the cause of most of the trouble on that subject. You use it as if it meant simply to apply water. Is that what you mean by it? if so, why not say so? I have distinctly stated what I mean by it, which is *immerse*. Now if you say it does not mean immerse, then we have a fair issue. But you may as well understand at once that I will not follow you further in your indefinite use of this word, after this reply. But if you will distinctly define, then the investigation may go on. But you claim that the preposition *en*, means at, or near, and render the passage, "were baptized of him near Jordan." The word Jordan is a noun of place, and the rule is, that before nouns of place, *en* means in; as, in a house, in a ship. But if you are correct in translating *en*, by *near*, before one noun of place, then we must translate it by *near*, in every similar place. We will try a few instances: Jesus speaks of his Father, as "in heaven," but according to your rendering, God is not *in* heaven, but only *near* there. When the swine ran down into the sea, they are said to have perished "in the waters." But according to you, Dr., they were not really *in* the water, but only *near* the water, and so perished on *dry land*. In the parable of the tares,

the man is said to have "sowed good seed in his field." But then Dr., not really *in* his field, but somewhere round, *near* to it. It is said of the wise virgins, they "took oil in their vessels with their lamps." But no, Dr. you would have the oil not *in* their vessels, but somewhere *near* them. The Savior told the people if they would deny themselves, and follow him, they should have treasure in heaven. No, not *in* heaven, but somewhere *near*.

But these are only a few, among hundreds of instances that might be given in the New Testament, in which *en* stands before nouns of place, in precisely the same relation as *en* stands before Jordan. And now, if you translate that passage *near* Jordan, we defy you, or any other man to get rid of the word *near* in these other passages we have given. Thus in your strain to get rid of immersion, you make nonsense of all such passages as the above, and show that there is no specific meaning in words. But we state again, that the literal meaning of *en* before nouns of place, is *in*, and in translating, the universal rule is to take the literal or primary meaning, unless the sense requires a secondary meaning. Now, Sir, will you undertake to show that in the sentence you give, the sense requires you to put *near*, instead of *in*? Until you can do that, it stands clear that you have done violence to the passage. The Greek preposition *en*, occurs something over two thousand and seven-hundred times in the New Testament, and we have been unable thus far, to find a single instance where *en* is rendered *near*, in our common version. Yet we do not

affirm that it is not so rendered; only that we have not yet found it rendered thus. We find it sometimes rendered *at*, but in nearly or quite every case, *in* would make quite as good sense, and *at* really has in most of those cases, the sense of *in*. In nearly four fifths of the occurrences of *en*, it is rendered by *in* in our common version, and the sense requires that. Hence, if *in* Jordan does not mean just what it says, then *in* heaven does not mean *in* heaven. But you say, *apo* means away from, as well as out of. Grant it. Still, it takes them from the place where *en* represents them as being, and a literal rendering places them *in* Jordan when the baptizing was done, or else there is no such thing as God, or any one else being *in* heaven. Then since they were *in* Jordan, when they were baptized, *apo* takes them from that position, translate it what you may. And so, you are welcome to all you gain by that rendering. But your whole argument amounts to about this: Baptidzo is once or twice translated wash: washing can be done by pouring; therefore baptizo means to pour. And upon this process of reasoning, you reach the grand conclusion, that Acts i: 5 may be rendered, "John truly poured water upon the people, but the Holy Ghost shall be poured upon you." This principle of interpretation destroys language itself, and makes the Bible of no avail to man, for he never can tell what it means. Indeed, upon this principle, language means nothing. You can just as easily prove that a man is an alligator, as you prove that baptizo means to pour; thus, the word man is sometimes used in the

sense of animal: an alligator is an animal, therefore man is an alligator. This is just as good logic as that by which you prove that baptidzo means pour. Prove that baptidzo primarily means pour, and then you gain your point. When anything is immersed in water, it is, in one sense of the word, washed; not because the word immerse means wash, but because one result of immersing in water, is washing. Hence when the result of immersion is spoken of, it is then called a washing, as when Paul says, "and our bodies washed with pure water." And when the immersion of beds, pots, etc., are spoken of, our translators, looking to the result, and not to the action, rendered the word washing instead of immersing. But the words immerse and wash, by no means signify the same thing. And therefore the word baptidzo can never be rendered wash, except as looking to the result, and not the action. But you say Alexander Campbell was of the opinion that it does not take much water to wash the hands, and give a translation as endorsed by him, that they washed their hands by pouring a little water upon them. But you ought to know that in the washing there spoken of, the Greek word *nipto*, and not baptizo, is used. And *nipto* is used in Greek, to express the washing of the hands, feet, or some particular part of the body, and is never used to express the ordinance of baptism. So that has nothing in the world to do in settling the meaning of baptizo. Baptizo has a specific meaning given to it in the Lexicons, and that specific meaning must always be used, unless the sense requires a secondary or figurative

meaning, and then, the idea of immersion, which is the literal specific meaning of the word must still go with it. It never can lose that idea. But then you attempt to brush away what I said on the burial in baptism, as mentioned by Paul. You say that Thapto is the word used, and that this word has three meanings one to inter, one to burn the body, and one to throw a few handfuls of dirt upon it. Granting that what you say is correct, this word has one primary meaning, and that the primary or first meaning is to inter, to bury. This word is used only eleven times in the New Testament in its simple form, and is every time translated by the word bury. It is the word used where Christ is said to have been buried, where the rich man was buried, and where Ananias and Sapphira are said to have been buried by the young men, etc. Inter being the literal or first meaning, it must be taken in every place where it will make good sense, and you know Dr., that the word bury, with our present meaning attached, makes good sense. What sort of sense would your secondary meanings make in this passage in the sixth of Romans? Therefore we are *burned* with him by baptism into death. Was Christ's body burned? and are ours burned in baptism? Really, Doctor, this is trifling with the word of God. But moreover, the word thapto is not used in sixth of Romans and second of Colossians in its simple form; *sunthapto* is the word used in these passages, and translated *buried*, and Donegan's Lexicon gives it but one meaning, and that is, "to *inter* with another, to inter together." Hence our common

version is exactly literal, "buried with him." Buried with him in our acceptance of the term buried. So in this case also, you run off after the secondary meanings of the word instead of the literal or first meaning, and you take the wrong word, at that. So the argument on the word buried stands unanswered, and will, till you prove that it ought to be rendered *burned*, or a few handfuls of dirt thrown over them, and then you make nonsense of the Bible. But really this is what you have been doing all the time. Your reference to what I said of the sufferings of the Savior, expressed by himself under the figure of baptism, is still more trivial, and is really not worthy a serious reply. You know that his sufferings overwhelmed him, and crushed him down to death, and it was to all of his tortures and sufferings that he alluded, when he said, "I have a baptism to be baptized with;" and for you to speak of his sufferings in little single items as you have done in your article, to try to destroy the force of the figure, does not do justice to your learning and pretensions. In conclusion then, allow me to say, that in almost every position you have taken, you have taken the figurative and far-fetched meaning of the words used, so that with you there is nothing definite. Words have no specific meaning. In your strain to get the people out of the river Jordan, and to disprove immersion, you establish a principle that will prove in the same way, that God is not in heaven, that the swine though drowned, were all the while on dry ground, And that when we are baptized into Christ, instead of being buried with

him in baptism, our bodies are burned with him—that instead of the Savior being overwhelmed with suffering, and borne down to death and the tomb, he only suffered a few little scattering items here and there, that could not amount to much any way. You deny everything and prove nothing. Your whole article seems more like a burlesque upon the Bible, and the Greek and English language, and upon a divine ordinance of God, than anything like serious argument. Finally, your last question, as to whether I would pour water upon a certain character for baptism or not, amounts to asking me if I would publicly violate my own conscientious convictions of heaven's truth. To which I answer most emphatically *no*.

E. G. S.

Peter's Cowardly Renunciation of His Master.

Luke tells us, that "Peter followed at a distance." (xxii, 54.)

John writes: "And Simon Peter followed Jesus; and so did another disciple." (xviii. 15.)

We are almost sure, that his "other disciple" was John; for this is his style of alluding to himself. (xiii. 23, 24, 25.) Clarke and others have thought differently. It has been supposed that as John was a Galilean fisherman, he could not have been an acquaintance of the High Priest; and that the conjecture of Grotius is most likely correct; namely this "other disciple" was the man at whose house the Passover had been eaten the previous evening. Now, though Augustine said, "We

should not decide hastily in a matter on which the Scriptures are silent," yet I can hardly suppose it possible for the Beloved Disciple to stay away from the trial of his teacher. Besides, "that other disciple" followed with Peter; whereas, we have no evidence that the "man" of Grotius' conjecture was in the crowd that followed Jesus to the place of trial; not even that he was a disciple at all.

"And that other disciple was acquainted with the Chief Priest; and he accompanied Jesus into the Chief Priest's Palace. But Peter stood outside, near the door." No doubt Peter was afraid to go in, lest he should be recognized as the one who had cut off the ear of the High Priest's servant. "Then the other disciple, who was acquainted with the Chief Priest, went out and spoke to the door-keeper, and brought Peter in."

It was now about midnight, and the trial of the innocent Lamb of God had commenced. (The prisoner had first been conducted to Annas, who was formerly High Priest; but as the court of the priests, and the Sanhedrim, were assembled at the house of Caiaphas, and had no doubt been anxiously awaiting the arrival of the illustrious Prisoner, Annas sent him at once to the High Priest's Palace.)

John gives no account of the trial, which was conducted at this place from midnight till three or four in the morning. The reason this omission probably was, he wished to avoid repeating what had been so fully reported by others. But he mentions the trial of Peter's courage

It appears that, when "that disciple" invited Peter in, the girl who was keeping the door took him to be a disciple, and said to him:

"Are you not one of the disciples of this man, too?"

Peter, who was sitting among the servants by the fire, waiting "to see the end" of the violent proceedings against his teacher, was much disconcerted by this unexpected question. The girl, looking intently at him as she added:

"You also was with him,"

Peter, in his confusion, said:

"Woman, I do not know him."

How Peter's courage failed him here! He forgot his confident words to his teacher, "though all others should renounce thee, yet I never will." The thought of his rash act of striking the Priest's servant is uppermost in his mind; and, as "conscience makes cowards of us all," he, in his confusion, denied that he was a disciple of the prisoner. "I am not" said he.

After this Peter went out into the entrance or vestibule, and heard the Cock's midnight crowing. While in this vestibule, it appears, another servant-girl saw him, "and said to those who were there:

"This man, too, was with Jesus the Nazarene."

From Luke it appears, that some man who heard what the girl said addressed Peter, saying:

"You are one of them, too."

Peter, most positively denied, saying:

"Man I am not; I do not know the man."

Peter now came into the room again, and was warming himself by

the fire. It was near three o'clock, and about an hour after the second denial, when Peter was again attacked, and his courage again failed him. Some one, seeing him talk, remarked:

"This man certainly was with him, for his language exposes him."

Then, turning to Peter, he charged him, saying:

"Surely you are one of them, for you are a Galilean, and your language exposes you."

Then, turning to Peter, he charged him saying:

"Surely you are one of them, for your language is like theirs."

Peter denied; but a relation of Malchus confronted him with the pointed question:

"Did I not see you with him in the garden?"

Then Peter commenced cursing and swearing, and said:

"Man, I do not know what you are saying: I do not know this man, of whom you speak."

Then, immediately, while he was still speaking the cock crowed the second time."

Jesus must now have been in the same room where this third denial took place; for Luke says:

"Then the Lord turned towards Peter. And Peter recollected the words that the Lord had spoken to him, "Before the cock crows twice, you will renounce me three times." And he went out and wept bitterly."

I wish not to indulge in severe criticisms on Peter's conduct, under those trying circumstances. His repentance was no doubt sincere. While Judas, filled with bitter remorse and

despair, went and hung himself, Peter found relief in tears of penitence.

But the narrative of Peter's experience ought to be a valuable lesson to all self-confident, hasty, fearful Christians, and cause them to be humble, and to trust in the Lord for strength, and courage, and patience to endure all the trials of life.

JESUS' TRIAL BEFORE CAIAPHAS.

When Jesus was brought into the presence of the Chief Priest, the Elders, and the Scribes, at the house of Caiaphas, the preliminary trial was opened, we presume, by the Chief Priest. John says :

"Then the Chief Priest questioned Jesus concerning his disciples and his teaching; to whom Jesus replied :

'I have spoken openly to the world; I always taught in the Synagogues and in the Temple, where the Jews always assemble; and in secrecy I have said nothing. Why do you ask me? Ask those who have heard, what things I said to them. See! they know what I have said.'" Noble, courageous reply! Who can read this bold and noble answer of the Son of God without being filled with admiration, and feeling assured of the justness of that righteous prisoner's cause? But such independence seemed to the underlings of the High Priest a great offence to such a dignitary as Caiaphas. So, "when he had spoken thus, one of the attendants who was standing near, smote Jesus with his open hand, and said :

'Do you answer the High Priest in that manner?'

Jesus was not frightened, but courageously replied :

"If I have spoken anything bad,

testify of the evil; but if well, why do you strike me?"

As Jesus persistently refused to say anything to gratify those who, by questioning him, only wished to draw out of him what would be made a ground of condemnation, "the Chief Priests and the Elders, together with the whole Sanhedrim searched for false testimony against Jesus, in order that they might put him to death. But they found none. For many testified falsely against him; but their testimony did not agree. At last, two false witnesses came and said :

'We heard this man say : "Destroy this Temple, that has been made with hands; and in three days I will build another made without hands."'

But even in this their testimony did not agree."

Jesus making no reply, "the Chief Priest stood up among them, and asked Jesus saying :

'Do you make no reply to what these testify against you?'

But Jesus remained silent."

This silence was provoking; but the Priest was determined to urge Jesus to say something that might serve as a more plausible pretense for condemning him, than the incoherent testimony of false witnesses.

"Then the Chief Priest, answering, said to him :

'I adjure you, by the living God that you tell us whether you are the Christ, the Son of the Blessed.'

Being now put under oath, "Jesus said to him :

'I am; and I say to you, in addition, that hereafter you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Almighty [One], and coming upon the clouds of heaven.'

This reply was enough. It was what they wanted.

"Then the Chief Priest tore his clothes and said :

'He is a [fit] subject for death.'

This appeal, and the desired response, gave license to that insolent class who were waiting for an opportunity to show by some overt acts their attachment to their "ecclesiastical superiors." The judicial proceedings seemed to have stopped here; and during the interval which elapsed till day-light, Jesus was the object of the insults of the mob.

"They did spit in his face and strike him with their fists." Some, after blindfolding him, "struck him with the open hand, and said :

'Give an answer to us, Christ : who is it that struck you?'

And many other impious things they said to him." (Luke.)

How insulting! What indignities our great Teacher suffered! But it was for us he bore it all. Let us love him more.

"When it became day the Elders of the people, the Chief Priests too, and the Scribes assembled, and conducted Jesus up to the Sanhedrim and said :

'If you are the Christ tell us ?

But he said to them ;

'If I tell you, you will not believe and if I, too, ask you a question, you will not answer me, or let me go. After this the Son of Man will sit on the right hand of the power of God.'

Then they said :

'You are, then, the Son of God?'

He said to them :

'You say that I am.'

They replied :

"What further need have we of

testimony? For we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.'

A consultation is now held; and we shall leave the Court-scene for the present and endeavor to learn, as nearly as we can, the fate of Judas, the traitorous Man of Kerioth.

THE TRAGICAL END OF JUDAS.

Matthew alone relates the melancholy fate of Judas : "Then Judas who had delivered him up, when he saw that he was condemned, [being] stung with remorse, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the Chief Priests and elders, saying :

'I have sinned, in having betrayed innocent blood.'

They replied :

'What is that to us? You will see to that.'

Little did they care for Judas or for justice. Their object had been accomplished through his perfidy; and now he, having been paid for his services, must take care of himself. Receiving no consolation from those heartless priests, he "threw down the money in the Temple," (where it is possible the Priests Elders, and Scribes had retired, at the close of the trial before Caiaphas and prior to assembling again in the morning.) He then departed, and went and hung himself."

"Then the Chief Priests took the money, and said : 'It is not lawful to put it into the sacred Treasury, because it is the price of blood.'

Then after consulting about the matter, they bought with it the potter's field, as a burial-place for foreigners. For this reason, that field is, to this day, called 'The field of blood.' Then the word was ful-

filled, which had been spoken by the prophet, saying: "Then they took thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that had a price set upon him: on whom the children of Israel did set a price, and gave them for the potters' field, as the Lord appointed me." (Zach .xi. 13.)

I have said that only Matthew tells of Judas' death. It is true, that Matthew is the only one of the four who mentions this sad circumstance in the Gospel History. But Luke, in his Acts of Apostles, reports the language of Peter, at the election of Matthias, as follows:

"Brethren, it was necessary for this Scripture to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit had before spoken by the mouth of David, concerning Judas, who was a guide to those who took Jesus: for he was enumerated with us, and had been appointed to this ministry. Therefore he purchased a field with the reward of his wickedness; and, falling headlong he burst apart in the middle, and all his bowels gushed out. And it was known to all who were dwelling in Jerusalem; so that the field is called in their own language, *Aceldama*, that is, 'The Field of Blood.' For it is written in the book of Psalms: "Let his habitation be desolate, and let no one dwell in it; and let another take his office." (Ps. lxi. 25, cix. 8.)

Wm. Smith, in his Dictionary, says of Peter's statement, above quoted, that "it is not easy to harmonize [it] with that given by St. Matthew. There [in Acts i. 16-20.] it is stated—

I. That, instead of throwing the money into the Temple, he bought a field with it.

2. That, instead of hanging himself; "falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out."

3. That, for this reason, and not because the priests had bought it with the price of blood, the field was called *Aceldama*. Receiving both as authentic we are yet led to the conclusion that the explanation is to be found in some unknown series of facts of which we have but two fragmentary narratives."

Respecting the first three difficulties, (which Smith takes no pains to remove,) it may be remarked, that in fact, both statements agree; namely, that a field was bought with the money paid to Judas for delivering up the teacher; and that the field was called the "Field of Blood." Peter did not think it necessary to give the particulars of Judas's throwing down the money, and the conversation that followed; but, in short, said he bought a field with it; though he only did this through the agency of the priests.

The second difficulty Dr. Clarke has taken a great deal of pains to explain; but after reading his long and interesting note, at the end of the first chapter of Acts, I feel like it would be useless to weary the general reader with all the guesses of learned men, however plausible some of them may be. I shall therefore briefly observe.

J. That if the translation, "hung himself," be correct, (which Clarke seemed to doubt,) it is probable that Judas fell from where he hung himself, and in his fall, burst asunder and thus died.

II. That if he did not hang him-

self, if the translation be *incorrect* we may reasonably suppose that he was seized with some affection of the bowels which occasioned a violent death.

As to the *third* difficulty, I would remark that Matthew and Peter *do* seem to give different reasons why that field was called the "Field of blood." But while I think Matthew gives the correct reason, I do not find fault with Peter for giving his opinion, at a time when he may not have been guided by inspiration, but simply alluded to well-known facts, understood by all in Jerusalem.

It is common, and perhaps just, to regard the treachery, the covetousness and the crime of Judas as deserving the severest condemnation. But still, I am inclined to adopt the sentiments of Dr. Clarke, who regarded the repentance or regret of Judas as sincere, and thought him less guilty of the murder of Jesus, than the Jews, who persisted in killing him without sufficient testimony to his guilt. Their guilt was deep; and those who did not repent must have been lost. But Judas at least confessed his sin, and, by returning the money made restitution as far as he could. But it was too late to reform: perhaps too late to obtain mercy; and the best we could say, if we had to "preach his funeral," would be, he is in the hands of a just God; and surely, the Judge of the Earth will do right.

There are some questions however, that will arise in the minds of some persons of a very inquisitive disposition, such as these:

1. Did Jesus know, when he chose Judas as "one of the twelve" apos-

ties, that he would prove to be his betrayer?

2. If Judas was a bad man, at the time he was chosen; that is, not a true disciple, why did not Jesus try to reform him? Or, was he a reprobate, and ordained to this end?

4. Was Judas lost forever? If so was it for the last great sin of his life of which he repented, or was he condemned to eternal punishment on account of a whole life of wickedness?

We cannot give Scriptural answers to these questions, because the Scriptures are silent respecting such matters; and I do not know that we are bound to answer such untaught questions at all. But lest some skeptical questioner should boast, I shall observe,

I. That while Jesus knew what was in man, it is not necessary, in the absence of divine testimony to suppose that he foreknew what every man would become.

II. It is not necessary to suppose that Judas was condemned for the one sin against his Teacher. If he had been a faithful disciple before, he might, like Peter, have "wept bitterly," and been restored.

III. If Judas was a bad man, when chosen, had he not the same opportunity of being reformed that the other apostles had? He saw the miracles, and heard the excellent teaching of Jesus, as well as the others. He was therefore without excuse.

IV. We do not now need to know whether he was lost forever, or not. But he was lost in some sense; for Jesus said so in his prayer.

W. PINKERTON.

Waynesfield, O., March 16, 1874.

QUERIES.

Bro. Sewell : Our brethren here all agree that the making and selling of whiskey is incompatible with the Christian character, yet some think it perfectly legitimate for them to sell or grind for the distillery, while others of us think that the business should not be countenanced even that way. Let us hear from you on the subject.

Fraternally

J. D. FLOYD.

Flat Creek, Tenn. March 18, 1874.

Those who sell grain, or grind it, or do anything knowingly, that gives aid to the making of whiskey, are certainly to that extent accessory to the business, are just to that extent responsible for its manufacture, and for the evil that results from it. The word of the Lord requires that we "abstain from appearance of evil," and also that "no man put a stumbling block in his brother's way, to cause him to fall." Those who sell grain, knowing that it is to be made into whiskey, which every body knows will be sold to any and every one that wishes to buy, and that some of those who buy will get drunk, and thereby injure their families, certainly do not abstain from all appearance of evil; for they can easily see through what they do, to the evil that will result from it. They also aid in putting a stumbling block before others, in two respects; first, A will say, if B can sell corn to make whiskey, it will be no harm for me to drink it. In the second place they will aid in

placing the bottle before their neighbor, to cause him to drink. It is certainly better to refrain from giving any aid or countenance, either directly or indirectly, to so great an evil. Let the children of God stand entirely aloof from such work, and if others will make it and drink it, let them bear all the blame, and let Christians be able to say, we gave no aid in filling drunkards' graves, or in making weeping and broken hearted wives and widows, and wailing orphans. Do the best we may we will have enough to answer for at the judgment seat of Christ without taking on this additional weight.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S. : Please answer these queries :

1. If we as Christians receive members from the Baptist Church on their own confession and baptism, do we not acknowledge by that act that there are Christians in the above-named church?

2. Did not Paul and Silas require an impossibility when he told the jailer to believe, at the same time they spoke to him. Acts 16, 31.

T. W. JAMES.

1st, We as a people have never denied that there are Christians among the Baptists. All who obey the Gospel of Christ are Christians, whether among the Baptists or elsewhere. But we claim that Christians should all stand together as one people; and drop all unscriptural names, and rules of faith and practice, and be simply Christians.

2. Paul and Silas immediately told the jailer what to believe, by speak-

ing to him the word of the Lord, and to all in his house. So that the facts to be believed, follow the command to believe in such succession, that it involves no impossibility whatever.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: What do you understand the 33, 34, 35, and 36th verses of fifth chapter of St. Matthew to teach, also the 12th verse of the 5th chapter of James. Please answer through the Advocate as I believe it will do much good.

Yours in the one hope,

F. M. JONES.

Murfreesboro, Tenn.

We think the verses above mentioned most likely refer to oaths of confirmation. Some think they refer to profane swearing only. But the Savior introduces the subject by referring to oaths of confirmation practiced among the Jews, and then adds "but I say unto you, swear not at all" and as he thus mentions that kind of swearing we think it embraces the oaths of confirmation so often administered in our country. And to relieve persons who have scruples about swearing in the usual form, affirmation is admitted, which to my mind is far preferable. James, we have no doubt, refers to the same kind of swearing that the Savior did in the sermon on the Mount, referred to in the above.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S.: from reading Mat. 5. 8, I find the following: "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God;" and Acts,

15, 9, "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." If I mistake not, our brethren teach that faith purifies the heart, also that faith precedes obedience, and without obedience we cannot be saved. If I am mistaken in what our brethren teach, please rectify the mistake, if not, please reconcile the above passages with our teaching. Please answer through the ADVOCATE.

WM. RING.

Bradyville, Cannon Co. Tenn.

We have never yet heard one of the brethren teach that faith precedes or is separate from obedience. We have always regarded faith a part of obedience to the gospel. Obedience, is doing what God commands us. He has commanded us to believe; therefore faith is a part of our obedience to the gospel. Peter says to Christians "ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth." Faith is part of the obedience that makes people Christians. Faith is as much a matter of obedience as repentance or baptism. It takes all these together to make a child of God.

E. G. S.

Mass Meeting of Disciples at Jackson Tenn.

There will be a meeting held at Jackson Tenn., commencing on Friday May 1st 1874—the object of which will be, investigation of the Scriptures, mutual encouragement and spiritual enjoyment.

Each congregation in West Tenn. is earnestly requested to send a full delegation to the meeting, and the

presence of every preacher is insisted upon. We sincerely hope that not a single church or preacher will disregard this earnest invitation. We have over forty preachers in West Tenn, every one of whom we hope to meet here. We do not confine our invitation to West Tenn, but extend it cordially to brethren (and sisters also) everywhere. Ample arrangements will be made to accommodate all. The delegates are requested to report to the meeting on the following questions :

1. What is the name of the church?
2. Where is it located?
3. What is the nearest post Office?
4. How many members in it?
5. How many accessions last year?
6. How much diminished by withdrawal, death, removal?
7. How often do you have preaching?
8. Who is your regular preacher?
9. Do the members meet every Lord's Day?
10. Has the church Elders and Deacons? if so, their names and post Office?

11. Has the church a house of worship? if so, what kind and how much worth?

12. Has the church a Sunday School? if so, how many pupils and teachers, and how conducted?

13. What are the annual receipts through the treasury and upon what objects is it chiefly expended?

14. What are the present prospects of the Church?

If the delegates report fully on these questions we will know much more of our "status" in West Tenn. than we do now. Hence attention to it is earnestly desired.

That every thing may be done decently and in order we submit the following programme containing questions for each day.

1. Committee will meet delegates upon their arrival at Depot and assign them a house.

2. Friday and Saturday evenings will be devoted to hearing reports from delegates.

3. Prayer meeting every morning from 10-11 o'clock.

4. Preaching every morning at 11 o'clock; every evening at 7.

5. Monday evening, 2-4 o'clock, What is the Scriptural theory of Church Government?

6. Tuesday evening: What is the Scriptural theory of Church co-operation?

7. Wednesday evening: What is the Scriptural theory of raising and disbursing money?

8. Thursday evening: Would the whole time of our evangelists devoted to holding protracted meetings do more good than monthly preaching?

9. Friday evening: What are our chief defects?

R. W. ANDREWS, }
B. F. BOND, } Elders

W. B. McKNABB, }
J. W. FOSTER, } Deacons.
J. R. WILKERSON, }

Jackson Tenn. March 25 1874.

Sunday School Books.

Below we give an extract from an article found in the "Standard" of Feb. 21, written by brother James Challen to which we ask the attention of our brethren. Perhaps one of the most difficult things for Christian parents

at the present time, is to be able to put, and keep, the right kind of books in the hands of their children. As to a Sunday School library, unless it be selected with very great care we are sure it would be better to have no books in such library except music books, and the word of God. And the music books that children use, should be selected with very great care; for many of the music books of the present day, prepared for the Sunday School are not fit to be in the hands of the young, on account of the character of the songs they contain. Children should never be taught to sing anything not in harmony with the word of the Lord. Many of the hymns of these books are not only too light and frivolous to be sung by the young on such occasions, but many of them are in sentiment contrary to the Scriptures. But the best book that was ever used in a Sunday School yet, is the Bible, the word of the living God. Children should be encouraged to read it, and to express their convictions of heaven's truth in the very language of the word of God. And in this way the young and rising generation would get rid of many difficulties that are now disturbing religious society. But at the same time, if we could have some books of the right kind to hand round among the children to read through the week, no one could object.

E. G. S.

SUNDAY SCHOOL LITERATURE.

A friend of mine, and preacher, said to me that a member of his church told him that his son handed him a book he had got from the

Sunday school connected with the church, and having examined it, he refused to let him read it; and meeting with his preacher, he said to him, that if his son had bought that book at one of the stores, he would have thrown it into the fire, but inasmuch as it was handed him by the Sunday School he attends, he did not know what to say. But he would not let his son read it. Now, this is the experience of almost every conscientious person who will look into the character of the publications that fill up the shelves of our Sunday School libraries. Is there any remedy, and where?

"Of making many books there is no end," was the sharp saying of Solomon, three thousand years and more ago. What would he now say, if here in this age?

The brains of the book-makers are daily stimulated in the matter of making books for the young. Manuscripts by the ton are passing from the study to the press, and the cry is still they come. Our large and small publishing houses are doing a thriving business in this growing department of trade. The stream is daily swollen with new accessions, carrying this species of traffic to every village, town, and city on the continent, and filling our homes with their products. Now, if the article is good, the effect will be beneficial, but if bad, intolerable; and if partly good and evil, doubtful in its effects. It is based upon the laws of trade, this book business—*i. e.*, demand and supply. The people must have them and we have a class of men and women ready to create them, and those that have in them the greatest ele-

ments of popularity meet with the greatest success.

The stimulants these books give to the brain increases the demand for more, until books of a healthy character lie upon the shelf untouched and unread.

Books are among the living forces of our Christian civilization, and we cannot ignore them.

Books are the indices of character. As a man is known by the company he keeps, so a man is known by the books he reads and the library he has access to.

Many of the books for the young are made by persons who have no faith in God or in the Bible—who regard the Christian religion as a thing to be tolerated, but in which they have no heartfelt confidence, as of God.

The fountain of religious thought should be pure. The old and well-read may, without any immediate disadvantage, read books of a doubtful character; but even to such there is danger. Robt. Hall once read a sensation novel, and he felt the influence of it for many days. But what shall we say of Sunday School books that fill libraries; that send their poisonous errors into the minds of our children? What would we think of the man who would put strychnine into our wells and springs of water? and yet the crime is not so great as that of selling and disseminating error by the wholesale for the use of the young.

The Sunday-school library forms the principal supply of reading matter for our children. What with the books and papers, scarcely anything more is read from the age

of five to twelve or fifteen. A generation fed upon such weak and suspicious food must be enfeebled, and the minds thus developed present poor specimens of humanity.

Fiction plays a mighty part in our Sunday-school literature. Now we do not object to fiction if it rests on a basis of truth; nor do we find fault with it when it is true to life. But the temptation is so great to exaggerate, that but few books of this kind are to be safely trusted in the hands of children. Indeed, I do not know but that it would be safe to keep out of our Sunday-school literature this species of writing altogether.

We need more books pervaded with the Bible and its teachings. The Bible must be the store house from which we should draw our resources for the young—the narratives of the Old Testament—the teachings of Christ—his parables, life, death, resurrection, etc.

We need more books—biographical—historical—scientific; books to enlarge the mind—to refine, purify, elevate. They need not be devoted altogether to religion; but they should be eminently moral, and free from Swedenborgianism, Universalism, Rationalism, and all the hydra-headedisms of the day.

The books we put into the hands of our children should be instructive—healthful—intellectually, morally, religiously. If they do not lead to heaven, they should not lead to the pit.

It is a shame to the Christian man to see in the Sunday-school library the popular novels of the day. The Lord knows our children will soon enough get hold of them—let us not

commit the sin of putting them in their hands. We, as a people, need, and must have a purer literature than any now afloat. The teaching of the pulpit and the family—the reading of the Bible—will be neutralized by the corrupt character of the library and the papers.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: We are glad to write you the results of our meeting which has just closed here. Bro. Wm. T. Crenshaw commenced preaching here last Saturday evening and continued till Tuesday night: he preached night and day and showed himself a laborer in the school of Christ worthy the commendation of the brethren every where.

We had four additions, one by confession and baptism, two by commendation, and one reclaimed. Thank the Lord for the Gospel, for it is the power of God.

The roads were very bad and prevented many from turning out to meeting; nevertheless we had a good audience.

Bro. C. is one of the Jerusalem Gospel men, and his plainness makes the impression that he wants no progress outside of the sacred word. He has been a teacher in the school of Christ for several years, and he knows the "Gospel plan of salvation." We trust he will come again. Our congregation of believers is small in this place. We organized here last September amidst the Sectarian element. We meet every Lord's day. We trust that our working and worthy elder, Bro. Borwine will show to the brethren the necessity of sup-

porting the preachers of the truth. To God be all the praise.

Yours in Christ,

A. SPARKS.

Wadesburg Cass Co., Mo. March 19, 1874.

Obituaries.

From the Examiner.

Bro. Clemitt: Our beloved brother, Robert C. Bruce, formerly of Fredericksburg, but for twenty-seven years a resident of this city, departed this life yesterday, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. As gently as an infant rests on his mother's bosom, so sweetly, and without a struggle, he slept in Christ Jesus. Our common mother, the earth, opens her arms to embrace all that can die of another child of the dust; while the "gates of the unseen world" part, to admit into the tenantry of that world all that cannot die of another son of God.

For many years past he had been recognized elder of the first congregation here, and was distinguished for his old-fashioned zeal in all that could, in his esteem, promote the cause he loved. He was well known, and universally regarded as an upright man and an earnest and devoted Christian.

Very truly yours in the one hope,

P. S. F.

We have personally known brother Bruce for many years, and can truthfully say, he manifested a deep and abiding interest in the cause of Christ. He was ever anxious to see the cause of truth prosper, and too see the people coming to Christ, and did what he could for the accomplishment of these ends. We deeply sympathize with Sister Bruce and the family, in their sad bereavement.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: Cruel relentless death has been amongst us. A few weeks since, Mrs. Dr. Beard, an intelligent lady of the Methodist church and a member of our Bible class, was hurriedly and unexpectedly called away. And last Wednesday, the 11th instant, little Charlie Jones, son of brother W. R. Jones, our Sunday-School superintendent, breathed his last a little after 2 o'clock, P. M. Charlie was a sweet little boy. Although only three years and about seven weeks, had known him here (having been born 20th Jan. 1871, and died 11 March 1874,) yet this was of sufficient duration, to entwine the cords of affection very strongly about him. An affectionate father and mother, a devoted grand father; two beloved aunts (Mary and Martha) with numerous sympathizing friends and relations, deeply mourn the sad bereavement. But ye saddened ones, be not too disconsolate. The kind shepherd, who

when he was here, said, 'suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven; has taken the little innocent lamb, to his own warm heart and tho' his little tender frame moulders away in the cemetery,—yet when the Second Adam the great restorer returns his from his Fathers' throne to earth, He will raise him from the dead; bestow upon him an immortalized body, and introduce him into a state, in which suffering and death and tears shall have no place. God grant we may all be prepared for that blissful and immortal state.

Fraternally,
G. W. ABELL.

Myrfreesboro March 18th. 1874.

A Dangerous Medicine.

In a work on "Digestion and Dyspepsia," Dr. Trall very pertinently remarks:—

"Clergymen, lawyers, and legislators, who devote much time to writing or studying, and do not give proper attention to diet and exercise, are often extreme sufferers. Were it proper and useful to do so, I could give the names of distinguished bishops, divines, statesmen, lawyers, and even physicians, who have been dragged down from positions of honor and wealth, to moral degradation and poverty, because of this condition and the medical treatment.

"I say 'medical treatment' advisedly. The condition itself might have occasioned disease, and even death; but it would not alone occasion dishonor. Opiates were given to relieve pain, and stimulants to support vitality. Their effects were only temporary, and, as the cause was not removed, they were frequently repeated. Soon morphine and brandy became necessities; and eventually drunkenness became a habit, followed in some instances by debauchery and other vices. Some of the readers of these lines may remem-

ber the sad story of two distinguished prelates, men of good name and fame and unimpeachable piety, occupying the exalted positions of bishops of the two greatest States of our Union, New York and Pennsylvania. They were brothers. Both were degraded from their high and holy office for intoxication and lecherous conduct. The unfortunate men were more sinned against than sinning. It was shown on their trial that the medicine which had worked their ruin had been prescribed by their physicians."

Eli Jones relates that at a yearly meeting of the Society of Friends, in Canada, the question was asked, "Is the use of ardent spirits confined strictly to medicinal purposes?" It was replied that it was "confined strictly to medicinal purposes;" whereupon an old Friend arose, and looking around upon the brotherhood, said, "Friends, let us be careful not to medicine it too much!"

Ardent spirits resemble the Yankee's nostrum, which was "Warranted to cure if used according to the directions, externally, internally, and eternally." But a medicine which always helps but never cures, is of very little value. A good medicine is supposed to cure the patient, and when he is cured it is high time to stop taking the medicine.

A noted English physician prescribed as a remedy for some dyspeptic old sinner, "Live upon a sixpence, a day, and earn it." This prescription would soon supersede many of the nostrums of the day, and give health without the aid of that deceptive poison which charms and deludes at the beginning, but at the last "biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder."—*The Christian.*

Real Kindness to the Sick.

A great deal of annoyance is experienced both by the sick and those who care for them in consequence of the well-meant but officious kindness of friends. Long calls are invariably fatiguing to those who languish on beds of pain and often seriously derange the work of the nurse. The sympathy and aid of friends in time of need is always pleasant to receive, and where sound common sense and a delicate discernment of the form this sympathy is made to take are exercised, the results are simply delightful. It is often the case that attention to the nurse is the truest kindness to the sick, and relishes for her appetite and relief from some of the outside duties of the sick room will be more acceptable and effective than anything else. In cases of long and dangerous illness and of death, the ordinary routine of living in a family is quite broken up, and a loaf of good bread, a toothsome pie, a savory pudding, sent in by a friend, comes in as a real benefaction to those who are well.

If one is not prepared to take hold and help in an afflicted family, either in the sick room or out of it, at whatever is to be done, a note expressing sympathy will be just in point, and far better than a personal assurance. If, however, the visit must be made, let it be brief and condensed, both in time and words, in the sick room especially, and not less out of it.

If one is really anxious to help, there are many household offices she can take to her home and perform, such as cleansing and ironing clothes, parching and grinding coffee, all

which will be as real aid to the sick as personal watching. In many parts of the country it is quite impossible to procure outside help; and if the neighbors are not kind, the sick must suffer. A pair of clean sheets or pillow slips for the invalid, a pretty bouquet, a pleasant picture, and similar attentions, where it is certain they will be received, will awaken gratitude that will live long after its cause has been forgotten. Visits of condolence in case of death should be brief. It is of little use in sharp bereavement to hint at consolation. The silent pressure of the hand, the glance that speaks sympathy, the wordless utterances of submission and resignation are more potent than anything else. Job's three friends sat in silence with him seven days and seven nights, for they saw his grief was very great. In this as in most other matters good taste and sound sense should guide practical expressions of sympathy toward both the sick and the well.—*N. Y. Observer.*

A TRUE PICTURE.

Portray the evils of intemperance, did I say? He does not live that can tell the whole story of its woes. Exaggeration there is impossible. The fatigued fancy falters in its flight before it comes to the fact. The true eye cannot take in the countless miseries of its motley train. No human art can put into that picture shades darker than the truth. Put into such a picture every conceivable thing that is terrible or revolting; paint health in ruins, hope destroyed; affections crushed, prayer silenced; paint the chosen seats of paternal

care, of filial piety, of brotherly love, of maternal devotion, all, all vacant; paint all the crimes, of every stature, and of every hue, from murder standing aghast over a grave which it has no means to cover, down to the meanest deception still confident of success; paint home a desert, and shame a tyrant, and poverty the legitimate child of vice in this community, and not its prolific mother; paint the dark valley of the shadow of death peopled with living slaves; paint a landscape with trees whose fruit is poison and whose shade is death with mountain torrents tributary to an ocean whose very waves are fire; put in the most distant back-ground the vanishing vision of a blessed past and into the foreground the terrible certainty of an accursed future; paint prisons with doors that open only inward; people the scene with men, whose shattered forms are tenanted by tormented souls, with children upon whose lips no smile can ever play, and with women into whose cheeks furrows have been burnt by tears wrung by anguish from breaking hearts—paint such a picture, and when you are ready to show it, do not let in the rays of the heavenly sun, but illuminate it with the glares of the infernal fires, and still your horrible picture falls short of the truth.—*Selected.*

LITTLE SINS MAKE WAY FOR LARGER SINS.—According to an ancient fable, a wood-cutter went into the woods and asked for one small sapling. The trees thought it would be ungenerous to refuse so small a request; but no sooner had the woodman obtained the sapling, than he

fashioned it into a handle for his ax, and then proceeded to cut down the largest trees. Thus boys suffer themselves to yield in what they consider a small matter, thinking surely no great harm can come of it. But Satan having gained his point, makes a handle of that sin with which to cut down their loftiest resolutions.

DISCIPLINE OF TRIALS.—It is not the things that we call best that make men; it is not the pleasantest things; it is not the calm experience of life; it is life's rugged experience, its tempests, its trials. The discipline of life is here good and there evil; here trouble and there joy; here radiance and there smoothness, one working with the other; and the alterations of the one and the other, which necessitate adaptations, constitute a part of that education which makes a man, in distinction from an animal, which has no education. The successful man invariably bears on his brow the marks of the struggle which he has undergone.

We are never out of our way while we follow the calling of God. Never any man lost by his obedience to the Most High.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Action of Baptism again.....	313
Peter's Cowardly renunciation of his Mas-	
teries.....	322
Mass Meeting of Disciples at Jackson Tenn	329
Sunday-School books.....	330
Church News.....	333
Obituaries.....	333
A Dangerous Medicine.....	334
Real kindeess to the sick.....	335
A True Picture.....	335

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 15.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, APRIL 9, 1874.

ROMANS 7. 8, & 9.

Brethren L. & S: An explanation through the columns of the G. A. upon the 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19th and 20th verses, 7th chapter of Romans, also 29th, 30th, and 33rd verses of the 8th chapter and 11th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, and 23rd, verses of the 9th chapter, would be of great satisfaction to me. Will you explain? Hoping to hear from you soon,

I am yours in the one hope of immortal glory.

GEORGE M. HOLLINGSWORTH.

We have frequently tried to explain these Scriptures. We have never satisfied ourselves and perhaps do not always explain them alike, as we never look at explanations when trying it again. We always try to go to them as though we had never read them and examine them afresh, in their connection and in the light of other Scriptures, but after all of our efforts, we are not satisfied fully that we understand what the apostle intended to teach by the Scriptures. The meaning is not evident upon the surface of the passages

and we must go to other passages to learn what they do mean. This is never, to me, a very satisfactory disposition to make of a passage. Every passage ought, in its proper connection to assert its own true meaning. We are perfectly willing to use other passages to corroborate a given or doubtful interpretation, but to force a meaning by other passages, that does not naturally flow from these, is to my mind not satisfactory. We suppose our interpretations are as little satisfactory to others as to ourselves, judging from the frequency with which the question is repeated. Our explanations at least do not strike the reader with such force as to stick with him.

On account of the unsatisfactoriness of our answers to ourselves and others we dislike to attempt one now.

We are not sure but that, it is better to class these Scriptures among those which Peter says, are hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest as they do other scriptures to their own destruction. Peter says some of Paul's writings on the subject of "account-

ing the long-suffering of our Lord salvation," are of this character. These passages are, some of them at least, on a subject of a kindred character. In the interpretation of these and all difficult passages, that are not very practical in nature, and no difficult passages are directly practical, no practical Scriptures are difficult of understanding) we are careful that our interpretations do not conflict with what is plain and simple. We can frequently hold such passages for a life-time without a definite and fixed idea on them. But the passage reads, "For we know the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow (approve) not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that I do. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, warring against my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am; who shall deliver me from the body of this death, I thank God through Jesus Christ,' etc.; then he adds in the next chapter "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but

after the Spirit. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh" &c.

The apostle is presenting here the law of sin that rules in our members, that is, in our flesh. This law works death. All flesh in this world is brought under bondage to this law. The work to be accomplished for man is to deliver him from this law, and its dominion over him. In accomplishing this, he first must be made sensible of the sinfulness of sin that dwells in him. The law of Moses made him thus sensible, revealed sin to man, but was weak to deliver him from its dominion. He saw the right, desired it, but the motives of sin in his flesh prevailed over the desire, and led him into the sin that his mind and soul despised. It did not give strength and help to overcome the sin. It was sin in the flesh ruling over him despite his desire. His soul enlightened by the law to see and know sin, anxious to be freed from its dominion, was yet helpless. The contest went on between the desire of the spirit to do good and the strength of sin in the flesh to do evil. Paul protests, it was not he, that is, his spirit that did the evil, but sin in his flesh that did it. But it, doing the evil against his will, brought him under bondage to sin, and to death. He then asks, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? From the body in which the law of sin ruled, that brings forth death. He thanks God through Jesus Christ, that what the law of

Moses in that it was weak could not do, the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus had done. It had given strength to overcome sin. Not that man is wholly free from sin, but the Spirit overcomes the flesh with its lusts.

This seems to me the purport of this passage. The apostle was showing what must be done for man, and how that the Jewish law, though giving the knowledge of sin, did not give strength to overcome sin. The law of Christ, or the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus gave this power to the Spiritual man to rule the carnal.

Our extreme Calvinistic friends use this passage to teach that man is totally depraved, that he has no good desires nor thoughts and that he can do nothing to help himself. That he is wholly carnal. The passage teaches exactly the opposite. It shows that man by the law of Moses, was made to see and feel sin—he desired release from sin, but that the law did, not enable him to overcome sin in the flesh, "could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience," but the bringing in a better hope through Christ, did. It teaches plainly that under the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, man may by the help given through that law become free from the law of sin and death. Without Christ, the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, man can do nothing, with and through that he can overcome sin and escape death.

Our Calvinistic friends from this Scripture maintain that man is wholly carnal, no good desire or hope dwells within him. It really teaches that while the flesh is sinful,

while it leads to sin, the Spirit or mind desires good, and that there are two principles striving in man for the mastery. These principles are neither of them ever wholly destroyed while man dwells within the flesh. Left alone without Christ, the flesh triumphs, the Spirit is subject to the law of sin, and death ensues. The Mosaic law did not aid the Spirit so that it could overcome, and control. The law of the Spirit of life in Christ affords that strength, and enables the Spirit to gain the mastery and hold in subjection the sinful motions of the flesh; though they are never wholly destroyed while man remains in the flesh.

The second passage beginning at 25th verse of 8th chapter reads, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose." This is his proposition. The reason he gives is "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son that he might be the first-born among many brethren. And whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and whom he called them also he justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified." This is given as proof that "all things work together for good to them that love God, who are the called according to his purpose." It was something that had occurred, facts that had been completed and perfected in such tangible and clear manner that they could be referred to as proof of the proposition. I think it refers to the proving, calling, justification and glorification of the ancient worthies among the patriarchs and

Jews of an ancient date. They all typified Christ. At his resurrection they likely came forth, of which he was the first fruits. But whether this or not, he had the supremacy as did the first-born among the Jews, of all the worthies of heaven and earth!

The 11th verse of the 9th chapter is simply a declaration that, before the children were born, he chose Jacob, as the stem of the promised seed,—Messiah. This and the succeeding verses indicated stand in an argument, in which Paul is showing that the Jewish law did not justify, but faith in God through Christ. And the Jews had no claim upon the especial favor of God in consequence of simple conformity to the law, after that law had been abrogated. In other words there was nothing in the service of the law, separated from faith and trust in God, that had a tendency to save man, or that entitled him to credit before God. And now since Christ has come, trust in God calls to a following of him, not the doing of the Jewish law.

In carrying out this argument, he shows that not even Abraham was justified by the works of the law, but through faith or confidence in God, and hence we are children of Abraham not through observing the ordinances of the Jewish law, but through faith in Christ. He in the same connection argues that God is under obligation to no man. The Jews seemed to think he was under obligation to them to save them, because they were the fleshly children of Abraham. Paul shows that Abraham's seed was never reckoned according to the flesh. Ishmael, Esau and others of his seed were rejected

—were not accounted his children. Only those who received the promise through faith were reckoned the children through the promise. Hence the promises are not to fleshly Israel but to Spiritual. They who are according to the flesh are not Abraham's children, but they who believe in Jesus Christ. And the promises are to them. To these he shows plainly the language, "so all Israel shall be saved" is applicable.

The Jews still seemed disposed to murmur at God's order or rule, Paul then boldly asserts the power and authority of God. If he saw fit to raise up one man, fitted to destruction as was Pharaoh, to show his power and his determination to destroy sin and iniquity who could say a word? He shows God has power to call whom he will, to show mercy upon whom he will. And that he wills to shew mercy on those who believe in Christ, not those who have descended from Abraham according to the flesh, but refuse confidence in Christ.

He then asks the question, "Has not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering, the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, and that he might make known the riches of his glory in the vessels of mercy, which he hath afore prepared unto glory * * both of the Jews and Gentiles." It does not say that God fitted any one for destruction. He raised up Pharaoh already fitted by his own evil life, that he might destroy him

before the whole world. He reserved the wicked Jews, who had grown wicked against his constant protest, for a spectacle to the world that he will destroy sin and the sinner even though in the family of Abraham; that he does elect and select on the principle of faithful and trusting obedience; even though this be found among the outcast Gentiles. It is a strong asseveration of God's right and power to justify on his own terms, and a declaration that he does select and bless not on the ground of personal claims, family inheritance or partiality for one individual over another, but upon the condition of faith or confidence in him. This seems to me the meaning of the passage. But in reference to it there are some things difficult to be understood, and he who would build a system or theory on one or two difficult passages of doubtful import, contrary to the plain teaching of the great body of divine Scripture, evidently is of that number spoken of by Peter, who wrest Paul's hard sayings as they do other Scriptures to their own destruction.

D. L.

(From the New-York Observer.)

DRUGGISTS SELLING LIQUORS.

We confess our ignorance of the ways of the world. At least that part of the world that buys its intoxicating drink at the druggists; and the druggists who sell liquors to be drank as a beverage, were wholly unknown to us, even by reputation, until this revival of temperance brought them before the public gaze. Now the discovery is made that in many

drug stores these liquors are sold without disguise, and in many more they are sold privately, but with the full knowledge of the fact on the part of the venders, that the liquors are not to be used for medicinal purposes.

There is a double-distilled wrong about this. It strikes us as being an aggravated case of iniquity that deserves to be specially condemned.

When policemen become murderers, as they do so frequently in this unfortunately-governed town of ours, the community feels the double shame of the crime committed by men who are set to protect the lives of those whom they destroy. The public cry out against it, as a monstrous evil, than which it is next to impossible to conceive of anything indicative of a more terrible depravity of public morals. And here in the prostitution of drug stores to the use of dram-drinkers, we have something of the same sort under a very different name. It has long been known and regretted, that the opium-eaters of our country, especially the women who are such great consumers of the destroying drug, are always and easily supplied with the baleful poison at the same shop where they would go, by the advice of a physician, to obtain the medicine to restore them to health, if diseased. And this is a great evil. A conscientious apothecary, knowing that a customer is in the habit of using opium without and perhaps against the physician's advice, should and would refuse to supply it. Such refusal, with remonstrance and instruction, may save the poor victim of the habit; and if that is impossible, the vender may escape

the stings of conscience and the divine displeasure which his continued supply of the drug may bring upon him. And this traffic in opium, when it is sought as an intoxicant, is wrong, morally wrong; and He who seeth in secret and will call all men to judgment, will not hold him guiltless who puts into the hands of a man or woman, a drug that is to be employed for evil and evil only. It is wicked to sell opium for such purposes.

But a far more prevalent and injurious traffic is that in intoxicating drinks. We are not indiscriminating in this sentence. We recognize distinctly and fully the right and proper use of them, as we do of all the poisons on the shelves and in the drawers and jars of the apothecary. Alcohol is not an evil. Arsenic is not an evil. Opium is not an evil. Nux Vomica is not an evil. The use of any one of them may be evil, and the abuse of any of them certainly is an evil. Poison is very sure to be an evil, if used without the advice of a discreet physician. In his hands, alcohol and opium and arsenic and nux vomica may be the salvation of human life. We have the highest medical authority for giving strong drink in certain cases, and we have as high authority forbidding us to put the bottle to our neighbor's lips, that is, to encourage him to drink. And when a good man is licensed by the State, or is encouraged by the community to keep a shop for the sale of drugs and medicines, the presumption is that his business will be conducted to promote the health of the public. He is to sell healing remedies. The apothecary, like the physician whose aid and ally he is

regarded, has no more right to distribute that which injures the community than the physician has to prescribe what he knows will injure his patient. The doctor would be held to be a monster who should feed his sick people with poison, when they needed nutritious food. And no less a monster is the druggist who becomes a retailer of intoxicating liquors, and under the guise of medicine, furnishes temptation to men and women to become drunkards. We look to them to guard the community against the vice of drunkenness, and if they use their shops and their reputation as cloaks to cover up a secret traffic in what they know to be destructive to the health of their customers, their guilt is very great, and they surely will be brought to judgment. Again we say that this censure does not apply to the sale of alcoholic liquors for legitimate and useful purposes, but to their sale as a drink to persons in health, who are better without them and may be ruined by their use.

This temperance revival has opened the eyes of thousands hitherto blind to the enormous evil of this traffic. The business itself is beginning to be looked upon in a new light, or rather shade. Hundreds have abandoned what was regarded as respectable two months ago. The vice of intemperance has suddenly confronted the public with its amazing proportions. The voice of God is heard over the land. And in this hour of attention, it is wise and well to speak these words of entreaty and warning to men who have hitherto been regarded as seeking only to promote the health of their custom-

ers, and who are charged with complicity in the promotion of the great prolific cause of disease.

Right well do we know there are thousands of druggists to whom these remarks do not apply: men who would scorn to be engaged in illicit commerce with these ruinous liquors. They will unite with us in this appeal and remonstrance. And may we not indulge the hope that the time is at hand when it shall no longer be regarded as respectable for a druggist or a hotel-keeper, or a grocer, or any other man, to afford to the public inducements and temptations to become moderate drinkers or drunkards.

Objections Answered.

There are some objections frequently urged by our religious neighbors, against baptism for remission of sins, which I propose to notice briefly through the Advocate. I am aware that there has already been much discussion on this subject, and this is urged by some good brethren as a reason why we should not devote any time to it now.

But the fact that the subject has already been discussed exhaustively, by no means proves that it is not necessary to discuss it still. As long as there are people in the world who profess to be Christians, and who declare to the world that any positive commands of our Lord may be neglected at pleasure, without giving offence to the great Head of the Church, so long is it the duty of the true disciples of Jesus Christ to contend earnestly for His commands. We will never be released from the

obligation to contend for the teachings of the New Testament, as long as there is one to oppose them. As the command, to be baptized for remission of sins is more extensively opposed than any other, it demands more investigation. But to the questions.

The first objection I propose to answer is in regard to the heathen. They reason about thus: "You claim that baptism is essential to salvation. What do you do with the heathen? They cannot obey this command, because they know nothing about it. The idea is that if it condemns the heathen, it is wrong, let the Bible say what it may about it!

"Let God be true, and every man a liar," is the language of inspiration. We must conclude that God's words are to be regarded, if it condemn the whole world. But let us ask them a few questions. Is faith essential to salvation? All answer, "It is." Can a man be saved without it? All say, "He cannot." They cannot have faith, because they know nothing about Jesus Christ. Likewise they say repentance is essential to salvation. This, too, would exclude the heathen, for they know nothing about repentance. "Oh!" say they, "heathen people are not accountable for not having faith and repentance. They will be saved through ignorance."

How strange they do not discover this fact in regard to baptism! They can see how God could deviate from His plan to save a man without faith or repentance, but they are unable to see how He could save him without baptism, if it be a part of His plan. "There are none so blind as those

who will not see." The worst blindness a man ever had, is to be blinded by theory. As to whether or not the heathen will be saved on account of their ignorance, I do not pretend to say, for I do not know. But one thing I do know, is, that the same reasoning that will exclude baptism from the plan of salvation on this ground, will exclude faith, repentance, piety, prayer, and everything else that is required to make a man a follower of the meek and lowly Lamb. If we narrow down the plan of salvation till it will include the heathen, we will have nothing left. The Bible is only addressed to that class of individuals who can know its contents: hence we do not know what will become of them. It is our duty to preach the Gospel to them, and instruct them in the way of righteousness, and if they then walk in it, they will be saved. The question should not be, What effect will it have upon those who do not know the Gospel? but, What does God's word say about it?

We are commanded to be baptized for remission of sins, and we should not stop to inquire what will become of the heathen, or what the consequence of this doctrine will be to them, but go forward in obedience to the command, trusting in the promises of God for salvation, and He will provide for those who have never heard the Gospel, as he sees proper. A want of confidence in God, is the cause of all the trouble in this matter.

Another very popular objection is in supposing a man to be crossing a barren desert, with a companion who is a Christian. "The man falls sick"

—of course it's the unconverted man that gets sick—"his companion expounds the Gospel to him, he believes, and is willing to obey; but alas! there is no water in which to immerse him. Here is a man who is willing to obey Jesus' commands, but must be lost simply because he could not find water in which to be immersed." This is about the way the reasoning goes. I do not remember that I ever heard an attempt to show that baptism was unnecessary in which this argument was not used. They have all learned it by heart, and can talk quite fluently of "the desert of Sahara," from which one would suppose the world was principally filled up with "Sahara" deserts, and that thousands annually died on them, crying for water in which to be baptized. How many men have you ever known to die without an opportunity to be baptized, who actually desired to do so? Very few, I presume. But suppose possibly there are a few, what does that prove? Simply nothing at all. We are to learn our duty alone from the Bible, and not from the peculiar condition or circumstances of some individual who might chance to be crossing the desert of Sahara. The Bible is addressed to the masses who have it in their power to obey the Gospel, and what will become of individuals who die without this privilege, I am not prepared to say, as the Scriptures do not furnish me with the information. As in the case noticed above, the same reasoning that would exclude baptism, here, would exclude faith, repentance, and everything else; for the man might start across the desert alone, without any knowledge of

God; he would of course have no opportunity to learn of Christ while crossing the desert; and should he die on his way, he must die without faith.

A man never resorts to such arguments as these, except when he is driven to it, in order to defend a defenseless cause. It always shows conclusively, that the author of them is out of Scriptural argument for his position, and is willing to resort to everything both fair and unfair, with which he can blind the minds of the people, and lead them on to disobedience. It is to be hoped that the time will yet come when men will be willing to let the Bible decide all questions of a religious character. If all would do this, what an amount of discussion it would save! What an easy matter it would be to learn the design of baptism, if all were willing to take the plain words of the New Testament for a decision. But man's reasoning must be introduced, and we are brought under the painful necessity of answering all this foolish quibbling. Let us now turn to the New Testament and see what an easy task it would be to learn the design of baptism. The first baptism spoken of is that by John, in the river Jordan; and we are told that he "did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Mark 1: 4. "But," says one, "this was not Christian baptism." Very well. Then we turn to the first Gospel discourse preached under the commission Christ gave the apostles, when about to take his final leave of the earth. When Peter had preached Christ to them, and they believed his preach-

ing, they cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered, "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 Ghost." Acts 2: 38.

Here we are told, in so many words, that baptism, in connection with repentance, is for remission of sins. Jesus, in giving the commission, said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,"—or pardoned—(Mark 16: 16,) making pardon or salvation conditional on baptism, in connection with faith. Many more passages might be adduced, but these must suffice for the present.

May God speed the day when all men will be willing to be guided by the plain and simple words of divine truth, and trust in Jesus for salvation.

Faternally,

PESSIMUS.

Marietta, Miss., March 22, 1874.

Faith, What it is and How does it
Come.

When viewed just as revealed in the Bible, nothing is plainer, simpler than faith. But when viewed as taught in modern Theology, it is a very mysterious affair. We are told of several kinds of faith by modern teachers of religion, but when we turn to the word of God, we read nothing at all of these different kinds of faith. Jesus said, as recorded in the third chapter of John, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish,

but have everlasting life." Verses 14 and 15. Whoever believes on the Son of God has a chance to obtain eternal life, but an infidel has no such chance. But what does the word believe mean? This is a very important question. The meaning of this word must be determined just like we would determine the meaning of any other word. This word believe is defined, "to Credit upon the authority or testimony of another, to be persuaded of the truth of something." To be assured in our minds of the truth of all that is revealed unto us concerning Jesus of Nazareth, is to believe on Christ according to the New Testament. And in this, there is nothing mysterious or incomprehensible. To believe on Christ, as the Son of God, is no more mysterious or difficult, than to believe in Noah or Abraham. No one ever thought of there being any mystery in believing in full confidence that Abraham lived, and was the father of the Jewish nation. Nor is there anything mysterious in believing that Abraham offered sacrifices well pleasing to God. No one thinks of there being any mysteries in believing that Abraham proceeded to offer his son as a burnt-offering to God, and only the intervention of God himself hindered him from striking the fatal blow, which would have sent Isaac into eternity. All can easily understand what it is to believe in the passage of the Children of Israel through the Red Sea. And now if it is any more difficult, or more mysterious to believe what the Bible says concerning Jesus of Nazareth, we should be very glad to see the man that could point out that difference. The Bible tells us what Abraham did, and we believe it; we heartily accept it as true, upon the testimony that God has given. So also the Bible tells what Jesus did and suffered, and we believe that—we confidently accept it as true upon the testimony which God has given of his Son. And in the principle of believing, there is no difference. The difference is in the nature of the facts believed, and not in the principle of believing. Any one who can understand what it is to believe the historical facts concerning Gen. George Washington, can understand what it is to believe the historical facts concerning the Lord Jesus Christ. The difference is, the history of Washington is only the history of a man, while the other is a history of Jesus, the Son of God. Our salvation does not depend upon believing the one, while it does depend upon believing the other. But believing the one, is no more mysterious than believing the other. So when Jesus says, "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned," he simply means whoever will accept as true, the gospel that is, the death, burial, and resurrection of the Son of God, and will be baptized, shall be saved. But he that will not accept it as true, shall be condemned. So then, to believe any fact or truth, is to confidently accept it as true; to be fully satisfied that what is said of it is certainly correct. So then faith is no direct gift of God, nothing inwardly and secretly wrought in us by the secret workings of the Spirit of God,

but something performed or rather exercised by the individual in his own mind, and can be as intelligently done, as in the most simple incidents in every day life. And if these things be not true, we cannot see of what use the Bible is to man. The Bible reveals to us what God has done for the world through his Son; but of what use is all this, if man cannot believe it to the saving of his soul. If it still requires some other power to give us faith, that could be done as well without the Bible as with it. We read in the Old Testament that Moses erected a serpent of brass in the wilderness, and that when the people looked upon it, they were healed of the bite of the fiery serpent, and upon that testimony we believe it. We read in the New Testament that Jesus was put to death at Jerusalem, buried and raised from the dead the third day, and upon the testimony given, we believe that, just like we believe the other. And a man that does not believe that Jesus died and rose again, need not talk about believing the Bible. And as to the origin of faith, Paul says, "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10. No one ever yet believed on Jesus, who had never heard of him. The Eunuch did not—Lydia did not, nor any one else, either in divine or profane history. Not one soul was converted in the days of the apostles till he had heard the Gospel preached, and then believed what he heard. The Lord arranged it that way when he said, preach the Gospel to *every creature*. But we are satisfied that the great trouble on this subject, is not that the people do not believe

that Christ died and rose again,—the trouble lies beyond this. When Jesus says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," they do not believe this. They have no confidence in it. And when the Holy Spirit through Peter said to believers "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," they do not believe a word of it. And this unbelief among the people is on account of the unbelief of the preachers. Go for instance into a revival meeting, where there are mourners sincerely seeking the salvation of their souls, who believe with all their heart on the Lord Jesus Christ, and are as penitent as people can be, and repeat to these mourners what the Holy Spirit said to the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, and it will be to them as idle tales. Many of them would as soon follow the Koran, or the book of Mormon. And the man who would presume to go into one of these revivals and present Peter's language publicly to such mourners, would run the risk of going to the Court-house afterward to give an account of himself, for disturbing public worship. This language of Peter is what the preachers and people of modern denominations and revivals do not believe. They have no confidence in it. They will preach and exhort and pray for weeks at a time, to get the mourners through on a different line, and never quote this language, which three thousand people received, and by which they were made glad on the day of Pentecost, one single time. No; they tell us this plan is too easy, and that it

would be seeking salvation by works and not by grace. We have no recollection of ever having heard this language addressed to mourners in a revival meeting in life. And yet this is the very thing, and the only thing that is applicable to them in this situation. The people on such occasions are exactly in the condition that the people were on the day of Pentecost when they were told to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. This is what the people need to believe. How is it that people will believe the Bible while it tells them how Jesus was born in Bethlehem, baptized by John in Jordan, then went about doing good, healing the sick, casting out devils, and raising the dead, and that finally he himself died and rose again; and then when the same Bible says to the believer, repent and be baptized for the remission of sins,—how they will not believe *that*, and utterly reject that entire passage and all that it teaches, is strange to me. But the preachers say so, and the people believe them, rather than a plain declaration of the word of God. It is not enough then that we believe the Gospel facts; we must also believe the conditions upon which the Lord promises to pardon us. We must have sufficient faith in these to embrace them; and a faith short of this will never save the soul. Then couple with this faith, sufficient interest in salvation to induce the individual to embrace these things, and the promise of pardon is his. The greatest difficulty on the whole subject of religion, is to induce the people to believe in, and put their trust in the word of God, with a hearty willingness to comply with its divine requisitions, and trust in full measure the promises of God. But there is something taught as faith, that is entirely different from anything we have here presented. We are taught that there is a faith that is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit. Now if there is any such faith as this taught in the word of God, we should like to have it pointed out to us, that we may teach it too. But we know the Bible says not one word about such a faith. The faith about which the Bible talks is to be exercised by man, and one in which he is to all intents and purposes, responsible; "he that believeth not shall be damned." And so the minds of the people are puzzled and troubled over this faith about which the preachers talk so much, and in waiting for that overlook and reject the plain and simple faith that is revealed in the word of God. We need not trouble our minds over anything not plainly revealed in the Bible. There is enough there to save all the world, if faithfully complied with. John says, "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." Jno. 20. The miracles of Jesus are written that we may believe in him as the Son of God. But the believing itself does not give life, but only prepares one to obtain life or salvation. A believer can obtain salvation, but an infidel cannot, while he remains such. It is said of Jesus, "He came to his

own, and his own received him not, but to as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God; even to them that believe on his name." Jno. 1. Surely then it is one thing to believe, to have faith and another to obtain life through the name of Christ. And so the idea that through faith only we have salvation, and that this faith is the gift of God, is untaught, and unknown in the word of God. And yet the denominations around us, all practice upon the principle that the sinner is pardoned, is a Christian, before baptism, and independent of it. Not a word of which they can read if taken in its proper connection. The infidelity that is in the religious world, is greater than the people generally imagine. Eve was induced by the serpent to disbelieve God when he said if she ate the forbidden fruit she should die; but her disbelieving it did not prevent her from dying when she ate it. King Saul, doubtless, thought it would do just as well for him to save the best of the sheep and oxen, and sacrifice them to the Lord as to utterly destroy them. But his thinking so did not make it so, for he was rejected from God, and abandoned by him on account of it. Moses and Aaron evidently thought that it would do just as well for them to smite the rock with their rod as to speak to it. But on account of doing so, they were rejected from the land of Canaan, and died outside of its boundaries. And the people now think something else will do as well as for them to believe in and embrace the simple truth and requirements of the gos-

pel. But they may find out differently when it shall be forever too late for them. If the people would only learn how to regard an obedience to the gospel of Christ. with the same sort of simplicity that they regard other matters of the Bible, the whole matter of becoming a Christian would be a very plain matter. The Bible tells us that Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, and we believe it upon that statement. It is enough for us, that the word of God says so. The Bible also tells us that Christ healed the man sick of the palsy, and all are willing to believe that upon its simple statement. But when that same Jesus promises pardon upon believing and being baptized, the people say, No, this is not enough. We must have an inward evidence of pardon before we are willing to be baptized. Hence we insist upon it, that faith, full confidence in the commands and promises of God is more needed now than anything else in the matter of becoming Christians.

There are thousands of people today that want to be Christians, and would rather be Christians than anything else beneath the heavens, but have no confidence that they will become such by going forward and doing what the Lord requires in his word, as given in second of Acts. They are waiting year after year for the Lord to do something for them which the preacher talks about, but which the Bible says not one word about. No one in the days of the apostles was hindered an hour from becoming a Christian, after the way was pointed out. They then had confidence enough in the word of

God to go at once, the same day, or night and do what was commanded, and believe and rejoice in the promise of pardon. And it would be so now, if the preachers would just preach what they find recorded in the word of God. There will be a fearful account to be rendered for the manner in which the word of God is withheld from the people, and their confidence in it destroyed.

E. G. S.

Church Organization.

In the *A. C. Review* of March 17, of this year, is a communication from bro. L. B. Waters of McMinnville, Tenn., in which he asks bro. Franklin to set the GOSPEL ADVOCATE right on the subject of church organization, and officers, stating that he had attempted to do so, but had been ignored by my humble self, the author of what he is pleased to call "uncertain sounds," on that subject. It will be remembered that in year 1872 we wrote a series of articles on the subject, giving briefly on the subject, and requested the brethren, if they saw errors on the subject in our articles, to point them out, and give the true Scriptural teaching, if we had failed to do so. After we published the first article, brother Waters wrote and sent us an article on the subject, which we published verbatim, and made such reply as we thought proper. We then went on with the subject, and bro. Waters made not another word of reply. Months passed on, and we heard no more of bro. Waters, till Sept. 1873, nearly a year after we had closed our investigation of the sub-

ject, when he sent the article he speaks of as having been ignored. We had, as we thought, good reasons for not publishing said article. In the first place, he did not pretend to reply to a single point we had made on the subject, nor did he propose to reply, but only proposed to investigate the matter in his own way. In the second place his article was disrespectful and insulting to an extent that we were wholly unwilling to give it room in the ADVOCATE. And in the third place, brother Waters had withdrawn himself from the congregation at McMinnville, by becoming offended at the church, and refusing to meet with the brethren at that place, and we were unwilling on that account, to publish a series of articles from him under the circumstances. If we are so far wrong as he intimates, we of course ought to be set right. We have no desire to exert the blighting influence over the cause of truth that he claims we do. We are perfectly willing for brother Franklin, or any one else in good standing, to set the Advocate right, if it is wrong on this, or any other subject; but it must be done in a respectful way, and by scriptural arguments, and not merely by assertion and denunciation as brother W. has done. We thought at the time, and still think we did right in rejecting bro. Water's article. We do not claim to be very well posted in Editorial courtesy, but we are not quite sure that it is the best of courtesy for one editor, to publish denunciatory articles of this sort against another, without inquiring or knowing anything of the facts in the case. At all events, the fact that the *Re-*

view has published these things to the world, makes it necessary for us to make this explanation, which would not otherwise have been necessary.

E. G. S.

Religion in Daily Life.

It is not always the most comely offices that are the most tolerable. The service of a mother to a child involves something more than the mere act. It is invested with a feeling which makes it to the mother one of the most delightful of occupations. What mother does not know that it is a privilege to tend her own babe? What sick mother does not look sadly and enviously upon the nurse that performs the functions that must be performed for the child? And yet they are often functions which, if they were performed for any other than the mother's own child, would be odious to her.

Look upon the maiden, who vies with the butterfly; who, like the butterfly, is light, gay, songful; who seems as though she would be defiled even by the falling of the dew upon her. She is the darling of her father's house, and no man is found worthy of her. She marries; and every one says, "She has thrown herself away upon that man." She goes out into life; and the mysterious door that opens infinity is opened when the child is born. Then she loves as she never loved before. Then is opened the eye of the heart. Then not only love but faith is awakened. And what a transformation has taken place! How she has forgotten the festal party! How she has forgotten the sound of social music! How

she has forgotten all flatteries! For in yonder little cradle is a cherub that sings to her. And in her daily duties, morning and evening, while serving this little unrequiting thing, that can neither see, nor think, nor know that she is its mother, how her life bounds forth! and how her soul is poured out! And men say, "What a change!" Yes, there is a great change. The duties to which she applies herself are, to her, changed. How? By that of herself which she has brought to them. The cradle is not comely, and the service of the babe is not tasteful, to nature; but from the heart has gone out an atmosphere that transfigures it all; and fills it with beauty and desirableness.

And that which we see in the mother extends more or less through every part of life. That to which you bring diligence, and conscience, and taste, and cheerfulness, and gladness, and sympathy, becomes transformed. Whether a man be at the stable, or in the colliery, or in the stithy, or on the ship, or in the shop; wherever a man is, if he has a manly heart, and can bring to his affairs real manliness.—there duty becomes to him blossoming, and that is sweet which otherwise would be bitter.

Let not men, therefore, mumble their business, as unhungry boys do their unwelcome bread. Let not men say, "Oh, you have a good time preaching; but if you were a blacksmith you would find it different." I sometimes wish I were one. I have hammered as much cold iron in the pulpit as ever a blacksmith did hot iron on the anvil. Let not men say, "Ah! if you were poor and had to

drudge, you would not see things as you do now." I have been poor, and I have had to drudge. I have been through the various stages between adversity and prosperity, and I have found that some functions require less and some more moral elements than others; but I have also found that a kingly, noble-spirited man can redeem many duties which are in themselves unattractive and repulsive, and make them honorable and beautiful and agreeable.

There is no place where God puts you, where it is not your duty to turn round and say, "How shall I perfume this place, and make it fragrant as the honeysuckle and the violet, and beautiful as the rose?" In this world you are to perform the great duties of spiritual, moral and physical life, in the place where you are.

If you are a boy in school, you are to perform the duties which are assigned you by your master, by reason of your allegiance to Christ. It is not a question between you and your master; neither is it a question between you and your thought and judgment: it is a question between you and the Lord Jesus Christ. In whatever position one is called to occupy, he is to be governed by the mind and will of Christ. However secular his pursuit may be, he is to be a Christian, and is to act like a Christian.

You are an apprentice; you are working in a joiner's shop; you are a plasterer's journeyman; you are a tinner; you are a roofer; you are a stair-builder; you are a ship-joiner; you are a shoemaker; you are a hatter; you are perhaps, lower down

than what are called *the menial occupations of life*, a street-sweeper, or a boot-black; but whatever you are, unless in some business that you know is wrong, you are not so much to say, "How shall I get out of this occupation, in order that I may be made a Christian?" as "How, being a Christian, shall I work grace out of this occupation? How shall I be faithful where there is no other reward than the consciousness of doing right?"

Exactitude, trustworthiness, where there is no eye but God's to see; the fulfilling of the sense of a true Christian manhood in that which is disagreeable—these things constitute *taking up the cross*. Parents want to teach their children to take up the cross; and they say, "Now, my son, if you won't eat any sugar or butter for six months, in order that you may give to the missionaries, that will be taking up the cross." Self-denial is taking up the cross; and if there were no other way of getting at it, I would take it up by leaving off butter and sugar; but it seems to me that there are enough crosses to take up without resorting to such modes as that. When a boy does not want to get up in the morning, and he gets up, he takes up the cross. When a person is cross before breakfast, that is a good time for him to take up the cross, by keeping his temper. Where one does not like to be punctual in the performance of duties, or in the keeping of engagements, there is a good opportunity for him to take up the cross. When a boy sits by another boy that is disagreeable, and he wants to "nab" him all the time, he has a good

opportunity to take up the cross by being kind to him.

It is better to take up the cross in things that mean something. It is better, at home and abroad, in school and out of school, in business or pleasure, everywhere, and at all times, to hold a good temper, to maintain a true benevolence, to keep a warm and glowing sympathy with whatever is noble, to be punctual and truthful under all circumstances, and to do things that are right *because* they are right. Men oftentimes, feeling it to be their duty to take up the cross, seek to find artificial crosses to take up; but mostly, I think, we have crosses enough to take up in subduing the recreancy of our selfish nature to true kindness, and noble enterprise, and faithful manhood.

I will also remark, in connection with this subject of the strange and incongruous ethics which men introduce into different departments of their lives, that all business should be religious. All religion should have in it an element of business, that is, of active life. And whether the occupation be pleasure or business, it should always be in the service of God.

This would preclude the introduction of different rules of right and wrong into different parts of life. Men say that you cannot expect one to act in politics as he does in private life.* Why not? Are there ten commandments for politics which

* If it is right for a Christian to enter politics it is right he should act by Christian rules. But as Christians are so universally tempted to violate that Christian rule, we conclude it is wrong for a Christian to enter politics. "Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil" acted out would keep a man from politics.

D. L.

are different from the ten commandments for the rest of life? Was the Sermon on the Mount given for men unknown to politics? It is said that you cannot expect a man to act in business as he would in his household. Why not? Where do you find any argument to show that a man cannot carry on his business by precisely the same ethical rules that he does his household life? It is claimed by many that you cannot expect a man to be in public life what he is in private life. *Why not?*

I admit that men do have different rules and laws of ethical conduct in the different parts of their life; but I affirm that it is wrong. If you ask whether I would not myself act differently, and according to different ethical rules, under different circumstances, I reply that I might. Perhaps I should go with the multitude. I am as likely to break down as you are. But that does not make the adoption of different ethical rules right; nor does it make my instruction on the subject less important or less true.

I say that a man should be the same under all circumstances; and that which is true, honest, fair in the household is true, honest, fair in the store, and in the shop. That which is right between man and man in your own neighborhood is right between man and man in great States. That which is proper in private life is proper in public life. No man has a right, in his advance to a higher sphere, and to more responsibility, to relax his conscience, and take larger liberties. The scrupulousness of

honor ought to augment in proportion to the enlargement of the sphere in which one acts. The more complex a man's life becomes, the more rigorous should be his requisition upon his conscience. And yet it is not so. But the day will come, it must come, when it will be so.

You cannot be a man of honor, though you tell the truth in your household and neighborhood, if you lie without scruple in public affairs. It is no more right for a man to tell a lie on the stump, or in a newspaper, than it is for him to tell a lie in a church. The exigencies of party may sometimes seem to make it necessary to misrepresent facts; but it is never right, and, for the matter of that, it is never really politic.

How whole droves, vast swarms of lies, fly in every Presidential campaign! More lies were told in the last campaign than all the musquitoes in all the dismal swamps in the land. And the men that lie night and day, day and night, in politics and in public life, are the very men that cry out against lying in private life, and in neighborhoods and families. They cannot endure lying! It is shocking to them!

Why, we have all been lying. We have all been studying expediency for the sake of policy. We have all, out of sympathy for our companions, or from interested motives, been winking at things which will not bear scrutiny. And are we the ones to take up a stone and throw it at those who have gone astray in this particular? Are we to heap condemnation on those who are no more guilty than ten thousand who hoot and hound them? Not that they are

not guilty; but it is better, when you see how bad wrong is, how sinful it appears, to turn the light of its exposure upon your own selves, and see how you look, and what insincerities, and stretchings of conscience, and falsehoods, and demoralization you are guilty of.

Not slothful in business of any kind, fervent in spirit under all circumstances, and both fervency and diligence in such a way as to serve the Lord.

There is but one other point that I will make in connection with this subject, and that is, the mistake and unreasonableness of those who propose to themselves to lead a Christian life before they die, but who think they cannot for the present enter upon it on account of their occupation; on account of their cares; on account of their interests in business.

If religion were something apart from daily life, and from the experience of men in the discharge of daily duties, there might be some validity in this excuse or plea; but if religion is the right conduct of a man, and the right carriage of his thoughts and feelings, and if religion aims simply at perfect manhood, then everything is religious that tends to build up men in perfect manhood. Everything should be relative to the great end of building up a perfect manhood in Christ Jesus.

Then why should one wait? Why should not one accept religion without delay? Religion is to the soul what health is to the body. One does not say in respect to health, "I will wait till I have perfected this, that, or the other plan before I re-

cover." On the contrary, he says, "In order that I may perfect my plans I will seek health, and strength and vigor." A man's capacity to do business is improved by religion. There is nothing that one is called to do in life, which it is right for him to do, that he will not do better and easier with a conscience void of offense and a heart at peace with God, and a soul in sympathy with divine love.

It requires no more time for a man to be honest than to be dishonest; to speak truth than to speak a falsehood; to be gentlemanly than to behave brutally; to act with politeness than to act with rudeness; to carry one's self kindly than unkindly.

Religion is right-doing. It is righteousness. It is right thought and feeling, and the right application of them to the daily duties of life. And it takes no more time to do right than to do right than to do wrong—often not so much. Collectively and generically it is easier to perform even secular duties in a religious spirit than to perform those same duties in an irreligious spirit. While the lower nature is unchristianized; while pride and selfishness are the prime faculties, the chief motive powers, an element of discord is introduced, and the wheels turn hard. It takes more labor-pain to act in secular affairs, according to the lower spirit of the word, than according to the higher spirit of Christianity.

There is no reason why a man should delay entering upon a Christian life. It makes one better in the store; better on the farm; better in the household; better as a neighbor. Everywhere, religion means lifting

the standard of life in this world, and the bringing down from the heavenly land a sense of sympathy with God. It is bringing the better reason and the better moral feelings, instead of the animal side of human nature, into the ascendancy. No man, therefore, can excuse himself from being a Christian man on the ground that he has so much to do. No matter if you double and quadruple your business, you are to carry it on according to religious principles. Whether you eat, or drink, or whatsoever you do, you are to do it to the glory of God.

I do not ask you to leave off turning the wheel; to quit your business; to give up your pursuits; but your industrial occupation is to be conducted in a religious spirit. You are to be a Christian man where you are, and in the things which you are doing. You are to give yourself to your avocation with a Christian, not with a selfish, worldly disposition. Cultivate the grace of God in your heart, that you may discharge the duties which belong to your sphere in a better and nobler way.

And do not lose the step. Do not get out of the ranks. If you are out of the ranks, and have lost the step, get in as soon as possible, and catch up. March steadily and firmly along the way of the Lord. The time ought to come in every man's experience when the truth should be to him as an open book, and when he should say, "From this moment I mean to walk after the manner of the Christian life. I take the divine ideal, and accept the divine law. I put my trust in God, who is a Being of compassion, and who is willing to

wait for the development of his creature to the stature of men in Christ Jesus.

We ought to be drilled in our daily and hourly conduct, our whole present life ought to be drilled, with reference to our future life; and when that is done, the work will not be half accomplished. I believe there will be much to be added hereafter. Doubtless there will be much to be sloughed off, taken away, at the grave; but that which passes through will go on to blossom more largely, and to bear fruit more abundantly. The true heart will, notwithstanding its many aberrations and retrocessions, have a steady, constant tendency upward and onward every part of the life conforming to the glorious ideal of Christian manhood, full of patience, full of hope, full of love, so at last when at last the Task master shall say, "It is enough," the spirit shall go home, and find itself drawn upward, and carried through the air, as upon angels' wings, to that land where is perfect happiness.—*Beecher in Plymouth Pulpit.*

Obituaries.

Bros. L. & S: We hereby announce the death of Sister Margaret Palmer. She died at the residence of her husband, (our worthy old brother John Palmer.) near Lebanon Tennessee, on 5th day of January 1874. She was born 11th of January 1805. was seventy-one years old save six days. Was married to bro. Palmer. August 25th 1823. They earnestly strove together to make an honorable living, which they abundantly accomplished, out of which she was ever ready to do acts of kindness for the needy. Sister Palmer was youngest daughter of Thomas B. Reese who was one of the oldest pioneers of Tennessee in dangerous times. He was married in the Fort at Bledsoe's Lick, was severely wounded by the Indians, but recovered from his wound and

lived to a good old age and died honored and respected. Sister Palmer was convinced of the facts of the Gospel, the plan of salvation, and was immersed by our lamented brother Calvin Curlee in 1838. and was by the kind providence of God permitted to live in the kingdom of Christ on earth thirty-six years. She was greatly devoted to reading the Bible and also to the practice of its divine precepts and relied on its promises:

Although she was sorely afflicted with disease of the lungs for several years before her death, she bore it with Christian fortitude to the last, and died as she had lived, in full assurance of a blessed immortality beyond the grave. She lived to see all of her own children grown and several grand children and most of them humbly walking blamelessly in the ordinances of the Lord. She has gone before them, leaving them and a kind husband besides many warm friends to weep after her. But their troubles should all be quieted when they read in the Bible of a home in heaven which God is holding in reserve for the faithful, where all tears are to be wiped away; where there will be no more sorrow nor pain. But a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge will give. Then ought we not in the language of the poet to say,

"Why should we mourn departed friends,
Or shake at death's alarms?
'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends,
To call them to his arms."

W. C. HUFFMAN.

Enon College Trousda's Co, Tenn. Mar. 1874.

Bros. L. & S: It becomes my duty to record the death of our Bro. Isaac Rodgers. He died at the residence of Bro. R. L. Bromons, his Son-in-law in Sparta Tenn. on the 10th of March 1874—of consumption. aged 74 years and 15 days. He leaves a Christian wife, five daughters and many grand children who have our earnest sympathy. Bro. Rodgers had been a member of the Christian church for many years, and his family are nearly all members of the Church of Christ. O! may this stroke serve to draw our minds from earth. May it cause us to live more humbly, more devoted to the cause of Christ, so that when death shall come we may be able to close our eyes in death as our Bro. Rodgers did, in the full assurance that in the morning of the resurrection our bodies will be raised up Spiritual bodies to live where Christ and all his loved ones are, where we can praise him who died that we might live, is the prayer of

Your humble Bro.,

J H N S. RHEA.

Sparta Tenn., March 22 1874.

"The earth is the Lords, and' the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.

This Scripture occurred to my mind, as my heart seemed as though it would burst with grief, at the loss of our darling little boy David Collins Switzer, who died of Typhoid fever Feb. 14th 1874. This being the case, why should we grieve or repine as though we would dictate to our Maker when all are his. But then again Jesus wept, and we cannot but weep, and in an outburst of grief and tears we find relief. But O how heart rending to sit and watch day by day, and night after night, and know that friends, and parents, can afford no relief to the sweet, little patient sufferer. It is hard, indeed. But to know when life is extinct, that angels are waiting to bear the little Spirit home to God who gave it, to know that sickness and suffering are o'er, and the anxieties and troubles of this uncertain world are done with, and to know if we are finally faithful, we shall meet the dear one again, is indeed a consolation to the Christian. And may this be a means of bringing us nearer to God.

EUSTACIA SWITZER.

JORRECTION.

Brethren L. & S; Please correct an error in Bro. Miles P. Murphy's obituary published in No. 12 of the Advocate. Instead of eight sons it should be three. Closing sentence should be, *that we may have &c.*

H. NORTH.

Maury Co. Tenn. March 27th 1873.

QUERIES.

Friends Lipscomb & Sewell: You and your brethren take the position that a man cannot be saved without being baptized! I would like to know what you will do with the thief on the cross. Was not he saved without baptism? The Savior says, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." We have no account of his being baptized. If you deem it proper, you can answer through the Advocate.

Very truly,

S. P. M.

Pickensville, Ala., March 27, '74.

Not feeling disposed at present to enter into an extensive investigation of this subject, we may admit all that is claimed regarding the thief, and still show that it is nothing in the way of our teaching. Paul, of the New institution says, "A Testament is of force after men are dead; otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Heb. 9. When the thief asked the Savior to remember him, he was still alive, the plan of salvation not yet complete, and the new institution not yet established. And granting that the thief was saved, no one now can be saved that way; for when Jesus had completed the plan of salvation, and was about to ascend to heaven, he commanded his apostles to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." This is the arrangement under which we now live, and to which we must look for pardon.

We may just as well look back to the sin-offering of the Jews to learn how to obtain pardon as to look to the thief. Cornelius was an *honest man*, and yet he could not be saved that way, but had to send off for a preacher to tell him what to do. And when the preacher came to tell him what to do, he commanded him to be baptized; and so Cornelius, though an honest, praying man was not saved without baptism. And so we conclude that unless it is easier for a thief to be saved than an honest man, if the thief had lived when Cornelius did, he would have been required to be baptized. And since such a man as Cornelius was not saved without

baptism, we do not suppose that even a thief would be very likely to be so saved. And for the life of me, I cannot see why people should be running to the thief for an example of conversion instead of going to a good honest man like Cornelius.

And besides all this, no man knows whether that thief had ever been baptized or not. To say he was not baptized is to say what no one knows. It is mere presumption. Neither can any one say that he was baptized. We simply do not know. Why should we make such an ado over a case of presumption? And especially when the case did not occur under the dispensation in which we live. If we are ever saved at all, it will be by the great commission given by the Savior to his apostles when he was about to ascend to heaven, and not like the people claim that the thief was saved. Those who take the thief as their example, and depend upon being saved as they claim he was, and reject baptism, will certainly be condemned for disobedience. Besides, we do not like the negative style in which you represent our teaching. Instead of saying a man cannot be saved without baptism, we try to enforce the divine commission, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." When a man does all the commands, then we know he has the promise of pardon. Until then, he has not the promise.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S: Please give me your views of the 2nd and 5th verses of the 6th chapter of Galatians.

Answer through the GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

Your Bro.

JOHN McQUIDDY.

Farmington, Tenn. March 22 1874.

These are the verses. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ."

"For every man shall bear his own burden."

There is an apparent contradiction in these verses, if we take the verses themselves, without reference to the connection. In the first verses of the chapter, Paul tells them, "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."

This first verse is an explanation of the second one, the first of the two referred to. Christians must always be ready to sympathize with one another in their weakness and be always ready to help each other out of all sorts of missteps and improprieties. That instead of abusing and accusing, and talking about the members of the body who have done wrong, the stronger and better informed members should at once go to them in the spirit of love and meekness, and if possible correct the fault, and thus help one another,—bear one another's burdens. The fifth verse teaches in its connection that every Christian has a work to perform in the house of God, and that each man is individually responsible for what he is able to do, be it much or little, and that he will be held responsible for the doing of all that he is able to do.

If a man is able to teach others,

in the principles of our Holy Religion, he must do so. If he cannot teach, perhaps he can aid in sustaining others who can. Hence the sixth verse says, "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth, in all good things." Every member in the body of Christ has a part to perform, a work to fulfill, for which he will be held to an account before God, in the last day, and in that sense every man will have to bear his own burden.

E. G. S.

Correspondence.

Bros. L. & S.: It has been a long time since I wrote you and perhaps I ought to say something occasionally (if for no other purpose) just to let the readers of the *ADVOCATE* know that I am still alive—I was informed the other day by an esteemed bro. of Adair Co. Ky. that they had heard that I was *certainly* dead. I want all my friends to feel perfectly assured that no one was authorized, by me to circulate any such report and if it can't be stopped any other way I might pay them a visit this year.

I am inclined to spend my time this year in travelling and preaching though I cannot leave home much until after the rising of grass—I am very anxious to see my relatives and friends in Southern Ky. and Middle Tenn. again before I die—I have never found so fine a field of labor anywhere as several of the Green and Cumberland River Co.'s presented when I left Ky. I feel very sad to think of the success that crowned my humble efforts there and how little

I have done since I left—true we should not always estimate the worth of a man's labor by the additions he has. They have not been over 5 per cent with me of what I had in Ky. Made a little tour recently in the Eastern part of this (Cass) County visiting a point in Henry and had several additions by relation and one by confession and baptism—I have had several invitations to preach for congregations monthly but the longer I live the less I like monthly meeting religion.

I was pleased to meet the "Little Man," by his Fireside sometime back though he has not been in for several weeks. However if Uncle Joe would set with us when he is absent it would always be agreeable—they are both good talkers and we won't say which we like best. I don't know when my time will be out but notify me, for I can no more feel satisfied without it than I could without coffee for breakfast—I wish one of you would try your hand at textuary preaching, and take the latter clause of 8th verse of 3rd chapter of 1st Peter and that the other would give occasional extracts from Cowpers description of a preacher—these things might be profitable to many young preachers and some old ones. I can hardly forbear insisting on this matter of vast importance May God abundantly bless you.

Good bye,

W. T. CRENSHAW.

State Line, Mo.

A New Process of Washing.

Brethren L. & S.: If you think the following receipt will be of any benefit to the poor, please publish

and ask other Editors to copy. It is reliable, having been tested in my own family, and several others in my knowledge. Soak the clothing over night in warm soap suds, wring out and put them in a common wash kettle or stove boiler with the soiled parts well soaped, cover the clothing with cold water, then boil $\frac{3}{4}$ hour, rinse out in the usual way, and the washing is done equal to J. C. Tilton's steam washer.

G. W. HALL.

Bloomfield, Mo.

NEW MUSIC.

We have received the following pieces of new music for the piano. Three songs, "A Mother's Gift of her Daughter," "I Long to see the Dear Old Home," and "Is there Room Among the Angels." Also the "Ida Waltz," an instrumental piece. These nice pieces, and almost anything else you may call for, in the music line, can be had of McClure & Bro., No. 22 Cherry St., Nashville, Tennessee.

Church News.

The cause of Christ is prospering in this neighborhood. Mount Vernon Church is in a healthy condition. Our young brother T. M. Foster is preaching for us once a month, or rather four times, Saturday and night, Sunday and night. He is a promising young preacher and a good man, practices what he preaches. Brother Dr. Foster preaches for us on the first Lord's day in each month; one prodigal returned to the Church

last Saturday, we are looking for others soon.

Yours &c.

A. J. MCGAUGHEY.

Monroe, Ga.

MURMUR at nothing; if our ills are irreparable, it is ungrateful; if remediless it is vain. A Christian builds his fortitude on a better foundation than stoicism; he is pleased with everything that happens, because he knows it could not happen unless it had first pleased God, and that which pleases him must be the best. He is assured that no new thing can befall him, and that he is in the hands of a Father who will prove him with no affliction that resignation cannot conquer, or that death cannot cure.—*Cotton.*

New Advertisement.

We call attention to the advertisement of J. E. Goodwin, to be seen in our advertising columns. We can heartily commend bro. Goodwin to all who may wish to do business in his line. Give him a call or send what you want done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Romans 7, 8 & 9.....	337.
Druggists selling liquors.....	341
Objections answered.....	343
Faith, what is it, and how does it come?...	345
Church organization.....	350
Religion in daily Life.....	351
Obituaries.....	356
Correction.....	357
Queries.....	357
Correspondence.....	359
A New process of Washing.....	359
New Music.....	360
Church News.....	360
New Advertisement.....	360

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 16.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, APRIL 16, 1874.

Repentance; What is it?

Repentance, as taught in the Bible is so plain, that surely we need not say very much regarding it. The following very plain passages ought to impress every one with the importance of it. "Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein the most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Wo unto thee, Chorazin! wo unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in thee had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you." Matt. xi. 20-22. These cities against whom these terrible woes were pronounced were in the country of Galilee, and on or near the shore of the Sea of Galilee, in which country Jesus spent most of his personal ministry on earth. Most of his mighty miracles were wrought here, where the people had seen them, and had every opportunity needful, to assure themselves of the truth of his claims, to be the Messiah, the Son of God. But

they had utterly disregarded all these things, and had gone on their own way. until the mercy of God was exhausted towards them, and the Savior thus pronounces this terrible doom. The great trouble was, they repented not. And because they would not repent, they were to be destroyed. And such will be the final doom of all who refuse to repent. The masses of the people of this world have in every age hardened their hearts and stiffened their necks against God, and have met from time to time with the most awful calamities and destructions. Witness for example, the antediluvians. They rebelled against God, and walked in evil ways, and when Noah, a preacher of righteousness was sent unto them, they utterly disregarded his preaching and refused to repent. The result was they were overwhelmed with a terrible destruction.

And any one who will look seriously upon the masses of the people of this age, cannot fail to see that they are disregarding the authority of God, and are day by day preparing themselves for a most awful doom at the hands of God. If the

people could only be made to see the exceeding sinfulness of sin—could only see the awful cloud of destruction that hangs over their heads, they surely would pursue a different course. But alas for them, they blind their eyes against all these solemn things. Again says Jesus, "except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Luke 13. This is as positive and unchangeable, as anything that ever was spoken or written. The finally impenitent shall perish forever. The word repent in these passages is used in its broadest sense, and signifies the entire turning of the will, determination and life to God. The citizens of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum would not yield themselves to the Son of God—would not put themselves under his guidance and be his followers—would not turn from their evil ways, and put their trust in him as the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. The word repent, in its strictest sense, has reference to the determinations of the mind. The Greek word *metanoëo*, which is rendered repent, is compounded of *meta*, with and *noëo*, to think, or consider. Hence, literally, to think or consider with ones self; that is, to consider with ones-self the past course of life, with the determination to pursue a different course of life. Repentance then, in the strict sense of the word, signifies such a consideration and regret of ones former course of life as results in a fixed determination to forsake sin, and turn to God; which determination eventuates in an actual turning of the whole course of life to God.

And hence the word is often used

in a general sense, embracing both the determination of mind, and the actual turning away from sin to the service of God. Such is the meaning and use of the word in both the passages we have quoted. Sometimes it is used to signify a consideration, or determination of mind, as in 18 of Ezekiel, where God says, "Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin." Here the act of reformation is expressed by the word *turn*, so that in this case, the word repent refers to the determination of mind, which was to result in turning from all their transgressions to do the will of God. A mere sorrow of heart therefore, does not constitute the repentance of the Bible. No matter how much a man sorrows, nor how many times he may determine to do better, it all will amount to nothing till he actually turns from all his transgressions, and gives his life to God, in doing his will. The drunkard sometimes seems to regret his abominable course of drunkenness, and to determine that he will do so no more. But unfortunately the next time he can get whiskey, he is drunk again. In such case, all his sorrow, and determination of heart amount to nothing. His pretended repentance is but mockery in the sight of God and men. If he wants to make his repentance genuine, he must cut loose from all that sort of association, and force himself to keep out of that sort of temptation, as he would keep out of the flames or the rushing tornado. So of every evil habit in which men may engage. They must give their lives to God, through his divine ap-

pointments, or their sorrow and determinations of mind will amount to nothing. The matter of repentance is something that needs mature, and deliberate consideration. Men should be fully at themselves; not overcome by sympathetic excitement merely, but yield themselves to God from deliberate and earnest consideration. When people are merely moved by sympathetic excitement, the excitement must always be kept up, or they fall back into the world again; and in time become worse than they were at the beginning. Quite a considerable proportion of all those who come in in times of great revivals soon fall away. Nothing moved them but a kind of sympathetic excitement. No deliberate consideration of mind, nor calm determination of heart to dedicate the life to God, by forsaking all evil, and doing the will of the heavenly Father.

Mere excitement therefore in our meetings should be avoided, and the plain truth of God should be presented, and the motives of the Gospel plainly placed before the people, as an inducement to them to become the servants of God. We do not mean by this, that the gospel should be presented in a cold and indifferent sort of way, as if it were a worldly sort of concern. Such preaching is done in a sort of professional way, and when people are invited to obey the Lord it is done in such a cold, indifferent sort of way, that it impresses no one with its importance. There are two extremes, both of which should be avoided in our efforts to induce the people to repent. One, is to excite them, by strong, sympathetic appeals, by reciting pa-

thetic incidents in life, that have no connection with the plan of salvation, so that a mere worldly or fleshly sorrow is produced, which is of no permanent or lasting character. The other, is to present the glorious truths of the gospel in such a cold, careless, lifeless way, as to produce no effect. Men who pretend to preach the glorious gospel of Christ, should endeavor to appreciate the grandeur and importance of the theme, and present it in such a way as to make others appreciate its heavenly value.

And if in this way we induce men to repent, we will do something permanent, something that will last while life lasts. Another item of importance, is the length of time required to do the work of repentance. And on this subject we remark, viewed from one standpoint, it will take a lifetime. But from another standpoint, we would say the work of repentance could be done in an hour. Three thousand on the day of Pentecost repented and were baptized in one day. The jailer and his household, the same hour of the night. Hence so far as repentance is necessary in order to become a Christian; it can be done as well in a day or an hour, as in a lifetime. It was so done in the days of the apostles, and we can see no reason why it can not be so done now. The idea that sinners must make a great amount of lamentation, and spend a long time in almost utter despair, and regard themselves as the worst sinners on earth, and forever undone—all that sort of thing is wholly unknown in the Christian Scriptures. But that sinners must repent sufficiently to turn away from sin and folly, is as clearly

taught in the Scriptures as any other requirement made at the hands of men. But when people have become Christians, they have only begun the great work of repentance. Christians are liable all along the journey of life, to do things they ought not. And just so often as they do these things, and they are conscious of it, they are required to repent of them, confess them to God, and ask forgiveness for the same. And so upon this principle, repentance must be kept up throughout the entire period of our earthly existence. It will never end till we cease to sin.

Restitution is also intimately connected with repentance. If a man has wronged another, has by any means got possession of his property or money wrongfully, when he repents and becomes a child of God, he must, if it lies in his power, make full reparation for the ill-gotten gain. And our convictions are that the claim of repentance will amount to but little, till this is done. And not only when any one has just become a Christian must this be done, but all along the journey of life, whenever we find out that we have in any way wronged or injured any one, it is our duty so soon as we ascertain that, to go at once, and make the matter right again, if it lies in our power to do so. Nor do we believe that our service will be acceptable to God while we refuse so to do. Restitution was a prominent feature in the Jewish economy, and certainly it is not less so in the Christian institution. We may say in conclusion, that repentance in all its forms, is something to be done by man—not something that God has promised to do for the sinner. When

Paul was preaching at Athens, he said God had commanded all men everywhere to repent. And what God has commanded man to do, he will not do himself for man. Some have taught that God works repentance in the hearts of sinners, by the Holy Spirit, through its secret influences. But the Bible does not so teach. And if sinners sit down to wait for this work to be done for them, they will be likely to wait till doomsday and then be lost.

E. G. S.

The Law of Sin and Death Again.

Dear Bro. N. B. Gibbons: The ADVOCATE, No. 12, containing your remarks, addressed to me, on the above-named subject, has been received, and I attempt to offer a reply to your arguments.

It is of very little avail, when two are in a controversy on any point, for one to say it "is a very easy and simple case," that "the reading itself ought to give entire satisfaction," etc. Such arguments have very little weight, my esteemed Bro., with thinking readers. This is the point to be *proved*, Bro. G. Suffice it to say in regard to this, that the simple reading of the passage by no means satisfies me that your position is correct. If it had, we should have had no argument on the subject.

You say, "Why is the first (law) called the law of the Spirit? Because it is peculiar to, and given by, and in the dispensation of, the Spirit. Why is the later (law) called the law of sin and death? Because sin is the author of it—lust conceives and brings forth sin, and the end or con-

sequence of sin is death." I accept your answer to the first, but cannot accept the second without considerable modification. Sin is not *directly* the author of any law, but it may be said to be the author of this law *indirectly*, as it was the sole cause of the introduction of this law. It was in a sinful dispensation, when sin—or the author of sin, the devil—was the ruling monarch of the world, and this law was introduced to "condemn sin in the flesh," which Paul tells us it was too weak to do, "but God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." Rom. 8: 3. I did not mean to make the impression that the law of Moses was too weak to free Paul from the same law, as you seem to think.

You refer to the 6th chapter of Romans, where Paul speaks of the rule or dominion of sin. Let us read his language: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." How were they made free from sin? Was it freedom from this sinful disposition which Paul found in his members, warring against the law of his mind, and which you call the law of sin and death? By no means. As remarked in a previous article, men are never free from these temptations, till they cross the Jordan of death, and land on the other shore. They were made free from the condemnation of past sins, but not freed from the danger of committing sin in the future. Their past sins are all pardoned, and hence they are made free from them. Again,

you say, "The law of sin and death' and 'the body of this death' are not identical." I frankly admit that. I never intimated that they were. I did say, however, that "the body of this death" was identical with what you term "the law of sin and death," and still think so, your argument to the contrary notwithstanding. By referring to 1 Cor. 15th chapter, I suppose you intend to convey the idea that we are to be delivered from "the body of this death" in the resurrection.

You make "the body of this death" "the body that must die," or simply the natural, material body. I am bound to think, my dear brother, that you had not given this point much thought previous to writing, or you could not have taken such a position. You would make Paul say, "Who shall deliver me from my body?" Who is the "me" to be delivered, Bro. Gibbons?

The apostle had just spoken of this law of sin that was warring in his members against the law of his mind, or his desire to do right, and exclaims, "Oh! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Think you, Bro. Gibbons, that the apostle would have branched off on to something as remote from the subject of his discourse as this? Surely not. "The body of this death" he speaks of was surely the sinful disposition he had been lamenting over.

"You think that if the apostle had not intended us to understand him to mean the Mosaic law, when he said 'the law of sin and death,' he would have explained himself in the 3rd verse thus: for what the law of Mo-

ses could not do,' etc. I remark, Paul almost always when speaking of the law of Moses, calls it the law." Yes, I did think so, and I must say I think so yet. I admit that when Paul was treating on the Mosaic law, and there were no circumstances to require an explanation of what law he referred to, he usually just said "the law," and was understood to mean the law of Moses. But in this case he was speaking of a law, and if he intended to change, and speak of a *different law*, would not the circumstances require him to make some explanation, in order to be understood? The inevitable conclusion is, that he continued to speak of the same law, and you will surely admit that he was speaking of the Mosaic law in the 3rd verse, where he says, "What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh," etc. You ask me to try my interpretation of Rom. 8: 2, thus: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law (of Moses), for what the law (of Moses) could not do in that it was weak through the flesh," etc., and add: "Don't you see at once it is altogether wrong? Just think, if you can, of God's giving or making a law that was so weak that it could not make the apostles free from itself." By no means do I "see that it is altogether wrong," but I see that your construction of my argument is "altogether wrong." I cannot see how you could understand me to mean that the law of Moses was too weak to make the apostle free from itself. Such a thought never once entered my mind, till I read it in your article. I explained my meaning of this in No. 1 of

my series* of articles on this chapter—the same article to which you objected, and which you replied to. I said that the law of Moses failed to secure perfect, sinless obedience, which, under that law, was required, but Jesus, coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, lived a life of sinlessness, thus showing that such a life was possible, and left us without excuse for sin. However, "when we sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," and "if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

I must say in conclusion, dear Bro. Gibbons, that you need not depend on my being convinced by re-reading the passage in dispute, for every time I read it I am more firmly convinced that my position is the true one.

If I am convinced at all, it must be by arguments yet to be brought up. I will be glad to read anything you may write on the subject; for if I am not convinced that I am in error, some ideas* are sure to be advanced that will be beneficial to me as well as to the mass of readers. I have ever been slow to believe anything erroneous that came from my good old brother—in whom I have almost unlimited confidence—whether delivered orally or through the press, but in this case I am bound to differ from him until my views are changed on this subject.

With fraternal love and friendship, I remain, most truly, your brother in the one Christian hope,

PESSIMUS.

Marietta, Miss., April 1, 1874.

QUERIES.

Brethren L. & S.: Should Christians partake of the Lord's supper with Pede-Baptists?

Please answer through the Advocate and oblige your Bro.

J. D.

Pickensville, Ala. March 19th, 1874.

If a Christian can find no assembly of the disciples of Christ, and can do no better than to eat with Pedobaptists, we should think there would be nothing wrong in it. But when Christians can meet with their own brethren, we think they ought to do so.

E. G. S.

Editors Gospel Advocate: Please answer the following questions, and add such remarks as you may see proper.

Should Christians furnish the material, fruit or grain to make whiskey or brandy when they know that he to whom they sell it intends selling the distilled product to be used in any way the purchaser may see proper?

We have had some sharp contentions even with our own brethren in regard to this matter, we take the negative of this question, and say that no man has any moral or Scriptural right to furnish Fruit or grain to be distilled and used as it generally is, are we right?

A. N. DANIEL.

There is one principle governing the callings of Christians, the manner in which they may labor together, with the end to which they may direct

their labor—that labor shall result in good, not evil, to the human family. "Let him labor working with his own hands the thing which is good—that he may have to give to him that needeth." No principle is more clearly or plainly marked than that the Christian's labor shall result in good, that he shall be of good report and shall be partaker of the evil deeds of none. Then, in our callings in life the point is,—the Christian should engage in nothing the general or common results of which are evil to the human family. He should not only not engage in this calling himself, but he should not aid or abet or participate in or encourage a work of this kind in another. In doing this he becomes a partaker of his evil deeds.

We have been careful to say the general or common or legitimate results of a calling should not be evil, because any calling or position may be perverted to evil.

When a man engages in a calling the general and legitimate results of which are good, and beneficial to society, and without his connivance, his labor or the fruit of it is perverted to evil he is not responsible. He did good, another perverted his good to evil. Under this rule, no Christian man, it seems to me, can engage in distilling or handling intoxicating drinks. He cannot aid or encourage another in doing it.

If he raises corn or fruit, he does well. If he throws it upon the general market, sells it to the merchant or trader, and he sells to the distiller the raiser is guiltless. Another perverts his labor to evil. If he sells to the distiller, it seems to me, he

willingly becomes a partaker of his evil—a participator in evil results of his own labor.

There is no greater evil or curse upon our people than intoxicating liquors. Its evil influences are wide-spread and destructive in their character. Every Christian ought to so conduct himself with reference to its manufacture, sale and use, that his hands will be pure of the blood of all men and his conscience be void of offense both toward God and man. It is always better to keep as far from evil and any connection with evil as is possible. It is better to be on the safe side.

D. L.

Bro. Lipscomb: I have had it on my mind some time to write to you and get you to answer the following questions through the GOSPEL ADVOCATE, to wit:

1. Is it admissible to use leaven or a slice of light bread in the sacrament.

2. Is it admissible for an elder to include both bread and wine in one thanksgiving. Please answer the above and oblige your brother,

G. B. HARRIS.

P. S. I am doing th best I can as elder at Union. We have a good membership meeting at Union, meet every Lord's day and worship. We failed to attend to the supper one Lord's day on account of having a slice of loaf bread; I had doubts, and when I do, I prefer standing still. I still have doubts. See the occasion of the feast of the passover, also the 12th chapter of Exodus. We have precept and example so that we are thoroughly furnished.

Your Bro.

G. B. H.

There is nothing positively clear as to the kind of bread used or required to be used in the observance of the Lord's supper revealed in the Bible.

In the passover, unleavened bread only could be used, as we believe was the case in most of the services of the Jewish temple. In some of them leavened bread was to be used. But as a general rule the bread to be used in the Jewish worship or service was unleavened bread.

The Jews being converted to the Christian religion without special instruction, would naturally use it exclusively in religious observances.

We doubt not they did this. The Gentiles receiving the institution from the Jews—would receive the custom of using the unleavened bread. Although nothing is said upon the subject in the New Testament, we have but little doubt in our mind but what the unleavened was used by the primitive disciples. But the Lord's supper does not come in place of the passover, Christ himself is our passover, Paul says. The bread of the passover has no reference we think to the bread of the supper. The unleavened bread with which the supper was kept is used by Paul to illustrate and enforce the truth that our lives are to be seasoned with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

Our preferences are very decidedly for unleavened bread. But as nothing positive is revealed upon the subject, we have not refused when leavened bread, a few times in our experience, has been used.

We have but little doubt, but wheaten bread was used in primitive times. And we would prefer it. But

we do not think it essential or some indication to that effect would be given.

In a country where wheaten bread could not be had, we would not hesitate to use bread made from corn, or rye, barley, or oats. As to the wine, it specifically says, the juice of the grape. Where the law is thus specific we can take no substitute. We have heard of blackberry wine being used. We had as soon have cold water or cider.

There is another feature in the use of the slice of light bread, or a mere biscuit as we have seen a few times. They indicate a lack of preparation for the Lord's service. Preparation was made for a common meal—and only what is left is taken for the Lord's service. We do not like this. It seems like treating the matter lightly and indifferently. We had much rather see something prepared especially for this service. It shows respect, considerateness for the service.

The example is, the Savior first gave thanks for the bread, then took the cup and gave thanks for it,—did it for each separately. That is a good example to follow. We do not see why a person should desire to change an order adopted by the Savior himself. We are very much disposed to be safe in religious matters. The issues are too important to be in doubt or to follow a doubtful course when a safe and certain one is at hand. It is safe to use unleavened bread. To give thanks for each, separately is to follow a divine example. It is safe.

Brethren L. & S: Please give me your views on the following passages of Scripture Acts 11th chapter and 15th and 16th verses.

"And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning." "Then remembered I the word of the Lord how that he said John indeed baptized with water but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Please answer through the *ADVOCATE* at your earliest convenience and oblige,

Yours in the one hope,

J. D.

Pickensville, Ala. March 30 1874.

The outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius was miraculous; and was just like the miraculous pouring out of the Spirit upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost. Both events were wholly of a miraculous character. The manner in which the Spirit came upon them was miraculous. They all spake with tongues; that is, in different languages. But this outpouring of the Spirit in neither case had anything to do in saving, or pardoning the sins of these people. Those on the day of Pentecost were already disciples, when the Spirit came upon them, and the design of it was to guide the apostles into all truth, and bring to their remembrance all the Savior had said to them. And those at the house of Cornelius were not pardoned by the Spirit, for they were told that when Peter came, he would tell them words by which they were to be saved. And when Peter arrived, he told them, among other things, to be baptized, and

D. L.

they were at once; and since Jesus says, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," these people were saved when they believed and were baptized. This giving of the Spirit to the Gentiles, was a witness to them of their acceptance with God as a people, and to be a lasting testimony to the Jews, that the Gentiles also were accepted of God through the Gospel of Christ as well as themselves. But this miraculous outpouring of the Spirit had nothing to do in saving these people, and therefore no example by which we can be saved. And moreover, there is no evidence in the Bible that the Spirit was ever miraculously poured out upon any one, after the events at the house of Cornelius, as it was on that occasion. Both those events, the one at Jerusalem, and at the house of Cornelius, are called baptisms. But as the like miraculous events never occur now, we therefore now have no baptisms of the Holy Spirit. And now it is vain for any one to claim to be baptized in the Holy Spirit, unless He come as then, miraculously, and enables them to speak in other languages, which they have never learned, and enables them to perform miracles. Those who obey the gospel of Christ, have the promise of the Holy Spirit to dwell with them. But this promise of the Spirit to dwell in the church, in the Christian, is nothing like a baptism of the Spirit. Still there are thousands of people who are claiming with great confidence that they have been baptized with the Holy Ghost. Whenever they give the proof, we will believe them, but not till then.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: For the benefit of some of our friends in this community, I write you this note. I want you through the Advocate to give us some light on 1 John iii: 9, which says, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." John i: 8 says, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." This is a considerable difficulty with some, and you will please notice it and give us the true meaning of both passages.

J. P. W.

Granville, Tennessee.

The above passages have caused much difficulty in the minds of many. The passages seem at first view, to contradict. Yet it is evident they do not, for an inspired man as was John would not thus contradict himself in the same letter to the same people. And if we so interpret these passages as to make them contradict each other, we may know that we are mistaken in our interpretation: for no two passages of God's word are contradictory. In the passage in the first chapter, in which he says, "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," he certainly alludes to the frailties and imperfections of man, and that we, as frail, imperfect creatures, are liable to sin, to do wrong in the sight of God, and to fail to do what we ought to do, and that in such cases we are dependent upon God for forgiveness—that we cannot forgive ourselves—that we, as imperfect beings, cannot live so uprightly as to have no sins to be forgiven—that therefore we, if we say that we are so pure and holy as to have no sin at

all, deceive ourselves, and he says in another place, "we make God a liar, and his word is not in us." Christians therefore, the best they can do, will have frequent need of confessing their sins, and asking God to forgive them. Those who, while in the midst of life, and subject to the frailties and temptations of the flesh, profess sanctification, and claim that for months, and even years they have not committed a single sin, are either self-deceived, and no truth in them, or else they are downright hypocrites. We can therefore think but little of such claims of sanctification among frail mortals.

But when he says, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," he is contrasting the servant of God with the wicked man, who does not pretend to serve God, but walks in his own ways. The next verse says, "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." The man of the world, the wicked man, who disregards the authority of God and sets all his counsels at nought, lives continually in sin; constantly walks in darkness. But the servant of God is continually striving to honor the Lord, to do his will. He takes the word of God for his constant guide. He walks in the light, and makes it the constant effort of his life to know and to do the will of the Lord. The Savior refers to this same principle when he says, a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. The wicked man walks constantly in darkness, while the righteous man

walks constantly in the light. He walks by the word of God, and in that is light. The Psalmist says, "the entrance of thy word giveth light." To fully express the difference between the children of God and the children of the devil, between the righteous man and the wicked, requires strong language. Hence, when looking to that point he says, whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin. But when he is speaking of the weakness and imperfections of mortality, and our utter inability to save ourselves, and to guard us against looking to our righteousness and perfection, he lets us know that if we claim that we are so holy as to have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and his word is not in us. Hence the apparent contradiction in the two passages, consists in our applying both passages to the same thing, when the apostle had different things and principles before his mind. Make the proper distinctions, and all is plain enough.

E. G. S

Political Rights of Christians.

REPLY OF BRO. RAMSEY TO BRO. WALLING.

BRO. WALLING: *Dear Sir.* We have just finished reading your reply to ours of Jan. the 29th, and regret that we were unable to satisfy you in reference to our position on Rom. 13. We will review the subject again, and hope that we may be able to present it in such a manner that you may at least understand our position, whether you endorse it or not. We believe (as we stated in our last)

that God ordained the rulers of this world for the punishment of wickedness, and that they are his ministers to execute wrath upon earth, just as the devil is his minister to execute wrath on the finally impenitent in hell. You ask for the proof of this proposition, which we propose to give, and will base our first argument on your admission that Nero was one of the devil's missionaries. Now he and his officers under him are the very individuals and powers that Paul commanded the Roman Christians to submit to. For, says he, they are the ministers of God, avengers to execute wrath and for the praise of those who do well. Now Paul affirms this of the bloodiest and most bitter, persecuting government the world ever saw, or that the devil could desire. But you say you can't see how all this would result in the praise of those who do well. We would ask our Bro. if he cannot see how that hell itself is a promoter of virtue and is for the praise and honor of those who do well, as well as for the punishment of the evil-doer.

Our heavenly Father uses one wicked nation to punish another wicked nation, in turn to be punished and destroyed itself, until finally, one after another being destroyed, and the people of God having come out from among them (as directed just before the destruction of Jerusalem), they will all cease to exist and God's kingdom which alone is eternal, will be all in all and will stand forever. Now would not the destruction of wicked nations and wicked rulers result in the praise and honor of those who do well, by removing all such obstacles out of the

way of the peaceful reign of our Lord and master? In further proof of this proposition, we invite your attention to the condition of things just before the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Savior in foretelling its destruction, Luke xxi : 12, says, "before all these things they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogue and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake. Remember how Saul made havoc of the church, entering into every house—punishing the Christians in every synagogue, and persecuting them even unto strange cities. Peter and John were delivered to councils. Paul was brought before kings. Paul and Silas were not only imprisoned, but beaten. Stephen and James were put to death. The Savior was persecuted and his life sought almost from his birth, until his final crucifixion. So eager was Herod for his life that he even slew all the male children in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof from two years old and under, in order that he might be sure of his destruction. There is reason to believe that none of the apostles or original evangelists but John, died a natural death. Christians were counted as the filth of the world, being literally hated for the very name they bore. And all this evil came from the political governments and rulers of this world. Can you not see that the destruction of such might result in the good of those who do well? But Bro. W. charges us with making war on the political governments and rulers. In this you very much mistake our position. We say let them stand, and

submit to their existence and rule in their proper place; but save men from them, by bringing them into the kingdom of Christ. It will be necessary for God to tolerate the governments of this world, so long as any respectable number of people refuse to submit to the peaceful reign of his Son. We agree with you that the law is good, but only so for those for whom it was ordained,—evil doers. Law was not made for the righteous, but for the disobedient. Bro. W. insists that a bad law or a bad ruler for a time is no proof that the government belongs to Satan. Neither is a kind officer or a good law any proof that the government is our Lord's. It is only a circumstance indicating a peaceful state of society at the time of their existence, which is liable to be changed and converted to the most arbitrary forms at any time. If I had no stronger proof in favor of my position than an occasional bad ruler, I would certainly not labor so strenuously in its support. Yet an occasional kind ruler is all Bro. W. can produce in favor of his position. Bro. W. insists that a refusal on the part of a disciple to discharge the duties of an office would involve him in a violation of the law of God; for he requires all Christians to submit to the powers that be. Now show me that a Christian has the right to hold an office in a political government, and then I will agree with Bro. W. that he ought to discharge all the duties imposed by his office, even if President of the United States; and if it should become necessary for him as commander-in-chief of the armies of the country to call them to active service, and march them to the front and destroy a sufficient number of opposing forces to cause the balance to retire from our soil, I would say he certainly ought to do so. But you must show us that he has the right to hold the office before we can admit his right to engage in a work so bloody. Now Bro. W., to follow you in all your meandering, I find will require more space than the Advocate can consistently allow or its readers have patience to read. Therefore you must permit us to reply to your most important objections under one heading. And under this we propose to show you the inconsistency of your position, as a peace officer and a peace voter. Now if I understand you, you condemn war as incompatible with Christianity, yet you persist in voting, and holding office. In this you simply avail yourself of citizenship in Cæsar's government but refuse him service when he needs it most. There is no consistency in such a course. The man who votes or holds an office ought at all times to be ready to fortify his vote or office with a bullet and bayonet. An election to a civil office is worthless, if the strong arm of the militia is withheld. A defeated aspirant with a small band of adherents, having no compunctions against warfare, could hold his office against any number who would not fight. Civil governments without the sword are powerless, and elections a mere farce. Although the military power may not be called into active requisition, it is nevertheless the constant sanction of human laws, and fear of it alone compels the compliance of the

unruly. If I aid to elect a man to office, I am bound to aid him in the execution of it. If the people are sovereign, it becomes them to enforce their will. There is no escape from this position. Besides, he who votes for a President or a Governor of a State, votes for the Commander-in-chief of the army and navy or of the militia. They then as the agents of the voters command the military forces of the country and conduct all wars in which the country may become involved, for, and in the name of the sovereign people. If I elect a man to office, I constitute him my agent to perform the duties of the office. What I do by another, I do by myself. If war be a crime, he who by his vote sends men to the field is equally as guilty of the blood of his slaughtered fellow-men, as those who are personally engaged in the conflict. Now Bro. W., suppose you were President of the United States and Great Britain were to invade our soil, would you not be bound as commander-in-chief of the armies of the country to command your brethren to fall into ranks with musket and bayonet to kill our brethren on the other side, who had been forced to the front on that side, in obedience to a call from the powers that be? But perhaps your anti-war proclivities might compel you to resign, and then suppose all the balance were to do the same thing, for if I understand you, you propose to have all or as near all the offices filled with Christians as possible. Now, which horn of the dilemma would you take? Either would be bad enough. But suppose you take the latter. Then we could behold one of the grandest military promenades from the border to the capital the world ever saw. Now Bro. W., the difference between you and me in this matter is simply this: you make war the limit of your compliance to the powers that be, while I stop this side the ballot-box, thereby saving myself much trouble, anxiety and inconsistency. I am glad Bro. W. has at last been able to locate the line so that he and others may know just which side the Lord is on when a political contest comes up. He says all intelligent, thinking Christians know that he (the Lord) is not on the side of the dishonest man, or the one who treats for votes. I suppose he may vote for any other class confidently expecting the Lord to be on their side. Well, suppose we grant this for the sake of argument: Will not Bro. W. find it a little difficult in hunting through the muddy pool of politics to find this character, without exposing his garments to political filth—especially in this day and time? Bro. W. can't see how we can resist the devil, and submit to his subordinates. Your difficulty consists in a failure on your part to discriminate between a citizen and a subject. A citizen, as defined by Webster, is one vested with the rights of a freeman, while a subject is one under the power of another. A Christian is a subject of whatever government he may happen to live under, and is required to submit to the powers that be without regard to their character, so far as he can do so without violating the law of God. A citizen of any of them he cannot be, for his citizenship is in heaven. Bro. W. is very much surprised at our

expecting a blessing by submitting to the powers that be. Now if it is not the will of the Lord that we thus act before praying, please state what it is, as your parallel case falls short of the mark. For we are certainly commanded to submit, and this would at least be one step in the right direction, while those praying for the remission of sins while living in a state of rebellion have no authority in the Bible whatever. Bro. W. is at last forced to admit that the governments and people were Satan's, when the Savior came into the world; but that since then matters have changed, and they are no longer his, and offers as an argument in favor of his new position, that the governments have ceased to hang good men and only hang the bad ones.

Now Bro. W., when did this transfer take place? I don't think you can show it, for the simple reason the change only consists in a change of front on the part of the wicked one. You would have us believe that his hands and teeth are always dripping with human blood. If such were his character he would drive all decent people from him at once and make it an easy matter to destroy his influence. Paul says, 2nd Corinthians xi: 13, "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ; and no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no strange thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness." Does not our brother think that he did some rather clever deeds while he was playing the role of an

angel of light? Don't you think he was somewhat inclined to be religious? Don't you think his ministers when transformed as ministers of righteousness, would build houses of worship, and other beneficent institutions, organize a few benevolent societies, etc., provided their master the devil and his kingdom in which they rule can get the honor and glory, if it can be made respectable, and by this means he can retain in his service numbers of rather clever persons, who, if he did not encourage such deeds would leave his kingdom and become followers of Christ? On page 301, Bro. W. seems to rally for a time, and makes a kind of spasmodic effort and proposes to be more pointed, but unfortunately for his cause his compass points with more unerring precision to the deformities of reasoning than anything previously said by him; and strange to say, in this article in which he proposes to show that Christians have the right to enter these human governments, as active participants, he does not, in seven pages of closely printed matter, bring forth a single passage of Scripture as a warrant for this right. This is suggestive. But like others, engaged in a weak cause, where the Scripture fails to supply him, he seeks supply in his powers of ridicule, and triumphantly asks if Peter did not actively participate when he went a-fishing. Bro. W., is not the expression (went a-fishing) rather irreverent, and light, for a grave subject? Peter only did what we have been contending for all the time in this discussion, and that was to submit to the demand made upon him by Caesar's government.

Bro. W. finds trouble in doing all things in the name of the Lord. We stated in our last that Christians should do all things in the name of the Lord, that is by his authority, or if you prefer let him do just as the Lord would do under the same circumstances if he were here upon earth. For example, if you employ an agent in business, you first expect of him as a faithful agent doing business in your name, to do as you direct. And if in case no specific directions are given, you expect him to exercise his best judgment, basing the same on what he knows of your character. If he knows you to be an honest, upright man, he will do nothing in your name calculated to detract anything from it. Now I contend that in this way we can do all things in the name of the Lord. Suppose I desire to do all things in the name of the Lord, and at the same time have a desire to advance my pecuniary interest by making or vending spirituous liquors. It is nowhere said in so many words that I shall not engage in it. Now how am I to determine this matter? Simply by acquainting myself thoroughly with the life and teachings of the Savior, and then ask myself the question, Would the Lord, if he were here engage in such an abominable practice, that brings with it such a multiplicity of evils? I don't think any sane man after thus posting himself, could be at a loss in determining how he should act in his name in a matter of this kind. As to the sale of the horse—If I practiced no fraud, made no false impressions, accepted only a fair price and no more, then from my knowledge of the teaching of the

Savior, I feel warranted in saying I did it in his name. Now Bro. W., if there is anything wrong in the command (do all things in the name of the Lord) or if it is one of that class of non-essentials show it and I will accept it. You ask me why I refused to serve on the jury, when the Bible enjoins submission to the powers that be. I did it for the same reason that you refuse to go into the army. The law of God forbids it. You make war the limit of your obedience, while I in this case, made the Jury box the limit of my obedience. But the strangest thing of all is, you say that Paul did not cease to be a Roman or a Jew when he became a Christian. Now if this is not union of church and State with Jewish and Christian identity, I must confess I do not know what it takes to constitute either. This must have been penned in great haste. Believing such to be the case we will avoid much criticism. The Savior has positively said the law and the prophets were in authority or were public instructors, your teachers, until John came. Since that time, the kingdom of God is preached, and all men press into it. Luke xvi: 16.

What language could be more clearly expressive of the cessation or withdrawal of one class of teachers and the introduction of a new institution. The law and the prophets were the Old Testament, but now a new institution into which out of some other one, all the conscientious press. It would be impossible to conceive one so learned as Paul, and so discriminating would not have seen that Christianity was only reformed Judaism, if that were its real charac-

ter. Bro. W. says Paul appealed to Cæsar, in order to escape the fury of the Jews. True he did, but did he ever exercise the rights of citizenship? Did he ever participate in the affairs of Roman government? These were merely the protections that the Roman Empire had thrown around her subjects. The only legitimate deduction to be drawn from the conduct of the apostle is that when Christians in the performance of their duties become obnoxious to the civil authorities, it is their privilege to avail themselves of all the security provided for them by the civil law. Thus does God often open up a door of escape for his people. Paul was a Roman subject, and as such was entitled to the protection provided by the Roman government for all her subjects,

Bro. W. asks how the transfer of the kingdoms of the world was made to Satan, if original sovereignty belonged to God. Evidently by man transferring his allegiance from God to Satan by ceasing to obey God, and following Satan. Christ recognized the claims of the tempter to the kingdoms of this world. He acknowledged by his action at the time by his response to the wicked one through his inspired apostles, Matthew, Luke and Paul, that the offer of the kingdoms of this world by the wicked one was a temptation. The apostle says he suffered, being tempted. This could only have been true on the supposition that they were actually the possession of the devil. The world had been delivered him by man, to whose control God had committed it. Christ came into the world to rescue it from the dominion or possession of the wicked one, and proposes to do this

not by entering into and controlling these kingdoms, that had been established under the rule and in the interest of the wicked one, but by destroying and consuming these and establishing a kingdom not made with hands—one whose founder and builder is God. We now feel that we have replied to all your objections, though in rather a hasty manner from a want of space. We propose before closing, to give you some items of proof from history. The historian Gibbon says, of the Christians of the first three centuries, "Their simplicity was offended by the use of oaths, by the pomp of magistracy, by the active contention of public life. Nor could their humane ignorance be convinced that it was lawful on any occasion to shed the blood of our fellow-creatures, either by the sword of justice, or by that of war." Vol. 1st, page 550. "But while Christians inculcated the maxims of passive obedience, they refused to take any active part in the civil administration, or the military defense of the empire. It was impossible that the Christians without renouncing a mere sacred duty, could assume the Character of soldiers, of magistrates or of Princes." Vol. 1st page 552. The great historian Mosheim says: "Prior to the age of Luther, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, very many persons in whose minds was deeply deeply rooted that principle which the Waldenses, the Wickliffites and the Hussites maintained some, more covertly, others more openly; namely, that the kingdom set up upon

earth, or the visible church, is an assembly of holy persons, and ought therefore to be entirely free not only from ungodly persons, and sinners, but from all institutions of human device against ungodliness." Vol. 3 page 208.

Thus the Waldenses the Wickliffites the Hussites the Mennonites as they were called, all opposed the connection of Christians with institutions of human device against ungodliness. The regular anabaptists refused to admit Magistrates into the church. Vol. 3 page 208. We might go on with quotations from history of this character until we would exhaust your patience, but for the present we will let these suffice, and will close our communication, and with it possibly close the correspondence on our part. We expect you to reply as you have the right to close the discussion. We then hope the readers of the *ADVOCATE* will take due notice of all that has been said and govern themselves accordingly. Now Bro. W. if there is any thing in this that seems to be the least personal, permit me to say that nothing of the kind was intended. For we have the most profound respect for your great piety and devotion. I feel proud to bear the most cheerful testimony to your pure and spotless Christian character. It is only your teaching as embodied in your article to which I have replied. And I must state before closing that my first conviction after reading your article was that you aimed more to elicit truth than to defend a cause.

So I remain your affectionate bro. and friend

S. MC. RAMSEY.

Church News.

Bros. L & S.: I preached for the church at Cairo, Ill., 3rd and 4th Lord's days of March. Had twelve additions there, five by confession and baptism, seven by letter. The church bids fair to prosper there now. Fifteen souls have been added since I commenced to labor for them. I went from there to Charleston, Mo. Spent 5th Lord's day, one added there. Charleston presents a fine field for labor.

I held a meeting at Milburn last Saturday and Lord's day at which three were added to the church, two by confession and baptism and one by letter. The cause of truth is prospering here wherever the word is faithfully proclaimed.

Yours in love,

R. B. TRIMBLE.

Mayfield, Ky., April 9, 1874.

How to Send Money.

Our losses this year through the mails have been heavy. And it is beginning to be very oppressive upon us. There is a leakage somewhere in the mail routes, such as has not been before since we have been connected with the *ADVOCATE*. And if it continues so, it will be difficult for us to go on with the paper. We therefore again insist that all who send money will register, or send by Postal order, Bank draft or express. It costs but eight cents now to register a letter, and but a trifle to send money Orders, and we do hope that wherever any of these advantages can be had, our

brethren and friends will avail themselves of them.

E. G. S.

The Bible Proves Itself.

Suppose I have never seen or heard of a sewing machine. I have no idea of its parts, of its construction, or of its use. But after a time—no matter how—I come into possession of one. It is not set up however or even put together. I have the wheels and bands, and arms, and the cloth-plate, and the shuttle, and the needles and the treadle. But not being a machinist, I do not know how to put the parts together, so I put them away. By-and-by there comes to me through the mail a pamphlet. The post mark is dim, and I cannot make it out. It has no name on it either of author or sender. I look it curiously through, and find it full of cuts and explanatory letter press, and as I turn over the leaves I am struck by the resemblance of some of the plates to some parts of the almost forgotten and useless machine. I look more closely, and find that it is a guide for the setting up and running of what it calls a sewing-machine. I compare the pieces and the book, and following its instructions I find it all goes accurately together. I thread the needle, and taking a piece of cloth I find it works precisely as the book said it would.

Now, I care not where the machine came from or where the book came from. I may not know who wrote the book, or even so much as that the inventor of the machine ever heard of him or his writing. But I

know that the idea of him who made the machine, and the idea of him who made the book are identical. In that wherein it pretends to be a guide—that is, in putting together and running the machine—it is an accurate guide-book, and being true for the ends for which it was made, it is for such ends an absolute authority.

No conceivable thing could add to this authority. If it could be proved that the inventor of the machine wrote the book with his own hands, and that it was free from mistake, throughout, even to the grammar, and punctuation, it would not add to its authority one iota. It works. It stands trial. It does what it claims to do.

Now, suppose somebody should go to picking flaws in its grammar, or spelling, or chronological calculations, or obscurities of style, or because a stray leaf of an old almanac had got bound up in it. Suppose for such reasons, he should counsel throwing it away, and trusting to luck to get the machine together. Would you not call him a fool?

Come back, now, to the Book and the world, and see if you have not for Christianity an argument equally simple. Here is a disordered humanity. We have only the separate and unjoined parts. They do not work together. Here also is a Book. It pictures the present condition of humanity. It tells how to put the parts together and make it complete. Try it by this test. On its principle—the principle of love—you can build up a perfect man, a perfect family, a perfect society.

This one fact proves conclusively that the essential idea that is embod-

ied in humanity, and the essential idea of the book, are the same. In that wherein it pretends to be a guide, that is putting together and building up humanity, it is an accurate guide-book; and being thus true for the ends for which it was made, it is for such ends an absolute authority.

MINOT J. SAVAGE.

—Selected.

“I Must Have a Religious Newspaper.”

So says a subscriber of the “Congregationalist.” And he gives the following reasons:—

1. Because such a paper, rightly conducted is a public institution of great value, exerting a happy influence upon all the varied important interests of society, and I am bound to do my part in sustaining such an institution.

2. Because my own religious growth as a Christian is materially promoted by such a paper. My religion waxes or wanes in life and power in proportion to the clear or dim views I have of the great things of the kingdom of God. Next to my Bible, my paper increases the clearness and extent of my spiritual vision, giving light and expelling darkness by its never-ceasing supply of facts and appeals, which are sunshine and shower to the spiritual verdure of my soul.

3. Because I want a good commentary on the Bible. My religious paper furnishes it, often by direct expositions, by items of religious biography, strikingly illustrative of Bible truth, by constantly recurring events of divine providence equally illustrative, by narratives of revivals,

conversions, progress of missions at home and abroad, all showing the power of the Gospel, and and explanatory of God’s word.

4. Because I want to be a strong man, armed for defending truth and destroying error. Political partizans about me are familiar with all the facts and arguments which sustain their distinctive views, and are ever ready and able to assault or defend.

I want a similar kind of ability and facility, in sustaining the truth and in advancing the cause of my Master. My religious paper furnishes me with a power of offense and defense which is invaluable. It is as if a new arsenal of spiritual weapons was opened and offered to me every week.

5. My family needs to have just such a fountain of religious instruction as is opened in it every week, by such a periodical. The variety I find meets the cases and wants of old and young, male and female, ministering to the welfare of the entire circle.

6. My neighbor needs my paper. He will not take one for himself, as he ought to. But he shall not escape. He shall have a look at mine. For when it has walked into my dwelling and stayed long enough to scatter blessings on all sides, it walks up street or down street, or over the way to scatter them further, or takes wings, by the mail, and does good a thousand miles away.

Therefore, Mr. Editor, if you find a paper of mine returned with the word ‘stop’ upon it, you may infer that I have gone to the poor-house or the mad-house, or to the narrow house appointed for all the living.—

The Christian.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

"What is it all, When all is Done?"

"The sun goes up : and the sun goes down,
And a thousand years are the same as one;
The leaves grow green and the leaves grow
brown,
And what is it all, when all is done?"

Aye, what is it all, if this life be all,
But a draught to its dregs of a cup of gall,
A bitter round of rayless years,
A saddening dole of wormwood tear,
A sorrowful plaint of the spirit's thrall.
The grave, the shroud, the funeral pall—
This is its sum; if this life be all.

But it is not all—beyond this shore,
A sun goes up to go down no more,
The leaves that grow green are green for aye
And the flowers that bloom, know not decay.
A thousand years are indeed as one,
But of bitterness thap, the soul hath none,
And this is it all, when all is done.

LITTLE FOXES.

Some years ago I read a book for grown people called "Little Foxes," which I don't suppose many of you ever read. But I think children as well as grown people have a great deal to do with these same troublesome little animals that "spoil the vines," and I mean to show you as the little book showed to me, what some of them are called, and what is some of the mischief they do. Then whenever you come across them, you will know them at once and can set as many traps for them as you please.

I suppose of course you have all seen foxes, and have heard people tell about the naughty things they do. But if you had never heard these stories of plundered chicken-roosts, you would think, to look in

their faces, that they were the meekest, gentlest, most kind-hearted little creatures in the world.

I have no doubt you have heard of the little fox who fancied the grapes must be sour because they were too high for him to reach, but did you read in the Bible of foxes who really reached the grapes, and spoiled them too?

There is a verse in the "Song of Solomon" which reads this way: "Take us the foxes, the little foxes that spoil the vines, for our vines have tender grapes." Now of course you think that Solomon meant real living "little foxes," and real growing "tender grapes," do you not? Perhaps he did, but I think underneath this meaning—as the book showed me—he had a deeper and better one. And little children, as well as children who are older, have a deal to do with these same little foxes who "spoil the vines," and eat up the "tender grapes."

Did you ever see a little boy very intent on some wonderful story book, quite hidden away perhaps in an easy chair with his feet on the fender, and no eyes or ears for anything but the story!

His mother says, "Johnnie, won't you run around to the store and get me a spool of thread?"

Johnnie heaves a long sigh, and keeps right on with his reading.

"Johnnie, my son, did you hear?"

"Oh! ma," says Johnnie, "can't you make *that* thread do? I'm so tired, and 'Thomas' is just being shipwrecked."

Mother sighs, and wonders why Johnnie can't be more obliging; and unless she speaks again in two minutes he has forgotten all about it.

Do you see how the little fox, "Unwillingness," is spoiling all Johnnie's "tender grapes" of obedience and love?

If he had put his book by, risen in the midst of that wonderful shipwreck, long enough to do that little deed of kindness for his mother, how much more he would have enjoyed the story, and his warm corner when he came back to them; and how much more comfort his mother would have had in her boy. I think you little ones understand, how we, who are older, feel our hearts warming toward you with love and admiration, when we hear you say to one and another: "Oh! let me do that for you," or "What is it you wanted? I'll run up stairs for it at once."

This is a very small fox, you think, but oh! how he grows and thrives upon grapes!

Then there's a little fox "Wait-a-while." Do you think you have ever heard of him before? He gets at a good many vines, and spoils more tender grapes than you would suppose. He is such a well looking little fox in the face, with very innocent eyes, and seems to mean no manner of harm. But all the time he is enfeebling our wills, over turning our good resolutions, and working great deal of harm. This harmless-looking fox is very greedy indeed.

"Jenny, you must put away your hat and sacque says grandma, "don't leave them lying about, my dear.

Jenny has just come home from school and is busy cutting a dress for her doll—very busy, indeed.

"Yes, grandma," she answers, "I

am going to put them away in a minute."

The minute passes, and the half hour too, very likely—the dress is cut and almost fashioned.

"Jenny," says Grandma, coming into the room again, "your things are lying there still."

"Oh! I forgot, grandma; just wait till I put in these last few stitches."

And after a while grandma, who is a little too indulgent, quietly carries off the hat and sacque and hangs them up herself.

"Jenny," says mother, coming in presently from a sewing-meeting, "are your lessons learned, my little girl!"

"Oh! ma, I'm going to learn them after supper; its a good deal nicer."

Mother says nothing, having weightier cares on her mind, and after supper tired little Jenny falls asleep on the sofa, is sent up early to bed. She comforts herself with the thought that she will get up early in the morning, and have plenty of time for study before breakfast which she thinks is really the best plan, for one feels so much fresher in the morning. But alas! mother calls a great many times, and the breakfast bell rings before this sleepy little girl can summon resolution to jump out of bed, and hurry on her clothes. Then with no word of prayer to help her on through the day, she goes down to a cold breakfast, and begs to have an excuse for the history lesson which the little fox "Wait-a-while" has kept her from learning.

This is a very mischievous little fox, for beginning with a few grapes he climbs up to the large and beau-

tiful bunches, and if he is not caught will likely be the cause of very great sorrow and ruin.

There is a little fox blacker than either of these, a very bad looking, dangerous little fox called "Ill temper." There is one strange and alarming thing about him, which is this: he never keeps little very long, but grows and grows like Jack's wonderful bean stalk, until he is no longer a *little* fox, but goes about like a great wild beast, preying on far choicer things than grapes.

At first, however, he is a little fellow, and he rather charms and amuses us sometimes. Take the very baby brother who only creeps about on the floor and laughs at you; who gets into all manner of mischief; who would put his hand into the fire if he could reach it, and tips over mama's work-basket a dozen times a day. You see him put up his pretty lips, and strike out with his fat little hand at "sister," because she won't let him help himself to a bowl of sugar; and don't you laugh and think it is the funniest sight in the world? Such a wee, dainty fox as this can never do any harm!

But wait till he has grown a little. Then some day, while you sit in the corner reading, you may hear the same little brother say to one of his school-mates:

"Bob Jones, you've taken my new top, I left it just here on the table."

"Hum," says Bob, "I haven't any such thing; think I want your old top-penny totum, Johnnie White!"

Johnnie flashes like a full-blown poppy.

"Guess I know where I left my own top, and you'd best own up."

And Bob answers back, and Johnnie gets very angry, and gives him a blow in the face perhaps; and if you, like a good sister, don't stop them at once, no one knows where it would all end.

So you see how the little fox has grown in a few years, and how it may grow in years to come, unless Johnnie looks for God's grace to strangle it.

There are a great many other little foxes; for I have only told you of three, and if we began to count them on our fingers, perhaps we should hardly know where to stop. Can any of you tell me how to catch and kill them? Of course, the very best time is to begin at once, and strangle them while they are little, before they have grown so great and fierce as to master us entirely. But we cannot kill them of ourselves. Asking the Lord to help us, we must pray and *watch*. If your little fox shows the least tip of his nose, put out all your strength to push him down, or else he will spoil the tender grapes that are growing in your hearts.—*N. Y. Observer.*

Death of Geo. S. Morton.

Died April 6, 1874, Geo. S. Morton, at his residence in Nashville, Tenn. He had been feeble for some months past, but was stricken with Paralysis about one month before his death, from the effects of which he never rallied. He has been for a good while, a book-binder in Nashville, and has done all the folding, stitching and trimming of the *ADVOCATE*, and in fact all our binding for many years. He came as near

being a model of honesty, as any man we have ever known. His word to those that knew him, was all they wanted,—perfectly prompt and reliable always in paying or performing whatever he promised. He was born in Manchester, England, but had spent most of his life in the United States, faithfully following his trade all the while. He was about 66 years of age when he died. He had been a strict member of the Methodist Church for a number of years before his death. We deeply sympathize with his bereaved wife and children.

E. G. S.

HABITS GOOD AND BAD.

There are a few habits which form a pretty good foundation for success in life and insure the friendship of the discerning and virtuous. First among these we would place the habit of self-help. This may and should be formed in a child before it can walk or talk, by providing resources for its amusement, and leaving it, within due bounds to depend upon those resources. Then as it grows older it should be taught and gently compelled to perform in its own behalf all that it can do. Few of us but know young men and women perfectly helpless for all ordinary uses of life. If they alone were the sufferers it wouldn't matter much, but they are social leeches, always demanding service and never rendering it. Good husbands, good wives, good parents, rarely, if ever, are found in this class of people. Next in importance to the habit of self-help we would place that of personal

tidiness. We do not care to guess how many American men and women sit down to breakfast every morning with their toilets half made, the men without collar or cravat, and the women with unkempt hair, and the children resembling the parents in dress as in feature. "But you see there are so many things to do in the morning—stock to feed, cows to milk, fires to make, milk to skim, children to dress, breakfast to get—that one can't spend much time fixing themselves up." All very true; but one doesn't go round barefooted in the morning, or without washing face and hands, because a habit the reverse of all that has been formed. "My hair is combed in the morning for all day before I leave my chamber," said an elegant housekeeper the other day, and she keeps no girl. That "cleanliness is next to godliness," should be early and deeply impressed on every child and it should be taught to shrink from uncleanness and untidiness as it shrinks from from vice.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

New Advertisement.

The reader will notice in this number a new advertisement from Bosworth, Chase & Hall, of the life of Bro. Walter Scott. Doubtless many will want the book when it comes out. E. G. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Repentance, what is it?.....	361
The law of sin and death.....	364
Queries.....	367
Political rights of Christians.....	371
Church News.....	378
How to send money.....	378
The Bible proves itself.....	379
"I must have a Religious Newspaper.....	380
The Fireside.	
'What is it all, when all is done.....	381
Little Foxes.....	381
Death of Geo. S. Morton.....	383
Habits good and bad.....	384

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 17.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, APRIL 23, 1874.

Laying on of Hands.

In a very able article by bro. Lipscomb on "Officers," we find the following; "We have grave doubts if hands were ever formally imposed save for imparting spiritual gifts." The Advocate has kept up a wholesome balance of power on the subject of officers; but I am unable to see why grave doubts should arise upon the setting apart of public servants by the laying on of hands.

When the Grecian widows were neglected in the daily ministration at Jerusalem, the twelve said, "Look you out among you seven men of good repute, full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom, whom we will appoint over this business." When they were chosen and set before the apostles, "having prayed, they laid their hands on them. Did the apostles impose hands in this case to impart Spiritual gifts? There is no account of six of these deacons doing any wonders; so the question is narrowed down to Stephen alone. Stephen after being set apart did great signs and wonders but he was full of the Holy Spirit,

before he was set apart by the imposition of hands. How then can we attribute the Spiritual gifts to this ceremony?

The church at Antioch set apart Barnabas and Saul—"having fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Barnabas and Saul soon began to work miracles, especially Paul, whereas we have no account of their doing so before. One might conclude therefore, that the laying on of hands conferred spiritual gifts. But these were called "prophets" before their ordination, and the apostle alluding to "gifts of healing," the "working of miracles," "prophecy" etc., says, "all these work the one and self-same Spirit." Then Barnabas and Paul, being prophets, had spiritual gifts before the laying on of hands. Moreover, Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles, and did he not receive his power direct from the Savior as did the others? Only those that received power from Christ directly could transmit it to others, and Paul did this in the case of Timothy.

Paul says to Timothy, "Neglect

not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee through prophecy, with the laying on of the *hands of the eldership*. It is admitted that in this case a gift was conferred, and that too by laying on of hands; for Paul says in another place, "Stir up the gift which is in thee by laying on of my hands." But the gift was conferred by laying on of Paul's hands, and not by the laying on of the hands of the eldership. These were laid on at the same time for another purpose.

If I am not mistaken I feel assured that Bro. L. can give me light on these passages. But if hands were imposed upon public servants in primitive times, for other purposes than to impart spiritual gifts why not now? If the grave responsibilities resting on the ministry of God were realized, these solemn ceremonies, methinks, would appear more appropriate than under the present circumstances. They would be appropriate as the crowning of kings or inauguration of presidents. If some then have to give an account of the souls of men, their setting apart should be solemn.

C. M. W.

We might be content to publish our brother's articles without a word of comment as presenting all the ground for our grave doubts we can give. But we will call attention to a few points. Our brother assumes as true, "Only those who received power directly from Christ can transmit it to others." I am aware that Alexander Campbell announced this as true and from him it has been generally accepted by our brethren. Other evi-

dence of it I have never seen. We would like some other before we can make it the basis of a theory involving the interpretation of so many passages of Scripture. We have never been able to see why the apostles could be said to receive the Holy Spirit direct from Christ any more than those of the household of Cornelius or even of Samaria or Ephesus. At the house of Cornelius the Holy Spirit fell on them as on the apostles at the beginning, "we suppose he fell from the same place, and was sent by the same power. Christ promised to send the Holy Spirit to the apostles, so he did to others. We do not suppose the magic of the apostolic touch imparted the Holy Spirit, as an electrical current. Paul did not receive the spirit when he saw Christ in person. The seeing Christ seems to have been necessary to the apostleship to which he was called, but the giving of the Spirit did not take place then. Ananias came to him and put his hands upon him that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. Paul certainly received the Spirit as much through the instrumentality of Ananias as the Samaritans did through Peter and John. Paul was in turn the instrument through whom Timothy received it by the laying on of his hands and of the eldership. We think the theory stands sadly in need of substitution.

But as to the cases on whom hands were laid, we now remember only, the seven, the Samaritans, Paul at Damascus, Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, the Ephesians and Timothy. Now there are no other clearly defined cases of imposition of hands in

the New Testament. Of these every one but two specifically state it was that the Holy Spirit might be received. The other two, the case of the seven appointed to see that the Grecian widows were cared for as recorded in Acts 6, and the laying of hands on Paul and Barnabas at Antioch we will examine.

The seven were full of the Holy Ghost. Our brother does not believe being full of the Holy Ghost and possessing the gifts of the Spirit are the same. Nothing is said of any of the seven possessing the gifts of the Spirit before hands were laid upon them. The only one of them certainly mentioned and whose history is given, afterwards assesses these gifts. Philip supposed to be another is in direct communication with the Spirit, under his inspiring guidance. Certainly this would indicate the possibility if not strong probability that they were gifted by the Spirit to enable them to do their work properly. And that the laying on of hands had something to do with the reception of this power especially this thought it seems to me would commend itself to those who believe the apostolic hands especially and only could impart this power or these gifts of the Spirit.

The other case is that of Paul and Barnabas. It is true that Paul had received the Holy Spirit when Ananias laid hands on him. The Spirit was given by measure to all save Christ. Some had a larger measure of the Spirit than others. There was a difference in the gifts. The measure of the Spirit doubtless differed at different periods with the same individuals. Paul—before the imposi-

tion of hands was now numbered among the prophets (teachers.) In the convention of teachers or prophets, he was last named. It was previous to this time, Barnabas and Saul. In the New Testament the least esteemed is last mentioned. The enumeration of apostles begins with Peter, and ends with Judas who betrayed him. No mention previous to this time is made of Paul's working a miracle.

He never was recognized as the apostle to the Gentiles before this; The Holy Spirit now specifically directed him to the work for which Christ had called him. He was Saul previously, now he is Paul. His full apostolic mission begins here, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

This unesteemed and retiring Saul who stands last in the teachers enumerated, has hands laid upon him. He immediately works miracles, steps to the front, is recognized as an apostle. It is no longer Barnabas and Saul but now Paul and Barnabas. He taking precedence in labor, in suffering, in dangers, and in responsibilities from the Lord, above all others. I cannot resist the conviction that in the imposition of hands here, he received a fuller or larger measure of the gifts of the Spirit, by which he was qualified for the apostolic work among the Gentiles which Christ called him. These at least are possibilities and I think strong probabilities. This latter case seems to me a certainty. If so, taken in connection with the clear cases of impartation of the Spirit in every other case of imposition of hands, it at least affords ground for grave

doubts, whether it was not imparted also in these two instances. If in these, then in all cases recorded in the New Testament.

We are free to state that our judgment has oscillated between this idea and the idea that after the customs of the Eastern Countries with their demonstrativeness, every time an individual went forth from the Church to work, the hands of the elders were laid upon him and prayer made for him, as a tender and affectionate way of bidding him God-speed, and asking God's blessing upon him. As to the idea of solemn consecration to life-long offices of honor or power, I have been able to find nothing in the New Testament.

Our brother talks about the responsibilities resting on the ministry of God, as though the ministry was some distinct class of beings. Will he tell us who are God's ministers? who constitute his ministry? Every class of servants of God from the Savior of the world, down to the humblest woman that washed a disciple's feet or gave a cup of water in his name, and even the inanimate winds which are used to do his will, are called his ministers. A minister is a servant. Every servant of God, the humblest who in his name gives a piece of bread to the hungry—or a cup of cold water to the thirsty, speaks a comforting word to the distressed and sorrowing heart, is as much a minister of God, as the most exalted and effective preacher in the world. He is so recognized in the Bible, is just as highly esteemed of God, if he but does his part well. Each will be held to account too for the souls of men according to his ability. None will

escape, from the least to the greatest. This responsibility cannot be shifted to the shoulders of a select few. Some will be held to an accountability above others only inasmuch as their capacities are superior, their opportunities better. But each stands alike responsible before God for the souls of men. And "all are to have the same care one for another."

We protest against the least squinting toward a clerical body, distinct from others with greater responsibilities or higher privileges, in a manner that does not rest on every child of God. This idea is the hurtful idea that is now drying up the activities, dwarfing the life, and destroying the work of God among the churches of Christ on earth. Throw the whole responsibility with all the privileges of labor on one class of individuals and you are relieving from a sense of responsibility all others.

God's church is God's ministry on earth. his royal nation and Holy priesthood.

He is prominently favored of God and will be most highly exalted, who serves most humbly and faithfully, according to his ability, however lowly the service, and however despised of man the calling.

D. L.

OUR MONEY.

(The following article, which was printed some years ago in one of the papers of our brethren, we insert in the *ADVOCATE*, at the request of a good sister. E. G. S.)

"The love of money" is the nucleus around which cluster an infinite

number of sins that clog the souls of Christians and hinder the development of that high standard of spirituality that should characterize the church. If the disciples could be persuaded to give of their ability as "God has prospered them" to the furtherance of the gospel, it requires but little faith to see down the stream of time that the glory of the Lord would shortly cover the whole earth. Its radiance would crown the mountains with a blessed effulgence that would shimmer down their rugged sides and fill the valleys with its loveliness. From the hill-tops would echo the voice of praise as it ascended from the plains. The myriads that ride upon the bosom of the "great deep" would join the chorus and swell the glad anthem that would arise from hearts purified from sin and filled with the love of God. No longer would gaunt hunger menace the poor, nor poverty fasten its cruel grasp upon the helpless orphans, and blight their young lives, stifle their hearts' best, truest impulses, and wreck their souls, because miserly Christians clutch their purses with a grip that—were they capable—would make them groan with anguish, not only from pain but from a sense of the immense good they are restrained from doing in the name of the Lord. In the hands of the disciples is a fund sufficient, if used with hearts single to the glory of God, to entirely revolutionize the spiritual condition of the churches of this whole country, and as the "stone cut out of the mountain without hands" gathered strength, from this land would go forth the glad tidings of salvation to the ends of the earth, and the glo-

rious, long-desired, ardently prayed-for coming of our Lord would be hastened.

When we think of the noble purposes to which money may be put, and the almost miraculous results that it might accomplish, we are amazed that Christians allow it to carnalize them and bind them in degrading bondage to the world. Thousands of disciples whose coffers are filled with gold, whose broad fields yield their produce ungrudgingly, and whose families are "clothed in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day," if asked to give "a mite" to the service of him they profess to love, will tell that with their large families to support, the failure of a certain crop, the death of a favorite horse, or some other such vain excuse, *they are not able to give anything*. My soul! Has age dimmed the eye that detected the lie in Ananias and Sapphira, or palsied the arm that sealed with death their impious lips? Have we the right to hoard money while a soul is unconverted, a widow or orphan uncared for, or God's poor children suffering anywhere?

What says our Savior will be the standard by which will be determined our eternal destinies? "I was hungry, and ye fed me; thirsty, and ye gave me drink. I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me. I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me." "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the *least* of these my brethren, ye did it unto me," is the sentence that shall usher the saint into joy for evermore, while the *not doing* these things will consign the

wicked to the lake "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

The story of the Cross is no idle tale of the jester, no fanciful dream of the poet. It is a grand and glorious reality, the only reality within human ken, and is worthy of the best, noblest offerings man can make. To work is the great heritage of man since the fall—to work to recover his lost estate, to work for great and noble purposes, to work for Christ. But to work to heap together treasures upon earth, never entered the mind of the Spirit when it said, "Be diligent in business." Neither when it said, "He that provides not for his own house has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel," did it mean that the Christian should expend his entire energies for the aggrandizement of his household according to the flesh. Has the household of faith no claims upon him? Is his mission here to be a recipient of the manifold blessings of heaven, and he yield no evidence of the gratitude that should fill his soul with a benevolence and charity co-extensive with the human family?

There are entire churches whose membership hold untold thousands of dollars, and yet they are almost pulseless—a shame to their sister churches and a stumbling-stone to the world. And why? Because the insatiate monster, Covetousness, has been enthroned in their midst. It is a wonder that their lip-prayer, "May thy kingdom extend and thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven," does not call down the maledictions of the Lord upon them.

What says the Lord? After enu-

merating the things needful for the flesh, he says, "Seek *first* the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." The lives of church members being the *criteria* for judging, there is not one Christian in ten who believes it, though it is a bond entered into by the Omnipotent to provide for his faithful children. What will it avail the Christian parent to amass the wealth of a Rothschild for his children, and thus foster pride, selfishness, licentiousness, profligacy and the host of sins that follow wealth? There is a better inheritance that may be left them—a "pattern of good works," which should be the legacy of every follower of Christ, not only to his children, but to the world. Every dollar selfishly hoarded by the Christian but adds to the weight of the money-bags that it is to be feared will drag countless souls from the church and sink them down in "outer darkness." It is in vain that the poorly-paid preacher wears himself out in pleading with sinners to take up the cross and follow Christ while the church pursues the pleasures of the world as eagerly as they. Example is always a most potent argument to the world that the Christian believes what he professes. Is it right that the cross bears most heavily upon the shoulders of the ministers? Do they *alone* need to "work out their salvation? No. To every one who espouses the name of Christ is given the command, "Go work in my vineyard," and woe is to him who presumes to wear the sacred name and fails, according to his *full* ability, to work. All have not the "gift of tongues," but those who have

“an impediment in their speech” may hold up the hands of the proclaimer of glad tidings, by doing *all* things that are commanded them. When we have done all we *can* do we can not attain to the purity lost by our first parents, and “*grace* shall lead us home.” The possibility of gaining heaven is a boon too priceless to risk for any consideration, and we can not do *too much* for “him that loved us and gave himself for us.” It is an inestimable privilege that he allows us to bring him an offering of the fruits of our labor—one we may not so lightly esteem as to selfishly use that which may aid in bringing a sinful race to the Cross of its Redeemer.

TABITHA.

Life Insurance.

Sister M. M. Roberts, near Columbia asks, ‘Is it right for Christians to insure their lives; a life insurance agent says the members of the church of Christ were the last of the religious bodies to engage in it, but leading persons among them are now taking large policies on their lives. Is this so?’

There is no doubt that numbers of the leading men of all the Churches in the land have insured their lives, our brethren among the rest. There are some things that we cannot judge of as in themselves positively right or wrong. We judge of them only by their tendencies, influences and associations. These are often slow of development. Insurance is of this character. We have always believed that the tendency of insurance on a community was evil.

Insurance at best is a species of

chance. Those who invest have a feeling that it is lottery. But it is worse than this. The insurance companies are organised with the deliberate calculation that from “at least two thirds of those who take risks they expect to get something for nothing. If all who insure their lives would keep up their policy until death or the expiration of the policy no insurance company in the land could fail of bankruptcy.

The agents work upon the feelings, excite by falsely-colored statements, the imagination of the excitable and credulous, arouse anticipations that cannot be realized, and get the credulous and impulsive to insure, with the calculation upon the part of the company that after the payment of a few installments the mass of them will either forfeit entirely or partially the policy, or cease to pay, so as to let the benefits accrue to the company. This taking advantage of the credulity, weakness, ignorance, excitability, or unstability of the human family is wrong.

We have talked with many agents, have found none that would give a fair, candid and truthful representation of the working of the institutions when soliciting policies. This is a hard saying, considering so many preachers are agents, but we deliberately state it, as our judgment and say that preachers can no more withstand temptation to do wrong than other individuals. “Lead us not into temptation” is their safety as well as others.

Again, the companies have it so arranged that men owing others, largely in debt, take the money justly belonging to their creditors and

invest in policies for the benefit of their families, from the proceeds of this investment granting it is nothing but a common business transaction their creditors are excluded. This is used as an argument to induce many to invest. This is not honest, it is a temptation to dishonesty, instead of regular industry and economy. It flourishes in speculative communities and individuals rather than with the steady and industrious. If these things be true, we think they are evils that should not be countenanced or supported by Christian people.

The best and only insurance needed for Christians is habits of industry and economy, and a trustful dependence upon God, instilled upon the habits and hearts of our families.

We doubt if money brought into the family through any of these doubtful agencies ever benefits it.

D. L.

KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY,

ITS MANAGEMENT AND INFLUENCE UPON THE CHURCHES.

Our readers are aware of our position toward the University of Ky. and its difficulties. But many of them may not be aware, that an appeal through petitions numerous signed by the churches throughout the State was made to the recent legislature, to change its present management and transfer it to a board of managers elected every five years by the members of the churches of the State. This resolution granting this change passed the lower branch of the legislative assembly by two or three votes and failed in the Senate by one vote. The mem-

bers of the church especially the leading ones, connected with the University propose to make this a political question in the next election. That is they propose to enter the political arena and become a party to its strifes for purposes of the church.

Quite a discussion has sprung up in the secular and religious papers upon the Ohio river upon over this question. We give the following very pertinent remarks from brother Challen on the subject, from the *Standard*.

"I said that the changes sought by the petitioners in the charter "involved" a grand ecclesiastic body, and a change in the "polity" of the churches of Christ in Kentucky. This you have not met, nor can you meet it successfully; and this was, and is, the gist of the whole controversy so far as I am concerned. To anticipate and prevent this, I wrote my first article.

The whole tenor of my articles bore upon the fact that the churches were to be empowered to "elect" these "curators," to hold the estate, personal and real, of the University, and to give direction to its control and management. I saw, and still see, in this prospectively a great centralizing body in the churches or created out of them, not for Christian ends and purposes except incidentally, but agricultural mechanical, medical, legal, academical and theological purposes, and which will offer an arena for personal spite, bitter hate, and all uncharitableness, in the very bosom of the churches and State meetings.

The movement may look in your eyes like a very "innocent and harm-

less thing, but not so to me and many others. You may prosecute it to the bitter end, and probably will, but I think you will find it "evil and only evil," and that continually. I need not venture anything as to the manner or Spirit in which the churches shall elect these "curators," whether by a popular vote in each church, or through the eldership; or by a delegated State meeting, with or without instruction, or by the missionary meeting or State Board. Nor need I speak of the manipulation, canvassing, *ruseing*, emulation and strife, that it will create among the churches. I do not wish to sound the depths of that "continent of mud" into which the "petitioners" would plunge the churches. Why, we cannot interest the churches even in missionary work without subjecting its friends to the charge of unsoundness and departure from the faith! What will be the case, when all the churches in Kentucky shall be turned away from their legitimate work to the management of a great University in all of its complicated machinery, through a *curatorship* created it may be to suit the designs of those personally interested for private ends and purposes. Any one who thinks that a field so open to "jobbing" can be entered into by the Christian churches of Kentucky or elsewhere, in any conceivable way, without the dangers of which I have spoken knows but little of human nature and the spirit of the age in which we live! In whatever way the churches may act in carrying out the designs of the petitioners, it "involves" all that I have said; and it bears upon its face the elements of discord, faction and disunion."

Our sympathies have been in this controversy personally with those who are now seeking to attain their ends by interesting the churches as a combined and centralized denomination in the matter, and through a political contest. We believe they had infinitely better surrender the University and let it stand as monument of misguided zeal and effort to do more than is required, and as a warning against causes indicated by policy and expediency, than to engage in such a controversy. They had better lose their money than their principle. In surrendering the University they do that in consolidating the church into an ecclesiasticism, and entering the arena of politics they will do that.

We think the consolidation of the churches into one organization for any purpose, necessarily forms an ecclesiasticism and subverts the whole order of heaven in regard to churches. We think bro. Challer's words of warning timely.

D. L.

What kind of Company do you keep?

There is no one thing that young Christians should guard more carefully, than the kind of company they keep. It is utterly impossible for the young to associate with others, and not partake more or less of their habits, and ways, and modes of thought. If therefore young Christians associate with the gay, the giddy, and light-headed, and light-hearted, they are sure to imbibe more or less of the same from them: If they associate with the proud, the vain, and the dressy, they will cer-

tainly be influenced also in that direction. While on the other hand, if they will seek for their associates as far as possible the plain, practical, the modest and unassuming, then will they partake of these characteristics. Those who desire to form true and substantial Christian characters, should seek as far as possible the society of persons of that character. If the young disciples of Christ would always seek to associate with the humble, the pure in heart, and such as love the cause of God; such as are themselves seeking to elevate and purify their own hearts and lives, it will be easy enough to form the characters that our holy religion requires us to form. We are told that "Evil communications corrupt good manners." It is therefore impossible to associate with the fleshly, worldly-minded, without having our own hearts and lives more or less contaminated thereby. And certainly to gain heaven ought to be inducement enough to cause us to use every possible effort to form the kind of characters that are promised eternal rest in heaven.

E. G. S.

From the Christian Monitor.

EARLY RECOLLECTIONS.

BY FANNIE H. CHRISTOPHER.

"Cry aloud, spare not, lift up your voice like a trumpet and show my people their transgressions and the house of Jacob their sins."—Isaiah, lvii.

Many years since I heard a discourse from this portion of Scripture; The main points discussed I have never forgotten, but they are as fresh in my memory to-day as then.

The subject was nothing new, nor delivered by a man of great talent. The speaker being only a plain village pastor, read and known but little beyond that office; it amazed no one that one head carried what he knew. He was neither eloquent nor flowery; but plain, strong and pointed. When the preacher gave to his discourse a personal direction, every one was touched, save those who were given over to the hardness of their hearts, their faces plainly showing that they were seriously exercised, and though their lips moved not, they were prayerfully asking, "Lord, is it I?" It was the speaker's earnestness and Christian bravery on this particular occasion that sank so deeply into the hearts of his hearers.

The preacher, after reading the text, told them that he had not come before them with a cunningly devised speech, nor great wisdom, neither of which did he possess, nor to appeal to the unconverted as he had done heretofore; but to speak plainly to those who had professed Christ, inasmuch as his text admonished him "to spare not" but show the people their transgressions and sins.

"Brethren, though the words of my text were intended for the Jews, many centuries before our blessed Savior came among men, yet they come to the Christian with no less weight." And the writer would add, that the preacher of this day has no less reason to apply them to his people, and their import should come to each one of us with no less weight and significance than it did more than thirty years ago to most of the hearers in that little church.

"Brethren," continued the preach-

er, "I have been convinced for a long time that there is a spiritual blight among us. I have felt at times greatly distressed, for the Spirit of the blessed Savior seems not in our midst when a few of us have met together. I have cried unto the Lord in my distress, and have asked Him to show me the cause of this blight, and to make known unto me in some way what He would have me to do.

The portion of Scripture I have chosen has been in my mind some time, and I am convinced that it has been the will of our Father that I should talk to you therefrom. But I have refrained from declaring what I believed to be the truth concerning you, until I fear I have grieved the Spirit of God!"

The preacher then went into his subject by making a statement of some of the sins in high places by which professing Christians, who should be as beacon lights to the world, had become false lights and grievous stumbling blocks, and many a ship freighted with precious souls had been stranded and lost, lost! That some errors which had appeared among them had been suffered to grow unpruned until they had become fearfully rank and stronger than their virtues.

"Brethren," he continued, "some things I shall say may offend many of you, but I must cry aloud and spare none of you, for it is but the truth concerning some among us. A few may go away and be no more with us, as certain followers of the Savior did on one occasion after He had told them a few plain truths. But I have prayed to our Father for

you, that you may not be offended at His word, nor turn away; but that it may lead you to true repentance and a return to your first love, ere He shall have removed your candlestick out of its place.

"Brethren, as I have said, this blight among us gives me deep sorrow, fearing that I have not done all I could, and that my labors here and prayers for you have been in vain. And there have been times, when reflecting on our condition, that my faith has failed me, fearing we should become like unto the people in those doomed cities, where there could not be found enough righteous to stay the hand of Divine Justice.

"Brethren, what avails it that many are being gathered to our number, if while we are extending the walls of Zion one side, it becomes rotten and worthless on the other?"

"My brethren, I have tried in many ways to get at your hearts, for the purpose of arousing you from this spiritual lethargy. I have endeavored to be with you at all seasons, both at your places of business, and at your homes. This you know, and I find to my great sorrow that many of you, in your dealings with men, divest your dealings entirely of your religion, and put aside any scruples of conscience. Your wedding garment sits too loosely on you. Yet many of you, brethren, are found regularly at the house of prayer in the week, exhorting and calling on the Lord with seeming devotion, asking His blessing on what?"

"You are also found in your places on the Lord's day, partaking of the sacred emblems with unclean hands and impure hearts, yet knowing well

that to eat and drink unworthily seals your own condemnation.

"Brethren," said the speaker solemnly, "deceive not yourselves, for God is not mocked; whatever a man soweth that shall he also reap.

"Since I came among you we have been laboring with the unconverted; but I am surely convinced that it is more needful for us to begin at the house of Israel, as the Lord has commanded; for without a consistent walk their state is a most fearful one and far worse than that of the poor sinner.

"My brethren, when we invite acquaintances or strangers to our home we make all needful preparation to receive and retain them, and we seek out the best companions for them. But into what company here, in the Lord's house, do we invite the stranger? I will tell you.

"We find among us, to an alarming extent, confusion from ignorance and unbridled tongues, fearful hypocrisy; others proud, lovers of ease and greed loving, while some have a stolid indifference to the furtherance of the great truth or workings of any, especially if it be among the poor.

"My brethren, we will cease to invite or gather in among us until everything is ready for their reception, until we have set our house in true Christian order, until we have repented and become purged from our grievous sins.

"Brethren, God forbid that we should aggravate the state of the sinner; rather let him perish where he is. And now, for the present, I pray you in the name of the Judge of All, to look well to your own more fearful state. Let us not throw a

sanctimonious cloak over our own wickedness, and become so entirely enveloped in its ample folds that few, if any, shall ever succeed in peering beneath. Let us not go on through life deceiving multitudes, perhaps ourselves; for out from under that sanctimonious mantle we shall pass un clothed with all our guilt exposed, into the presence of the Great Judge."

The speaker continued with deep feeling: "Feelings of pity and compassion come over me when I contemplate what the condition of those will be who wilfully reject the Bible, repeated invitations and solemn warnings, and a sadness and a most fearful shrinking overwhelm me when I reflect on what will be the state of those who have professed Christ and have turned away or apostatized.

"The Apostle Paul was grieved at this state of things, and labored "in and out of season" to restrain unfaithful brethren; but there is less excuse for us, because the glorious light and liberty was not given to them as we have it, for as ages have rolled away they have taken with them much of the darkness which enshrouded them, bringing us into the glorious light of day, so that we can see more clearly the 'straight and narrow way.'

"One portion of this church are cold and indifferent, fair-weather Christians. The only claim they have on this church is, that their names are on the church record, and I grieve to say their names may be more frequently seen among lists of managers at season balls, lottery enterprises, &c., than among the list of any Christian workers.

"There is one thing, however, can be said of this class: they make no effort to deceive or cover up their sins with a cloak; they neither become troubled nor interfere in church matters, whether it goes forward or backward, right or wrong. They found the wedding garment the blessed Savior prepared, too tight for them, so they have cast it aside; hence, the crown the dear Savior had laid up for them will be taken away." The preacher uttered this with a trembling voice and eyes filled with tears, and continued:

"There are others I could mention who were among this people, and who have caused me deep sorrow and many tears. I leave them in the hands of the Just Judge, praying that he may have mercy upon them wherever they are.

"And now, brethren," continued the preacher, "God forbid that I should misjudge any; but "by their fruits ye shall know them." How appalling and overwhelming the thought that in our present condition the gate of heaven will never be opened to more than one-third of the number among us." This last sentence was uttered in a most impressive manner. At this point of the sermon all were evidently affected. So deep was the impression made upon the writer that in all the years since then the solemn and fearful thought has never left me, that upon so many professing Christians the gate of heaven will be forever closed.

"There is another class not yet mentioned; it is the lesser portion of this people."

Here the preacher's former tone and manner changed, and his face

beamed with a heavenly joy and hopefulness. "And they are the genuine, the tried, the faithful servants of the great Master, and when He comes they will not be found wanting. This portion, though always the less, have been the instruments in saving the Lord's people from destruction since the world's earliest history.

"To you, the faithful and sustaining portion of this people, I owe much; I know your purity of heart, your strong faith and patience, your perseverance under great discouragements, and your calmness and fortitude in saddest and darkest hours. All this has astonished me.

"When my faith and hopes were low and the blessed Savior seemed so far off, and the gates of heaven appeared closed to my supplications, and I could discern no bow of promise even in the distance for this people; then your words of cheer, strong hopes and fervent prayers for this people and your unworthy pastor gave me encouragement, comfort and hope. Most valuable are the lessons you have taught me; while you have been listening to me, I have been learning and gathering strength from you. There is a record of your faithfulness and work among this people in that higher court, where the Judge of all men will not forget the humblest one, but will bountifully reward you. There is another record, too, of the work of the other portion of this church, and what is there recorded will be their eternal condemnation."

Here the preacher raised his eyes, clasped his hands, and implored most fervently that the Almighty

God would stay His divine judgments, and give this portion time and space for repentance, and not reward them according to their faith and works.

"My dear brethren, when I began my labors with you to-day, it was with no little fear and trembling; but I am strengthened and encouraged, for I feel that the blessed Lord and Savior has met with us, and he is ready to hear and answer the petition of every contrite heart.

"And now, brethren, let us all pray," and the writer believes they all did pray earnestly, and that a blessing came into every heart in that little church more than thirty years ago.

Confession of Jhrist.

Every system and every institution must have a grand centre, around which all the different parts must revolve, and by which these different parts must be kept in their proper places. Mahomet is the centre of attraction in the institution called Mahometanism. And a Mahometan can no one be, and not acknowledge in full the name, power, and authority of that so called prophet. In the Jewish economy, God himself was the great center. "The Lord our God is one Lord," was the watchword of the Jews. And no Jew was safe who would not acknowledge the truth of this proposition. And in every instance where the Jews began to gather around any other standard, no matter what, they brought their own ruin. But when Jesus came into the world, the attention of all was turned to him. He said when

on earth, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." God the Father was the great ruler and king from the creation till the coronation of his Son. From that time forth Christ has been king in Zion. At his baptism, the Father publicly acknowledged him as his son, in whom he was well pleased. At the transfiguration he again acknowledged Jesus as his Son, in the presence of some of the disciples, adding this significant command; "hear ye him." Moses prophesied concerning him nearly fifteen hundred years before he was born, and said that every soul that would not hear him should be cut off from his people. Jesus himself said, during his personal ministry, "whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I deny before my father which is in heaven." Mat. 16, 32, 33.

Whether this confession spoken of here is just the confession that is made before baptism, just such as the Eunuch made when he was baptized or not, we are not going to affirm. But as we have the example of the eunuch to go by, we are sure it is safe to follow it. For Paul says of this confession, "That if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. 10. We are therefore required to confess the Lord Jesus with the mouth, and we know of no better way

of doing so, than in the way it is usually done among our brethren. But there is more in this confession than merely to open the mouth and say "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." It must be done with an earnest and hearty determination to take Jesus as our only Lord and Savior, and to follow him in all that he requires at our hands. To take him as our glorious Redeemer, while we remain on earth. That God the Father has exalted him to be our king and Savior, is abundantly shown by the word of the Lord. Paul, in first chapter of Ephesians, when speaking of the power of God, says; "which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him on his own right hand in the heavenly places; far above all principality and power and might, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that also which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all."

The name of Christ is above every name. He now has all authority and power, and will have, until he shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God himself may be all in all again. Again Paul says: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Where-

fore God hath highly exalted him and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. 2, 3-10. This passage gives us a very exalted view of the high relationship, power and authority of our Lord and Savior. Also we learn that every tongue, will be required to confess his name, and when just before baptism we make confession of his name, then our tongues have confessed him. We thus confess him as our Savior, king, and lawgiver. Thus we have the highest authority for the confession of the name of Christ. And the confession of this glorious name is no light matter, as some seem to suppose. Some are ready to say, "O! anybody can do that." So they can; but unfortunately there are not many that will confess him in the manner the Scriptures require; for if it be not done with a sincere heart, and with a fixed determination to take Jesus as ruler and Savior, it would amount to nothing merely to utter the words. There is a great amount of impiety manifested on the part of some religionists, in opposing such requirements as the confession of the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Why any one that claims to believe the Bible should oppose the confession of the name of Christ, when we set out to serve God we cannot possibly see.

Moreover, Jesus is our great high priest, through whom we have to approach the Father; and if we do not

confess him before men, God will never cleanse our sins with the precious blood of his Son. He is the mediator of the New Covenant, and if we refuse to confess his name and authority, we can have no claim or promise that he will ever intercede for us with his Father. He claims to have all power, in heaven, and in earth, and if we refuse to acknowledge his name or authority, there is no chance for our redemption. For we can only approach the Father through Christ; but if we deny him, we cannot approach the Father through him: he will deny us if we deny him. No chance therefore to obtain salvation except through Christ and no chance to approach him if we deny him. We can do nothing in Christianity except "in the name of Christ. The apostles performed miracles in his name. All things in the church are to be done by his authority, in his name. Paul says, "And whatsoever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him. He said to the disciples, whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name he will give it you." Without him he has said we can do nothing. He is the bright and morning star to those who would be saved. He is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Everything sacred to man in time and for eternity clusters around the Son of God. No wonder then that anathemas are pronounced against those who refuse to confess his name.

How ungrateful in poor sinful man, to refuse to confess his name, Man needs salvation, and Jesus is the

only Savior. And if we refuse him, all hope of redemption is forever gone. For us he left his home in the heavens; left the glory that he had with the Father before the world was, and took upon him mortal flesh, and became subject unto death, even the death of the Cross, in order that poor sinners might be saved. And he will be honored by the confession of his name, first or last. Those who will not bow the knee to him, and with the mouth and tongue confess him in this life, will be doomed to confess him to their everlasting shame and contempt. He must and will be honored by us, either in our obedience to him, or in our "everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Just in proportion as we exalt and honor the Son of God, in that proportion do we honor God and ourselves. Jesus was so pure, so full of love and compassion for our race, that he left nothing undone, that was needful for our happiness forever more. The more we exalt his name in the earth, the more we elevate ourselves. Why it is that so few persons comparatively will put themselves under the control, and saving love of Jesus of Nazareth, is passing strange. For all need salvation, and the way is plain. The Bible teaches us plainly how we can become the servants of God through Christ. It teaches us that Jesus Christ must be confessed, and that this confession is to be made with the mouth. The precise point of time is clearly enough defined. The Eunuch made it just before baptism, therefore he must have been a penitent believer, when he made it.

It is said of us as a people, that all we want is to get the people to confess that Jesus is the Christ, and baptize them. There is no small amount of wickedness in many of the misrepresentations that are made of us. If all the people and preachers in this country do not know better, it is because they *will not* know better, for all have a chance to know better. We have always taught that no one thing alone would save the sinner. We have always taught moreover, that whatever we do in the service of God must be done from the heart. Must be done for the sake of obeying and honoring God, that we may thereby enjoy his promised blessings. Nothing that we may do amounts to anything in the sight of God, if not done in humility and sincerity in the sight of the Lord. And any and every one in this country who represents us as teaching otherwise acts wickedly in the sight of God and man. If he knows what we teach, he sins wilfully. If he does not know, he sins in pretending and claiming to know, and making the people think he does know, when he does not. There is no possible apology to be made for those in this country who persist in misrepresenting our teaching. The sinner must believe with the heart. His penitence must be pure and sincere in the sight of God. His confession and baptism must be of the same character. Paul, when speaking to the Romans of their conversion and pardon, says; "God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants

of righteousness." All that we do must be done in humility, and with a spirit of devotion to God, or it will be no advantage to any one.

E. G. S.

QUERIES.

Bros. L. & S: In Acts ix. 7, we read, "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, *hearing a voice* but seeing no man."

And, Acts xxii, 9, we have this language: "And they that were with me saw indeed the light and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spoke to me." Now in the first of these passages, those who accompanied Saul in his mission of persecution are represented as hearing a voice—while in the second, the contrary is most emphatically asserted, it so appears to me at least. I write you with the hope that you will reconcile in some way, these passages.

Please do so and oblige,

MACK.

Madison Statton Davidson Co. Tenn.

The apparent contradiction may be reconciled in this way. One of the meanings of the word translated *hear* in these passages is also to understand, and so in the passage which says they heard not the voice; read they "understood not the voice, and the difficulty is at once out of the way. In 26th chapter of Acts, we are told that the voice spake in the Hebrew tongue. Paul understood the Hebrew language, but the probability is, there were but few in those times who did, and so the men who journeyed with him heard the sound,

when the words were uttered, but did not understand the meaning of the words spoken. Most words have more meanings than one; the first meaning is always to be taken, except where the sense requires a secondary. In this case in 22nd of Acts, the sense requires the secondary meaning of the word.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: Please explain the meaning of the 19th chapter of Matthew, beginning at the 21st verse, including the last ten verses and you will oblige your Bro. in Christ,

* *

There are some things so simple that they are difficult of explanation. This is one of them. We cannot see what explanation can make it plainer than the Savior's language. The rich young man comes to the Savior, asks what he must do to inherit eternal life. The Savior tells him to keep the commandments, and enumerates enough to show he means the commands of the Law. He says, "this have I done from my youth up. What lack I yet?" The Savior says, "if thou wilt be perfect, go sell all thou hast, give to the poor, and come follow me. When the young man heard this he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions." Christ says to his disciples, "verily I say unto you, a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven." Then as if to impress them more deeply, he tells them it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. This amazed his disciples exceedingly, and

they asked, "Who then can be saved?" Jesus said, this is impossible with men, but all things are possible with God. Peter began to tell, we have forsaken all for thee: what shall we have? Christ answers, In the regeneration, the renovation of all things, when the Son of Man sits on the throne of his glory, ye who have followed me shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one who forsakes father, mother, brother, sister, wife or children, lands or possessions, for my name's sake shall inherit a hundred fold (in this world) of blessing, and shall inherit eternal life. But many who are first, or greatest, shall be last or least.

It simply teaches that we must give up wealth and possessions for God and our fellow-man. We must not trust in them for happiness, but must use them for the good of others and in doing this we will be happier here as well as hereafter.

Bro. Lipscomb: If you are not too much crowded with matter for the Advocate, please give an explanation of the first epistle of John, third chapter and sixth verse.

To our mind this is hard to reconcile with the other teaching of the Scriptures.

Yours truly,

E. P. FRASER.

Near Columbia, March 30, 1874.

We reconcile this passage with other Scriptures just as we do the 9th verse of same chapter, together with several other passages in John's epistle. John draws the distinction

more fully between the wilful sin and sin of weakness, the sin knowingly, presumptuously committed, and the sin of infirmity through weakness of the flesh, than do other writers of the New Testament. He calls one the sin unto death, that need not be prayed for, the other the sin not unto death for which we must pray.

He deals in this epistle chiefly with the former of these sins. He is evidently speaking of this sin, in this verse. Whosoever abideth in him does not wilfully or presumptuously sin; whosoever thus sinneth, hath not properly known or appreciated him. He that committeth this sin is of the devil: for the devil sinneth knowingly, wilfully, from the beginning.

This to our mind is a complete and satisfactory explanation of the verse.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S.: I was in a Bible class last Sunday evening. Our lesson was 3rd chapter of Luke, the last part of 16th verse reads, "he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." The question was asked, were the same persons that were baptized with the Holy Ghost baptized with fire? Some said that they were the same persons, and gave as their reason, that the Holy Ghost and fire were joined together by a conjunction, and that it was bound to apply to the same persons. Others took the position that the baptisms were different elements, and applied to different characters. Please give us some light on this subject.

J. S. CLARK.

Little Elm P. O., Denton Co., Texas.

The connection in which this passage occurs, indicates clearly to my mind that the baptism of fire is one thing, and that of the Holy Spirit another. John was speaking to a mixed multitude, and the meaning is, some were to be baptized in the Spirit, and some in fire. The apostles were baptized in the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and in like manner the house of Cornelius. The wicked will be baptized in the fire of hell in eternity. For John says in the succeeding verse: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire." The chaff means the wicked. The only unquenchable fire we know of is the fire of eternal destruction. And this is what we understand the baptism of fire to be. Since John was speaking to a mixed multitude, the fact that Spirit and fire are connected by the conjunction *and*, makes nothing against the idea of some of them being baptized in fire, and some in Spirit, and that really two baptisms are spoken of.

E. G. S.

Church News.

Brethren L. & S.: Bro. Caskey of Miss. has been preaching for us ten or twelve days, and will continue several days longer. Up to this writing there have been two confessions, two from the Baptists and three by letter.

The preaching has been principally at night. One night was devoted to a lecture on Temperance, in which bro. Caskey showed himself master

of the assembly. He was rich in anecdote, fertile in imagery, and so perfect in mimicry that a drunkard would have been put to shame. After closing he began that good old song, "am I a soldier of the cross," and called for mourners. Many put down their names, among whom were some veteran drunkards.

There were two classes of persons out who were placed in very embarrassed conditions, the dram-sellers and old foggy Christians. The paper was presented to every one in the house, and of course neither of this class signed it. This placed them together in the ranks of anti-intemperance. Imagine a preacher of the Gospel—that Gospel which is brim full of temperance sitting very near head quarters, and a paper is handed to him to sign, he declines, eyes of indignation are turned on him. How do you reckon he felt? Oh! these scruples, what troublesome things Ghosts that wont down at the bidding.

A poor-disciple who cannot let his benevolence flow through the channels of the different societies of the times is far behind the times; and a poor preacher who can do nothing in the way of public speaking but old fashioned preaching, will rarely enjoy the inspiration given by a crowded house.

Bro. Caskey does flay alive Sec-tarian dogmas. He is entirely unique in matter and manner. He is about to get up a debate with Price, the Methodist Campbellite killer of Texas. I shall write again, if anything of note occurs.

Fraternally,

A. CLARK.

Ft. Worth Texas Apr. 7, 1874.

Obituary.

Bretheren Franklin & Rice:

I am again called on to record the death of another member of our church, Sister Sarah C. Watson, who died March 12, '74. She was born Sept. 8, 1849, the daughter of W. A. and Mary Williams, in Maury Co., Tenn. Moved to Lee Co., Miss., about four years ago, and was married to John Watson in 1872. She became a member of the Macedonia congregation, in this County, in October last, but more recently moved among and became a worshipper with us at the Eureka chu.ch, where she lived a devoted Christian.

Her association with us was short, but nevertheless pleasant. Her walk before the world was that which is characteristic of a true disciple, showing to the world the simplicity and reality of a Christian life, a calling that is dearer than all the toys of earth, which supported her when she saw that she must battle with the last enemy of this life, and enabled her to rejoice in the prospect of an eternal rest. Feeling satisfied with the prospect of the future, she said that she was not afraid to die. Death has lost its sting and the grave its victory in the glorious resurrection.

She leaves a little son, a large family of relatives, the church and many friends to mourn the loss.

M. M. DAVIS.

Eureka Miss. March 26.
(Copied by request.)

Gospel Plan of Salvation.

We are receiving orders for this excellent book, which we will fill just as soon as we can get the books on. We have written to Bro. Brents to furnish us with them as soon as possible, and we hope to have them soon. So those that have ordered the book will please have patience. They shall have it as soon as possible. Those who order it sent by mail, are requested to send postage, which is 28 cents per copy.

We hope the brethren generally will do themselves the favor of furnishing themselves with a copy of this book, that they may not only read it themselves, but also hand it to their friends of the world, that

they may read it. A more extended notice of the work will be given soon.

E. G. S.

THE MAIN THING IN LIFE.

"I would like to get well," said one on the very verge of the grave a day or two since, "that I might do more good before I die." Is not the feeling that prompted this utterance universal with those whose earthly pathway lies all behind them? What, in that final hour, can be recalled with real pleasure except that we have been in some way of use to the world, that we have made ourselves "friends of the mammon of unrighteousness," that for our ministry, humble though it be, some human heart has been made better or happier.

"If I were only rich," says one, how much good I would do." Almsgiving is not all of doing good. "If I were only learned," says another, "what an influence I would exert." The humblest poor have their mission of charity to the world no less than the rich. Multitudes fancy that some other position than the one they occupy would find them ready to serve their generation, and in vain longings for opportunities they cannot have, let those near at hand pass unimproved.

"Ah," said a faithful Irishman who was laying out our walks a few months ago, "if I only had book learning it would be the making of me." In our opinion, Mike, with his thorough work, his obliging disposition, his quick and careful eye

for straight lines and curves, can't well be spared from the place he fills.

A washerwoman is apt to feel that she occupies one of the lower positions in the social scale, but what should we do without her? If she is painstaking, trustworthy, and capable, isn't she a treasure in the household, a benefactor to society, and is not she immediately instrumental in enabling us to have that cleanliness which is next to godliness? There is no office, however mean or humble, that may not be dignified by a conscientious and faithful discharge of its duties; even as there is none, however noble and exalted, that may not be degraded by an unworthy and dishonest occupant. He who is faithful in that which is least shares the Divine approval equally with him to whom much was intrusted. The great work of the world is performed by humble ministries whose place in Divine economy is second in importance to none, however grand or mighty.. "The whole mass of the earth is engaged in keeping the snowdrop, the crocus, the violet in their proper position." These lovely members of the vegetable kingdom, ask but a handful of earth, careless whether it be in the wildwood or in the cultivated garden, to unfold their charms and fill the air around them with perfume, "Behold the flowers of the field?" What lessons of fidelity, of obedience, of trust they teach us.

If every day as it passes we would bring a smile to some human being, and add no shade of sadness to the world around us what a vast aggregate of positive good we may do in a lifetime. And will not the Maker of

the brute creation be pleased if we cause even the dumb animals under our care to rejoice and be glad during the brief day of their existence? He who makes the wilderness and the solitary places to blossom may look with complacency on those who imitating his example, carry with them light and warmth and joy to regions of darkness and shadow. Thus may we honor every office, however humble; thus may we ennoble each day of our lives with little ministries of beneficence and love to some of God's creatures, and feel assured that the Master will say, "She hath done what she could."

While we write, the soul of a beloved friend passes, and we sit in the shadow of death, a death in which there is no sorrow save to those who are left behind; and as we look back on the line of sweet and unostentatious charities no less to the dumb creation than to her fellows, which has characterized her life, how can we but feel that the chief end in life is to do good.—*N. Y. Observer.*

GOOD, kind, true, holy words dropped in conversation may be little thought of, but they are like seeds of a flower or beautiful tree falling by the wayside, borne by some bird afar, haply thereafter to fringe with beauty some barren mountain side, or to make glad some lonely wilderness.

Our short-sighted eyes cannot see dangers; or, seeing them are appalled. There is no safe way through the wilderness of this world, but as one crosses a foaming torrent,—fix your eyes upon God and on the other side.—*Anna Warner.*

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

Lights and Shades.

BY MRS. HEMANS.

The gloomiest day hath gleams of light,
The darkest wave hath bright foam near it;
And twinkles through the cloudiest night
Some solitary star to cheer it.

The gloomiest soul is not all gloom,
The saddest heart is not all sadness,
And sweetly o'er the darkest doom,
There shines some lingering beam of gladness.

Despair is never quite despair;
Nor life, nor death the future closes;
And round the shadowy brow of Care,
Will Hope and Fancy twine their roses.

SWINGING ON THE GATE,

Another week nearer home! Another blessed Saturday night added to the triumphs of Eternity as it has been snatched from time.

* * * * *

To-night we walked home, for the cars were crowded. We were thinking of the labor we had done since last week went and this one came. There were so many letters written—so many copies of editorials written—so many requests granted and so many refused—so many made glad and so many disappointed, just as it is in life each day, you know. And we were thinking and wondering how many thousands, or hundreds of thousands of persons in the land would read in his Saturday Night what we have written and printed since last we closed the labors of the week, wiped our pen so clean and placed it on the little rack to rest against the morrow.

As we walked along we saw, leaning over a little iron grate in front of a neat brick house, a pretty, chubby-faced boy, as if waiting for some one. Looking to a window, we saw a middle-aged woman sitting thereby with a paper in her hand, as if reading.

"Halloo, little captain! You are the boy that has red cheeks and bright eyes! What are you doing out here in the cold?"

"I am waiting for my papa!"

"Where is he coming from?"

"Down town, sir, and he comes afoot!"

"What is your name?"

"Bobby."

"How old are you?"

"Five years old, so my mamma says."

"Where is your mamma?"

"At the window. Don't you see her? I can!"

"Oh, yes—that is she, sure enough?"

"Yes, sir."

"When does your papa come?"

"He always comes now! and I am waiting for him, and so is mamma!"

"Well, Bobby, you're a nice little boy. Do you love your papa?"

"Yes, sir."

"Well, he will come pretty soon. Maybe he is stopping to buy something to bring to you?"

"I know he is—and he'll kiss me when he comes, and he'll kiss mamma, too, cause he always does, and I kiss him, and mamma kisses him too!"

"Well, Bobby, hadn't you better run in where your mamma is, and look out of the window till papa comes? It's cold out here!"

"No sir, I don't want to! He'll

come, for he always comes now?"

Just then, down the little one sprang from the gate, pushed it open and then scampered down the sidewalk a few rods to meet the one he had been waiting for; and who he knew always came now!

Perhaps some of you saw him. He was a well-built man, clad in honest garb. His cap fitted close to his head; his coat was closely buttoned; he caught the little boy in his arms and kissed him, then let him down and walked along with a proud, firm, muscular step like a monarch among men. No wonder the little boy swung on the gate; no wonder the wife sat looking out of the window for his coming. He held the hand of the little one who trotted along by his side. As they came to the gate by the side of which we stood carelessly, the woman at the window arose and walked to the door, the man passed by, little Bobby looked at us with a smile and said:

"I told you he'd come."

They passed into the house and we came to ours.

* * * * *

That man is living to a purpose. He is a true man, of use in the world. Two hearts at least, besides his own, were made glad by his coming. And he was good not to keep them waiting as thousands of men, and women too, keep their loved ones waiting, when the heart is hungry for love, and the minutes drag like hours. He was a working-man—his hands and clothes told us so. The week went and he came—not late as if he hated to come home, but early as if his heart was there. Little Bobby was

proud of him. He knew his papa would come—and with a warm and earnest kiss. Little Bobby was happy. The father was happy or his looks lied—and they did not.

* * * * *

Now, we have been thinking till the hands on the watch before us point to midnight. What a good world this would be if every home had a gate where swung and awaited a little one knowing that now papa would come with a kiss, a smile and a good heart. If at every home, by a window, were seated some loving woman and a loving wife, waiting, not dreading, the approach of her husband, knowing he would be there on time, quick, firm in his step, prompt in his manhood, and sober, like one who is a monarch of himself, and therefore over all. And all men might be so—can be so if they will. And then what a glorious world in which we live.

And we have been thinking, and must write it before we quit work, of the thousands of little boys and girls who might swing for hours and hours on gates, of the women who may watch at windows for hours, wondering when come—how will come—the one who is at heart real good, but who lacks the nerve for being the man he ought to be, can be, should, and would be, if he would only pause to think, and see if there is not a better way to happiness than he is in. And we have been thinking of the poor widows whose husbands can never more to them come, no matter how long they watch at windows—of the men whose wives are gone never more to return—of the orphans who have no one to come home now

and catch them in the arms and love them. And we have been wondering if any man who reads this will be brave enough to go to his home a little earlier each night and, try to be a good earnest man, who will be so proud as he is so deserving. We know some will, and some will think they will; but when comes the hour, they will forget as we all do, and instead of making glad the hearts of those who would be so glad to have have them come home, perhaps not with presents, but like men, sober, kind, loving, will wait just a little longer, till thus their life becomes a failure.

“God bless all who love their “loved ones” all, and do not keep them waiting, and all those who suffer at heart from the absence of those they dearly love, and for whom they wait and watch, and watch and wait, hours upon hours, till all the joy of hope of heart, of life, of love, have gone, as has this Saturday night.—*Selected.*

As the Lord's mercies are new every morning, so those to whom they come have a perpetual freshness of life untouched by the burden and heat of the day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Laying on of hands.....	385
Our Money.....	388
Life Insurance.....	391
Kentucky University.....	432
What kind of company do you keep?.....	393
Early Recollections.....	395
Confession of Christ.....	388
Queries.....	401
Church News.....	403
Obituary.....	404
Gospel Plan of Salvation.....	404
The Main thing in Life.....	405
Fireside	
Lights and shades.....	406
Swinging on the Gate.....	406

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 18.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, APRIL 30, 1874.

Baptism and Remission of sins.

When people sincerely believe the word of the Lord, and their minds have not been perverted by false teaching, all that is needful on the subject of baptism, is to present the plain word of the Lord to them, and they will at once appreciate its importance. And indeed to argue that it is necessary for people to be baptized in order to reach the promise of pardon, seems only to be an argument in behalf of the truth of the Bible. Just so certain as the word of God is true, just that certain is it, that he who would enjoy the promise of pardon from God must be baptized. The command regarding baptism is double. The apostles were commanded to baptize the people. "Go teach all nations, baptizing them." Here the command to the apostles to baptize the people, is just as positive as the command to teach, and all the world can make it no less. The word teach, here, is in the sense of disciple, make disciples of the nations. And the word *baptizing*, in the connection in which it is placed here, defines a

part of the work to be done in making disciples. And according to the language in this record of the divine commission, the apostles could never complete their work herein enjoined, without baptizing the people. Those who refused to be baptized were not the disciples of Christ at all. Baptism was the finishing act of making disciples, and where the people on their part refused to submit to this divine institution, they lacked that much of being, in the true and proper sense of that word, the disciples of Christ. And this record of the commission of Christ, admits of no other construction. There is no possible way of defining the sentence so as to leave out baptism. Just as easily may we leave out teach, or explain it all away. We must take all the passage, or none.

With many who reject this divine institution as having nothing to do in bringing a man to the promise of God, a spirit of rebellion is at the bottom of it. They know what the Scriptures say, but it does not suit them. They think they have a right to their own opinion in the matter,

and deal with it as if it were a mere human requisition. Indeed some have the presumption to call it Campbellism, and scout it as a dangerous and silly delusion, that wise people, and people of respectability in society ought not to submit to. But it is certain that in the case of the apostles they could in no wise make disciples or Christians out of the people without baptizing them. But preachers at the present time are far in advance of the apostles. They are claiming everywhere to make Christians, in the fullest sense of that word before baptism, and independent of it. Such was not the case with the apostles. They baptized the people everywhere, the same day or night, as fast as they would yield themselves to their preaching. Three thousand were baptized on the day of Pentecost. The Samaritans were baptized, both men and women, so soon as they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ. So the apostles understood the Lord to mean just what he said, and they carried it out to the very letter. And moreover it is certain that the baptism here referred to, is water baptism, for it is not in the power of man to baptize in the Holy Spirit. Men never were commanded to baptize in the Holy Spirit. This was always a promise, and not a command. The baptizing therefore that these apostles were commanded to do was in water, and not in the Holy Spirit. The apostles all understood it to be in water. Hence, when Peter was at the house of Cornelius, and the people were ready to be baptized, he said, "Can any man forbid water,

that these should be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." Some men claim that there is no such thing as water baptism taught in the New Testament at all. Surely the word of God is of no service to such men. I would just as soon undertake to prove that there is no heaven taught, as to try to prove that there is no water baptism. But we know that water baptism is taught, and that the apostles practiced it. And they could not have carried out this commission without it. Nor can any one carry out this commission for making Christians now, and not baptize those who are willing to obey the Lord.

But not only were the apostles commanded to baptize the people, but the people were commanded to be baptized. The apostles could have baptized none, without a readiness on their part to be baptized. Jesus said, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This record of the divine commission, places the obligation to be baptized upon the people, and places baptism between the sinner, and the remission of sins: and he can never reach that promise, without attending to this divine institution. Thus the command concerning baptism is two fold in its character. The apostles were commanded to baptize the people and the people were commanded to be baptized. These things are as true as they were then. Men may say what they please about a third party in religion, but the Lord ordained it that way, and mortals have no right

or authority to change, or in any way interfere with this order. When these things were thus ordained, in order for the people to be saved, the apostles were required to go and preach the gospel to them. And in those days, not a man learned the way of salvation except through preaching, so far as the word of God records. So in the matter of learning what the plan of salvation is, the people were dependent upon a third party. God did not reveal it directly to any of them. Then also in the matter of being baptized they were dependent upon a third party. No one was ever commanded to baptize himself, but to *be baptized*. This command necessitates a third party, and the whole arrangement is divine—the Lord did it himself. One chief objection often urged against baptism having anything to do in remission of sins, is because, say the objectors, it makes the pardon of a man's sins depend upon a third party, and that they think would be utterly out of the question. Every time they raise this objection, and scout the idea, they raise their wisdom against the wisdom of God, and scout and deride his divine arrangements. And when they raise this objection a thousand times, the word of God will stand as in the day the Savior uttered it. While time lasts, the command to *be baptized* will be in force, involving the necessity of a third party. So this objection, is simply an objection against the arrangements of the Lord. Yet the people cry out against us as a people, and against what we teach as if we had originated these things ourselves. They do not realize that they are fighting against God; but it is most certainly true that that they are. The same objection as to a third party can be urged against faith that is urged against baptism. Paul says, "so then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." And Paul also asks, how shall they hear without a preacher? This would be impossible. Hence the apostles were commanded to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. So the Lord has ordered that faith depends upon hearing. This necessitates a third party. So that whatever can be said against baptism because it necessitates a third party, can be said with equal force against faith. When people are blinded by prejudice, they are likely to place themselves into all sorts of difficulties without thinking. Baptism is the consummating act of our obedience to the gospel of Christ, and as it is the last step it connects itself with the promise of pardon. God's promises are at the end of his commands. When the Jews under Joshua had gone around Jericho the seventh time on the seventh day, and when upon that the trumpets were blown and the people set up a shout, they were then at the end of the commands. They had then done all that God required. And no sooner did they finish their obedience, than the promise was fully verified; the walls fell flat down, so that every man went up straight before him into the city. So also in this case, the promise of pardon is next after baptism. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "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." "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." All these passages show that baptism connects us with the promise of remission of sins. The eunuch went on his way rejoicing, when he was baptized. So then, in the economy of man's redemption, baptism connects us with the promise of remission, as certainly as that remission of sins is taught at all. And if it be true that sinners are saved or pardoned before baptism, and independently of it, the New Testament is the wrong book for us to have. And after the articles we have written on faith, repentance, and confession, no one can justly say we attribute salvation alone to baptism. One other fact in regard to baptism we wish to mention. That is, that by baptism we enter into Christ. In him is salvation. When we enter him therefore, we come where salvation is promised. In sixth of Rom. and 3rd of Gal. it is definitely declared that we are baptized into Christ. In first of Eph. and first of Col. we are plainly told that in him, that is, in Christ, we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. Paul also in 5th of 2nd Cor. says, "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things have passed away, and all things are become new." So then, we have in these few brief articles reached the conclusion, by searching the word of God, that when a sinner hears and believes the gospel, repents of his sins, confesses the name of Christ, he is then a Christian, a child of God, and a joint heir with Christ. This then, is briefly

what it takes to make a Christian. These things alone, will never make a Baptist, a Methodist, or a Presbyterian. But in every instance they are complied with, they will make Christians, and only Christians, sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. Thus we have shown by the Scriptures what it is to become a Christian; just what everybody ought to be.

E. G. S.

Review of Rev. J. Atkins, Sr.

Bros. L. & S.: In No 11 Bro. Sewell says, "The action of baptism needs to be investigated abundantly yet, before it will be understood." This is true, But when he or any one else investigates this subject, said investigations are read by but few of the people who are led by the investigators on the other side. While the one party is telling the people baptize means to immerse, the other party is telling them it means also to pour, to sprinkle, etc. They all know that every believer who has been immersed has been baptized. But the opposers of what they call the *immersing* mode of baptism, tell the people, if they have only a few drops of water sprinkled on the head or face, they are baptized by the *sprinkling* mode of baptism. *Is this baptism?* This is the question to be settled. Did John the Baptist, or Jesus Christ, or any one of his apostles, or any one else, mentioned in the New Testament, ever teach that to sprinkle, to rantize water upon any one was a *mode* of baptism? Of all the men in the world, the learned leaders of the people ought

to be the most honest, if one man should be more honest than another. The uneducated people have no way of knowing what God has said in the Bible, only as it is given to them by translators. They tell us that Jesus Christ said to his apostles, "Go you into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But *when is a man baptized?* This is a Greek word, untranslated. The translators have given us the English of all the other words in this passage. Why did they not translate baptize into English? *Baptize*—a Greek word, means, the scholars say, to sprinkle, in English. Well, now, will any learned man say that baptize means the same that *baptize* does? But I will notice some more of the sayings of the Rev. J. Atkins, Sr., by your permission. He has an amount of arguments against the Baptist notion that John the Baptist set up the kingdom of God, and that John's and Christian baptism are the same. Well, John required of those he baptized to believe in him who was to come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus; and to bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and to believe the kingdom of God was at hand. John baptized for the remission of sins. The apostles of Christ required those baptized by them to believe Christ had come, to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and of course to believe that the kingdom of God had come. John's disciples, when baptized, were saved from their past sins, for he was to "give knowledge of salvation to the Lord's people by the remission of their sins." Mr. Atkins thinks

Christ was not baptized by, or with John's baptism, nor with Christian baptism; but "the baptism he received at the hands of John, a regular Jewish high priest, was simply that ceremonial washing with water required by the Jewish law, of every high priest before entering upon the duties of his office." "It was a part of the ordained service of a high priest." "It was out of doors on the banks of the Jordan," etc.

It is true, that John was the first-born, and only son of Zacharias, a high priest; and according to the Law of Moses, in days previous to his day he would have been a high priest; but John was born about the time, or just before God made that "New Covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah which is not according to the Old Covenant," Instead of John's filling the office of "a regular Jewish high priest," God had other work for him to do. He was to "go before the Lord, in the spirit and power of Elias." "He was a prophet, and more than a prophet." He was to "make ready a people prepared for the Lord." He was to "give knowledge of salvation to his people by the remission of their sins," for "he preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." About this time the programme commenced to be changed. The "people made ready prepared for the Lord" became the first subjects of the kingdom of God, that John preached as being at hand—that was drawing nigh. They were the first who participated in, and enjoyed the privileges and blessings of the New Covenant, that is better than the Old Covenant. This

kingdom commenced on the day of Pentecost, after Christ had been crowned king in heaven, at the right hand of his Father. This was the beginning of the New Covenant Dispensation. It is nowhere intimated that "John was a regular Jewish high priest; neither is there any proof that John inducted Christ into the office of a high priest, when he baptized him "on the banks of the Jordan," as he, Mr. Atkins states it. "Christ was made a priest after the order of Melchisedec," "and not called a priest after the order of Aaron, for the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Of the tribe of Judah of which tribe Christ came, "Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." Christ was not made priest after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Christ was not made priest without an oath, but those who were made priests by the law of Moses were not made such without an oath. "By so much was Jesus made the mediator of a better testament." He was not a priest on earth, "For if he were on earth he should not be a priest; seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law." Read Hebrews vi, vii, and viii. If what Paul says about the priesthood of Christ be true, how can what the Rev. J. Atkins says on this subject be true? He thinks John the Baptist made Christ a regular Jewish high priest *on the banks* of the Jordan, by sprinkling water upon him, according to the law of Moses.

Mr. Atkins says, "our Baptist brethren teach that water baptism represents the *death*, burial and res-

urrection of Christ." Baptism does not represent the death of Christ, but it does represent his *burial* and his *resurrection*. He says "the *water* represents the cleansing influence of the Holy Ghost." In another place he says, "*baptism* represents the work of the Holy Ghost in purifying the hearts of men." In one place he makes *water* represent this cleansing influence, but in the other, he makes *baptism* represent said influence. *Water* is not *baptism*, neither is *baptism* *water*. If *water* represents anything in this case, it represents the *earth* in which the dead are buried, and baptism represents the *burial*. Rom. vi: 3-5, and Col. ii: 12, 13. These passages are the only ones in the New Testament that have reference to this emblematical design of baptism, unless 1 Cor. xv: 29, also has. In thus being "planted together in the *likeness* of Christ's death, we shall be also in the *likeness* of his resurrection," and are thus, by God, translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son." Or, as Paul otherwise expresses himself, "Hath called us into his kingdom and glory." See Col. i: 12; 1 Thes. ii: 12. He goes on to say, "*Because* when you received the word of God which you heard of us, you received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually also worketh in you that believe." Verse 13. God has never called any one into his kingdom on earth but by the preaching of the gospel, and every one who has truly believed and been buried with Christ by baptism, has arisen therefrom into the kingdom of God; and if what Christ said to Nicodemus be true, when he

said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of God," every one who has not thus been born again is not in said kingdom. Can the Rev. J. Atkins, Sr., say that he, as a *man*, has thus been born again? If he has, then he is in the kingdom of God. But when a man (not an infant) being a believer, has a few drops of water sprinkled on his head by *him*, or by *any one* else, is he thus born of water and of the Spirit? He may be begotten by the word of truth, but what is there in the sprinkling that resembles the birth?

When our Methodist friends wish to prove that pouring water upon a person is baptism, they tell us that those who were baptized with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, had the Holy Ghost poured out upon them, therefore water baptism should be administered by pouring water upon the person. But when we tell them Paul tells us Christians in his day had been *buried* by baptism, and had arisen therefrom, they tell us he had no allusion to water baptism, but to Holy Ghost baptism. So then we see our Methodist friends teach, after all, that Holy Ghost baptism is a *burial*, and thus, in one place, contradict what they teach in another. Is there any one, for about eighteen hundred years, who understands Paul, in his epistles to the Romans and the Colossians, to mean anything else than a burial in water by baptism. It seems to me, that this modern interpretation of these passages amounts to a wresting of the Scriptures. Does the New Testament anywhere teach that the Holy Spirit cleanses or purifies the hearts

of men by any kind of an operation? Does it anywhere teach that *water* or *baptism* represents this cleansing or purifying operation or work of the Spirit upon the hearts of men? If it does not so teach, why do men of this age teach it? The New Testament teaches that believers have purified their souls in obeying the truth" (given) through (by) the Spirit." It teaches that those who obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine that was delivered to them were *then* made free from sin. It does not teach that any one ever received the Holy Spirit until after he was a believer, at least, and generally, not until after baptism.

Mr. A. says, "Christ did not need the cleansing influence"—"the purifying work"—"the actual cleansing from sin—the work of the Holy Ghost in the salvation of the world," which work he says baptism represents, and yet we are buried with Christ by this Holy Ghost baptism that purifies. Why was Christ thus buried by this Holy Ghost baptism, when he did not need it? John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, and James McKnight, a prominent Presbyterian, understood Romans vi: 4, 5, and Col. ii: 12 to have reference to, or to mean a burial in water by baptism.

Your brother affectionately,
DELANCEY EGBERT.

Crab Orchard, Ky.

Is the Bible Definite?

I know, bro. Mathes, you can man up to any issue, even if it should unanswerably condemn some of your favorite theories. Some among us

seem to delight in trying to show how indefinite the Bible is. In our beginning we used to appeal to the Bible as our rule, without note or comment. We did not then criticise the Bible, and Greek-ize and grammarize the Bible until the minds of the hearers were turned from the cross to the scholar and critic. The Bible then, even the King's Version, was plain, and we delighted to say "To the law and the testimony" and as it read, was the end of the controversy. Now, young scholarly men say to call for a "Thus saith the Lord" in all we do religiously, is old fogyism; the dreams of old men in their dotage.

I fear some of our young men have studied Greek until they have become Greek, and the old plain gospel has become foolishness unto them. The false prophet, Balaam, when under God's control, said "I can not go beyond the word of the Lord, to say less or more." Paul writes, "with the holy Scriptures the man of God is perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The indefiniteness of God's word has been the plea of all system builders in all ages of the world. There is no form of Church government in the Bible, says the creed maker; then adopt any form you please. There is no form of baptism, says another; therefore make your election, sprinkle, pour, or dip, as you like. Now, say some among us, it cannot be shown definitely to whom was committed the gospel, and who ought to preach; who ought to send them, and who ought to support them. Then if God has given no instructions on the subject, we are under no obligations

to do it. Then God has not commanded us to preach; or if he has, his command is a failure, because of indefiniteness. Then comes the long chapter of expediency. We meet and form plans for ourselves, and go to work to do what God has not done. Some express great fears of centralism. They say we ought to have but a few papers, and a few colleges. Well, no doubt we have money spent to carry on other matters that would be better spent in sending men to preach to the poor; but the moment we meet to condemn one paper, or one college, and resolve in favor of our favorites, we are using moral tyranny, and running to centralism. Paper-printing and book-making is an individual enterprise, and the Church ought never to be encumbered with colleges. If some of the money spent in them was spent in sending the gospel to the poor, I think it would show to greater advantage in heaven than to present a few scholars there. The Master said he was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor.

Let us search the Word, and see if we can learn therein how the preaching of the gospel is to be perpetuated. In Mark, xvi, 15, we read, Jesus told the Apostles to "Go and preach the gospel to every creature." In Matt. xxvii, 19, 20, we read, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them. * * * Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and I will be with you to the end of the world." Then the Apostles were to teach those whom they baptized, to teach and baptize, on down to the end of the world. Paul tells Timothy to commit the

things committed to him "to faithful men, who were able to teach others also." Does any ask how such are designated? Paul tells Timothy to remember the gift which was in him by the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Paul designates another class of teachers in his first letter to Timothy, and the one to Titus, called elders or bishops. Then as the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, and as she is to hold forth the word of life, she is certainly to send preachers and sustain them. He writes, "They who preach the gospel must live of the gospel." But the hard question is, how shall we raise the money? Paul, in 2nd Cor. viii, 12-14, writes, "Let there be first a willing mind. 2d. Let not some be eased and others burdened. 3d. Let there be an equality. If any will not pay by equality, they are covetous, and to be so dealt with." In 1st Cor. xvi, Paul writes, "Let every man lay by him in store on the first day of the week, as God has prospered him. If he will not, then he is covetous.

Paul writes to the Thessalonians that "The word of God sounded out from them all around," and tells the Philippians to "Hold forth the word of life." Now, as a beginning we go back to Cane Ridge, to our beginning, and that church plants churches all around it, teaching each church to do the same. We have the pattern in the Jerusalem church. And she soon planted churches all over the Roman empire. This is not set up in opposition to any man's favorite plan, but to show the perfection of the gospel word. If my statements are not clear and Scriptural,

some brother can show it. If he can not, don't say any more, that the Bible is not full and clear in its directions to spread Christianity. In faith and love of the Bible, I am your brother in Christ,

JAS. L. THORNBERRY.

—In *Christian Record*.

Temperance Societies.

While we admit, that Temperance Societies do some good, as mere worldly institutions, by way of reforming a very few of the masses of drunkards, we are led to question very much, the expediency, or real benefit to the world, even of such organizations. But we are sure that Christians need them not. Such organizations would be well enough, if there was nothing higher—if there was, in other words—no divine plan, organized, for the reformation of mankind, then the Temperance Societies would be a benefit to the world. The formation of *any Society*, human merely—is an express declaration, that the church is inadequate to do the work, which the Society proposes to do. If we admit the necessity, and the expediency of a Society outside of the church, for the reformation of drunkards, why not, on the same principle, organize a Society for the reformation of liars, another for the reformation of thieves, etc. We might thus organize a separate society for the cure of every sin to which human nature is heir. And if our Societies should succeed, we would leave the church entirely out. What? has the gospel—the church—power to reform the liar, the murderer, the sorcerer, and every

kind of evil, save that of drunkenness? There is, indeed a thousand-fold more power in the gospel, to reform the drunkard, than in any other. The great difficulty is, that men do not properly use the power. Christians (?) drink too much themselves. What power, or influence has a man to reform drunkards, who drinks himself? And how is the influence, and power of a church weakened for this work, where its members are not only drinkers, but sellers of the vile stuff!

We know such a church. A church which not only tolerates drinking, in many of its members, but allows one to sell, and give away whiskey, to draw custom to other business, that he may hastily grow rich. Can any one of your readers tell me of a man who has made a fortune selling spirituous liquors, under the garb of religion who afterwards kept it—enjoyed it, and whose children were permitted to enjoy it? I believe that as a man sows, so shall he reap.

J. T. P.

Matth. xii: 29.

A man who has been made weak by education may surrender his house to the spoiler, but such a man "lies constantly open to mischief." When the invader, with impunity, reposes upon the ant, bee, or hornet, or thrusts his finger in the cat's mouth, and at the same time pinches its tail, then may he enter the strong man's house and spoil it without binding him. If God has cared for the ant and bee, has he not also cared for man? And in giving him the faculty—resentment, what more has he

required than: "as far as *in you lieth* live peaceably with all men."

A Christian must not take vengeance; but that he may defend his household, I for one have never doubted. As Christ died for the church so may a man die for his wife. If it is right for a man to defend his house against the spoiler, so may a whole nation combine in repelling the invader. If the Christian be on the side of the usurper it is cheerfully granted that he is in the wrong place. Possibly I am on the wrong side of this question, but it does not follow that I am therefore no Christian. If Mexico is to be annexed by subjugation and governed by carpet-bag legislation, I shall vote against it. If a drinking saloon or house of ill-fame is to be in my vicinity I will vote against them. For President I will vote for a Washington against a Nero, a Christian against an infidel. I may vote for the wrong man, but I often vote for the wrong measure in church. Dogmatists may talk of a man's being in the devil's kingdom, who directs the temporal affairs of a family, school, colony or nation, but I must see the Satanic spirit's manifestation, before I can believe it. I pray always, that our rulers may become Christians and walk by the golden rule, then will our nation be a light to the nations around us, and through the church God will be glorified in her example. Then will saloons, and gambling hells, and those other licensed horrors perish from the land we love, "or, cowering beneath the vigilant eyes of the law, sink back into Stygian darkness where the young and unwary seldom go. Then modesty may be seen unblushing on

our streets : and virtue go shopping unsuspected. I would here limit my reviewer to about 20 pages of foolscap, as our editors tire of long, windy articles.

"In hope,"

J. J. W.

Center Point, Ark.

From the Christian Monitor.

MAN AND WOMAN.

BY DR. J. H. HANAFORD.

The intelligent lad will naturally grow up and become a man and he can become no more, but he may become *less*. The blooming lass, joyous in her innocence and exuberant in the outgushing of her spirits, naturally develops into womanhood, and she need aspire to nothing higher than to occupy the position intended for her by her Creator. The true man must remain a man unless he chooses to descend to the level of the brute, or below that level, as he does when he becomes a slave of the "vile weed" and the intoxicating cup: he can not become a woman if he chooses to do so, while the true woman would not become a man and can not if she would, since she would utterly destroy the *materials* in the effort. The race is naturally and unavoidably divided into two classes, since the Creator made us *male* and *female* though *art* has seemed to produce a nondescript creature of doubtful sex or of no sex, ranging somewhere between the two, equidistant; it may be neutral. All of these efforts, however, in the wish to unsex ourselves must ever prove fruitless, so far as success and improvement

are concerned. When we may successfully cultivate "grapes" on the "bramble bush," or "gather figs of thistles," we may expect success in efforts to reverse nature in this regard and make passable men from female stock, or *vice versa*. A change is always *downward*—not progressive; a man is *manly* and a woman is *womanly*, each having characteristics as peculiar to and inseparable from themselves as the characteristics of the lion and the lamb, the oak and the pine, the rose and the thistle. "Each after his kind," is the law of the creator, and mortals must ever fail in any and all efforts to contravene that law. Each is the complement of the other, a *hemi-sphere*, perfection demanding a union of hearts. One, so far as the great interests of humanity are concerned, is as incomplete, as unfinished and as useless as the hook without the eye, the knife without its blade, and the scissors when disconnected. Perfection is found in unity, not in separation; in harmony, not in discord; in the proper relation of the distinct spheres, and not in an interchange of these spheres. Indeed, it is no more certain in the law of the sexes that man must be the father and woman the mother, than that *he* must be the leader, the rough executor, the muscle, the provider, performing the more arduous forms of labor, that demanding the greatest strength and endurance; while *she* is the teacher, moulding the mind and the soul, the one to soften and eradicate the asperities of nature, etc. He must be the personification of power and of will, it may be, of courage and of dominion. *She*, of kindness, sympathy, love,

persuasive humor, and finer feelings. He is the superior in physical development, she in moral and society characteristics. Each is mutually superior to the other, yet as unlike as some of the species of the lower orders of creation. "Man surpasses woman in strength," says H. Mann, "but the woman surpasses the man in beauty, in taste, in grace, in faith in affection, in purity. His better nature tends more to science and wisdom; hers, to love and the sympathies. He delights more in the worldly uses of the truth; she, more in its immortal beauty." Man was made to be the understanding of truth; and woman the affection of good," which, then, is the superior? Both. A quarrel between them in this regard is as wise as one would be between the oxygen and nitrogen of air or between the right eye and its left, and between the body and its several members. Woman must be the guardian and teacher of the young, or the race will die out. If she is to command armies, she must take her children with her. If she is to shine in the halls of congress, or in the arena of politics, she must divide her labors, caring for public affairs. She must do these things, must love, be an angel of mercy in the sickroom and in dens of misery and wo, or this labor must remain unperformed. She must remain a woman, or one-half of the social universe will become annihilated. She must remain true to her mission of *making men*, or the other half will be practically extinct. She is needed as a woman, but not as a man, since we have the full complement of men already; enough,

certainly for the usual duties of their position.

No careful observer can have failed to see that the direct tendency of the agitation of this subject, the *ultra* movements in favor of certain "rights," has been a conflict of the sexes, an arraying of the two names of a perfect whole, a warring of interests, and a state of things unfavorable to the welfare of both; one which neither can afford.

Erastus the Chamberlain.

Erastus is the only case in the New Testament concerning which there can be any doubt about his holding office. The letter to the Romans was written from Corinth, according to Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* now considered the best authority on the subject, in the Spring of A. D. 58. It is then he calls him the chamberlain or treasurer of the city (of Corinth.) I think it utterly impossible for him to have held this office at this time, for the following reasons:

Previous to the departure of Paul from Ephesus to Macedonia, which Conybeare and Howson fix in the Summer of 57—he ministered to Paul in Ephesus during his long stay there. See Acts xix. 22. Paul then sent him and Timothy into Macedonia, no doubt on an evangelistic tour, to precede himself, who purposed to go thither. He tarried in Asia for a season. Thence he came into Greece. Here he spends the Spring and was at Corinth. At this time he writes the letter to Rome and tells them that Erastus the chamberlain salutes them. He was here, came here not

more than three months before the letter was written, for Paul remained here only three months. Acts 2 1-3 It may have been written within a few weeks after their arrival. Erastus had been absent several years, he ministered to Paul at Ephesus, he was the companion of Timothy in his evangelical tours. Here he left Erastus, as he is not enumerated among those leaving with Paul. Acts, 20. 4. He was clearly an evangelist, had been from Corinth for two or three years, probably five, travelling with Paul, learning from him, ministering to him, and making tours evangelical himself, under Paul's instruction; after this he returns to Corinth, and within less than three months, he is called the chamberlain. It is not presumable, he would have this soon obtained an office after so protracted an absence from the city, had he desired it; and had he been permitted to hold it.

He was the companion of Timothy beyond all doubt, like him an evangelist, mentioned one with him, taught like him by Paul. Paul says to Timothy, "No man that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him that hath chosen h'im to be a soldier. If he strive also for mastery yet he is not crowned except he strive lawfully, thereby clearly implying that he who entangled himself with the affairs of this life did not strive lawfully for the Christian crown.

Erastus receiving the same teaching would not engage in the affairs of this life. Had he done so Paul would not have spoken so approvingly. Demas is one who did this. Others of the ministry who had been

with him were assigned their fields of labor as he tells us in last chapter 2nd Timothy among them Erastus abode at Corinth, with Paul's approval, no doubt as a teacher at his old home. Not as one loving this world. There are these difficulties which render it highly improbable that he at that time held office.

But here is another consideration that renders it possible. Persecution of the Christians at Corinth had fiercely raged at Corinth previous to this time. Paul refers to this in his first letter to the Corinthians and speaks of the time of this present, distress, which was so severe, that it was good not to marry. 1st. Cor. 7. 26. This persecution had continued for several years. It is almost certain that Erastus left Corinth on account of this persecution. He had been an officer of the government, a treasurer, he was converted, his prominence invited persecution, he left the city, until quiet was restored. This letter to the Corinthians was written less than a year previous to the letter to the Romans. Then the persecution was raging, a lull in the persecution takes place; he immediately returns home. The idea that he would be tolerated for the important office of treasurer should he desire it, is absurd. Nero was still Emperor, and who believes he could have tolerated a man as treasurer of this important city, who was so earnest and prominent as a Christian as was Erastus, so full of zeal as to leave home and to become the companion and successor of Paul for years, so prominent as to be sent by him with Timothy on important missions. The jailer knew that to let his prisoners escape was

death. Yet when he was converted turned them out and invited death. Those who think Christians could be tolerated in such positions, are lamentably ignorant of the condition of affairs.

Gibbon says, "for three centuries Christians could with truth and confidence say that they held the doctrine of passive obedience, and for three centuries their conduct had always been conformable to their principles." You can find much from Gibbon on this subject. Vol. 1 page 256, vol. 2, page 505, 546, 586. Vol. 3, page 1-46-61-60-62-69-254-256-275, &c

Paul, Bishop of Samosata was expelled from position A. D. 270, for accepting a magistracy among other things. Lardner, vol. 21, page 668. The above chronology differs some from the common as marked in the Bible. But the connections are the same. The events stand similarly related to each other though moved forward a couple of years.

Those of Cæsar's household were his slaves, not the officers of his government.

Conybeare and Howson say "There were (at Paul's prison) some of these unhappy bondsmen who first tasted of spiritual freedom, and were prepared to brave with patient heroism the tortures under which they soon were destined to expire in the gardens of the Vatican." [page 796.

Erastus was simply called the chamberlain because he had likely held it when converted as a distinguishing cognomen. Just as Matthew was called the publican, Luke the physician &c. because they had held the positions at the time of conversion.

Perfection.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

From the foregoing, perfection lies within our reach, and we have only to exercise the proper energy in investigating the Scriptures, and thereby furnish ourselves not only to one good work, or some good works, but "unto all good works."

We are surrounded by so many things that are said to be good works and good things, at times it is difficult to tell whether or not we shall engage in them; a man will call our attention to a work that he declares is good, for he has tried it, and will enumerate many advantages it offers, the great rapidity with which it spreads among the people, the great need of just such a work, and we are almost persuaded to put our shoulders to the wheel and forward this work with a strong zeal; but just before the child of God does this, he had better receive counsel from the Scriptures, knowing that God's ways are above man's ways, and that which man calls good, God may call evil.

Since we are not partly but *thoroughly* furnished to all good works, it may not be so difficult after all, if we pursue the proper course, to tell what is good and what is evil. If we are furnished the work in the Scriptures, we certainly may engage in it and cannot spend too much energy in advancing and building it

up; the Scriptures are silent in regard to it let the Christian's lips not be opened in its advocacy, his heart closed to its reception and his energy turned into that channel the word of God opens to him.

We are often presented the argument, that we should engage in a work because the best and most influential men of the world are participating in and advocating it: but the Scriptures say to the members of Christ's kingdom, "your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men," and the wisdom of the princes of the world shall come to nought, that "we have received not the spirit of the world but the Spirit which is of God,—and the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God." From these passages we must learn not to put too much confidence in the sayings and doings of even the princes of the world.

Again we are presented the fact, that by engaging in certain works, through the aid of the world, our wealth will be increased and we be enabled to do more for the cause of our Lord. To the Scriptures again Christian; they say, "the friendship of the world is enmity with God," and "if a man will be a friend to the world he is an enemy to God;" and besides, an offering made to God that was obtained through means inconsistent with his will we know is an abomination in his sight.

We have some works recommended, outside of the church of Christ, for our wives and daughters to engage in, that society may be improved and social relations established. Christians, look how our Savior related himself to the society of the

world. "Who for the joy set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." "If any man will come after me let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me."

There is a work recommended that we may buy and sell much more profitably, which seems most laudable, and we doubt not God intends us to enjoy the fruit of our labor—but "what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ let us go on to perfection."

RUFUS HOOVER.

Bellebuckle, Tenn.

QUERIES.

Bros. L. & S.: It seems that there is a great wrong among our brethren in a great many places or I must confess I am wrong. I wish to ask if our brethren, old in years and in the cause do their duty, when they go to church, take their seats back so as not to be asked to take part in the meeting? Maybe one would get up and read a chapter and exhort the brethren to be more faithful, then refuse to pray. We have old brethren who don't even return thanks at their tables; and brethren, we have old members who never let their children hear them pray. In the second chapter of first Peter, that apostle tells new born babes to desire the sincere milk of the word, and certainly the older brethren ought to impart it to them. But some of our brethren hide it from them and

the food is never administered at all. Is it not the duty of the head of every family, male or female, if a Christian, to pray with and for their children?

I remain as ever in the one hope,
EARNEST.

There can be no mistake but that God has ordained that the older members of the church should teach the younger members, and be examples for the younger ones, in everything. Paul told the elders (the older ones) at Ephesus, that they were to feed the flock, over which the Holy Spirit had made them the overseers. But one great misfortune is, that many of the members never take any interest in studying the Scriptures for themselves, to say nothing of teaching them to others. Many are like they were in the days of Paul; at the time they ought to be teachers of others, they need that some one should teach them the first principles of our holy religion. If all the members would only take an interest in the study of the Scriptures, and the older members would strive to teach the younger ones their duty, and put them to work at such things as they are competent to do, the churches might speedily edify themselves in love, and at the same time sound out the word of God to their neighbors, and the good Cause would then advance much more rapidly than at present. Brethren who have families should certainly pray in their families, and so ought widowed sisters we think, when there are no male members to lead.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: I believe it is admitted on all hands that every thing under the Jewish economy was a type of something that should be in

the Christian dispensation. That is so far as God's revealed will to man is concerned. Will you answer the following question through the Advocate: What are the antitypes of the High Priest, the common priest, and the people of the Jewish nation?

Your Bro. in Christ,

THOS. WHITE.

Fountain Ceeek, Tenn.

Each thing in the Jewish dispensation does not have a distinct and separate antitype. Different types often point to the same general antitype, each one usually typifying some particular feature of the antitype. There were many types of the Savior. No two probably typifying precisely the same idea concerning him. David typified his kingly power, Isaac his sacrificial, as the only begotten of the Father, Moses his Mediatorial, and prophetic. Each one of the prophets, we think probable, was intended to typify some characteristic of the Savior, or his mission and work.

The high priest who entered once a year into the holy of holies, to make atonement for the sins of the Jewish nation, typified and pointed to Christ, who once for all entered into Heaven itself. "For Christ is not entered into the Holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God, for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest enters into the Holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he have suffered often since the foundation of the world, but now once, in the end

of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

The high priest typified Christ. The common priests who entered only the outer courts in their privileges and rights of approach to God with their own sacrifices, typified the disciples of Christ. "Ye also, as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by (through) Jesus Christ." 1st Peter 2: 5. "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that you should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." 9th verse. "Hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father." Rev. 1: 5. "And has made us kings and priests unto our God." Rev. 5: 10. Thus the Priests typify Christians in their privileges and honors in the kingdom of God. Yet the Jewish people themselves as a distinct and peculiar people of God, separated from the world, subject to God's laws and dealt with and ruled over by God were types of the people of God through Christ, their separateness and distinctness. The manner of God's dealings with them, their obedience and disobedience, their rewards and punishments, all were types of the followers of God in Christ Jesus. The priests typified one feature or characteristic under Christ that differed from the condition of the Jewish people under Moses.

One type cannot fully represent an antitype superior to or above the type. So to represent all the char-

acteristics of the superior kingdom of Christ, there must have been several of one antitype each bearing on some characteristic, as there were many types of Christ.

Bros. L. & S.: In a Sunday-school class with Bro. John Owen of St. Louis some time since, I took the position against him and Bro. McGarvey's Commentary that the gift of the Holy Spirit promised in Acts ii: 38 is eternal life or is the birth of the Spirit from the tomb to eternal life when our Savior shall appear to judge the world and is also the birth of the Spirit that our Savior alluded to in John iii: 5. Am I right?

V. B. WALKER.

Paris, Tenn.

This has just come under my eye. We think the brother wholly wrong, but must refer him to response made to Bro. R. Warden in No. 5, current vol. of Advocate, under caption, "Born of the Spirit." We think the gift of the Spirit on Pentecost was the Spirit himself. The Apostles had just received the Spirit. They promised it to those present as a consequence of obedience. The language would convey the idea that it was an immediate result of obedience. Acts x: 44 says, "While Peter yet spake the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. They of the circumcision were astonished" because on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. Peter says, "who can forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as we." Thus the Holy

Ghost falling on them, the gift of the Holy Ghost and their receiving of the Holy Ghost, all were one and the same thing.

That he was always received with his wonder-working power, we do not believe, but that the reception of the Holy Ghost himself is receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, we do not doubt. God through the Spirit dwells in his church. Entering into that church we drink into that Spirit and he becomes a guest of our own hearts.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S.: You will please give us an explanation of Galatians iv: 22-29, and oblige

Your Bro. in Christ,

JAMES A. LEE.

Fayette Co. Texas, April 2, 1874.

In the verses referred to, Paul is speaking of the two covenants or institutions; the Jewish and Christian. These two covenants were foreshadowed in the family of Abraham. Hagar, the bond-woman, and her son Ishmael, are understood as prefiguring the Jewish covenant, the Mosaical institution and the Jewish people. Sarah and her son Isaac, prefigured the New Institution, the church of God, and the people of God under that institution. And as Hagar and her son were cast out of the family of Abraham after Isaac's birth, so the Jewish or Mosaical economy was disannulled or cast out, when the Christian institution, or new covenant was established. So that we are now under the new institution, and must be saved by it, if saved at all.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S.: As there is division in the congregation at this place in regard to Christians belonging to secret societies, please let us hear from you through your valuable paper the GOSPEL ADVOCATE, and oblige

Your brother in Christ,

J. A. L.

Fayette Co. Tex, April 2nd, 1874.

The very fact that there is division in sentiment among the brethren in regard to this matter, ought to be reason enough for letting such things alone. In matters of doubtful propriety, such as this is with these brethren, there is always one safe side. We all know that unless God ordained these secret societies, and required his people to work in them, it is perfectly safe to let them alone. Everybody knows that in the sight of God and men, it will be perfectly safe, always to let these secret organizations alone. We have never yet known an instance of division of sentiment arising among Christians simply because they let these things alone. The division is always because some will go into such things, while others think it not proper to do so. Jesus says, "every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." Unless it can be shown that God has planted these institutions, then it remains perfectly certain that they will be rooted up. God has ordained the church, as the institution through which his people are to work, and has given them his holy word as the rule by which they are to live, and that word is said to be sufficient to furnish the man of God to all good

works. The highest possible good that man can attain on this earth, is furnished in the church of God, through his word. The church of God is the head-quarters of all that is good. And whatever there is in secret societies that is good, has been taken from the word of God. Christ told the disciples that the world hated them, because he had chosen them out of the world. He says of his disciples "they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world."

There is room enough in the church for the accomplishment of every good thing that lies in the power of man to do. And wherever one single good thing is found in these secret organizations, that same thing is found somewhere in the word of the Lord, and is required of his people. If therefore Christians desire to do good, the highest possible good is found in the church of the living God. We can therefore see no good reason for Christians going into any sort of secret organizations, since all the good that they can do, is found and required in the church. When we perform good in the name of Christ, he is honored. But if we do these things in the name of some worldly organization, the world gets the honor. When Christians go into these worldly organizations through which to work and do good, it is an open acknowledgment that the church, to that extent is a failure, and that to that extent man's wisdom is superior to that of God.

In the church is the true and proper place for the Christian man to work, and do good for his fellow man. Since the church is

the highest institution on earth, whenever the Christian goes into these human institutions through which to do good, he descends to a lower position. Let all Christians then firmly maintain their high position as Christians, and strive to make the church what God intended it to be, and no Christian will then think of leaving it to go elsewhere to seek channels through which to do good.

E. G. S.

Brother Sewell: I find in the GOSPEL ADVOCATE No. 14 page 328, the following: "We as a people have never denied that there are Christians among the Baptists. All who obey the Gospel of Christ are Christians, whether among the Baptists, or elsewhere. But we claim that Christians should all stand together as one people and drop all unsriptural names and rules of faith and practice, and be simply Christians." Now brother S. I am very fond of showing the ADVOCATE to my Sectarian friends and letting them read it, but when it comes to such a passage, as this they say at once you acknowledge us to be as good as men can be (Christians). We do not wish to be any better: neither do I. My Baptist and other sectarian friends claim that they are Christians before they are baptized, and that baptism is not essential to salvation, which we do not recognize as obedience to the Gospel of Christ. Now if there are some (which there are) who believe that baptism is essential and are baptized accordingly, can they be Christians and fellowship those who they know have not obeyed the Gospel of Christ, or

would it not be more in accordance with divine teaching for them to come out from among the disobedient and fellowship those who they believe had obeyed the Gospel? You are ready to say obedience to the Gospel will admit all into the Holy City, so am I. But can a man obey the Gospel and be a Baptist, a Presbyterian or a Methodist? If so either one of these is good enough, and we would have nothing to sacrifice to withdraw from our church, and attach ourselves to whichever of these suited our conveniences best. In fact if we can be Christians and belong to any denomination, it is our duty to withdraw from what is called the Christian Church, (as it is small and not very popular anyway,) and attach ourselves to the largest and most flourishing denomination we can find, for by this means we will be instrumental in harmonizing the religious world, and bringing about unity instead of increasing the dissension. Now brother, I think that if we are Christians and fail to obey the commandments which God has given to us as Christians to obey, right then we fail to be Christians. And if we follow his commandments we are perfectly joined together—of one mind and judgment, all speaking the same things. Are we the disciples of Christ or Christians, and the Baptists and other sectarians in this condition? Please let me hear from you again on the subject.

Yours Fraternaly,

WM. RING,

Bradyville Tenn.

We see that Brother Ring has misapprehended our brief remarks on

the subject referred to, and as others may have done the same, we will say a few things more. We are astonished that Brother Ring thinks we intended to endorse the Baptist organization, or any other organization, except that revealed in the New Testament. We meant simply this: Every one that obeys the Gospel of Christ is a Christian, a child of God. And we have never yet denied but that there are some of these among the Baptists, as we said before. And all we could ask or expect of them is, that they should come out from that organization, and stand upon the one foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. This is just what we as a people are trying to accomplish, so far as that matter is concerned. We are trying to induce all Christians to leave all denominational organizations of every description, and stand with us upon the word of God, and that alone. Abandoning all human names and human wisdom in matters of religion, and be guided alone by the word of God. You will please notice Bro. Ring, that I did not admit that every man is a Christian among the Baptists who claims to be. I only admit that there are Christians among them; and should hate very much to think that none of them had obeyed the Gospel of Christ. But we believe that every one that has, ought to come out from among them, and wear no name as the followers of Jesus but such as are found in the New Testament, and belong to no organization except the one therein revealed, called sometimes the Church of God, and sometimes the kingdom of

God, the house of God, and the temple of God. But this institution revealed in the Scriptures is never called the Baptist Church, nor the Methodist church. These organizations as such are unknown in the Scriptures, and we want all Christians to abandon them.

We do not admit, nor have we ever admitted that anything will make a Christian, except an humble obedience to the Gospel of Christ. But that some people do this, and join themselves to these organizations, we have never denied. But in all sincerity we ask them to come out. No do we think they have wholly unchristianized themselves because they have lived for a time in these organizations. If brother Ring runs all his interpretations of the Scriptures to as great an extreme as he has my language, he can prove anything he chooses by the Bible. We simply stated we did not deny that there were Christians among the Baptists. But out of that admission he makes out a general endorsement of all the different denominations, and thinks that upon that principle, we ought to leave the Church of God, and join themselves to some of the denominations. Now we are perfectly sure that we said nothing that taken in the connection in which we placed it, could possibly intimate such a thing. We hope our brother will look a little more carefully next time and not interpret things quite so extravagantly. He can understand us now we hope. We do not believe in wholesale condemnations of every thing, and every body. We believe in being moderate and respectful to all, and win people to

the truth by love and kindness, if we possibly can. Not by compromising the truth with their errors, but give them credit for what they have done, and in kindness induce them to finish whatever they have left undone.

E. G. S.

HYMN BOOKS.

We ask our brethren to notice that the Hymn book we sell is the Canada book, and not the Cincinnati one. Brethren sometimes send to us for books, and when we send them they find it is not the book they wanted; they then have the trouble and expense to send them back. This is also a trouble and expense to us. We state in our advertisement on second page of the *ADVOCATE* that we sell the Canada edition, and we hope the brethren will bear this in mind, in ordering books. The Canada edition is nearly like the book last published by Bro. A. Campbell. About the same size, with a few of those hymns left out, and a few others added. A very convenient pocket size.

E. G. S.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: We have a number of most excellent brethren around here. Lord'sday two weeks ago, Bro. Cook organized a church in our little town (Fulton Station) of twenty-six members with about the same number yet to be added. Bro. Cook is a very able and efficient preacher. I will use every reasonable effort to circulate the *Advocate* for it is truly a valuable paper.

Your brother,

WM. B. LAURENCE.

Fulton Station, Ky.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

Why Cannot Farmers be Neat in Their Houses?

"I have been a farmer," writes a correspondent from Maine, "for 25 years and during that time I have been in a great many houses and have often been pained to see the men come into the sitting-room and even the parlor, where there were neatly dressed ladies, with an old, dirty, slouched hat on and with pantaloons tucked inside dirty boots. To me such sights are very painful, and I have often asked the question, Why cannot farmers be neat in their houses as well as other men? A great many farmers' wives have neat, clean rooms, good furniture, and they dress themselves neat and tasty; but the man of the house, and often the hired men and boys, will sit all the evening with their hats on, and worse still, chewing and spitting and smoking tobacco. Can children be properly educated in such an atmosphere? How refined and neatly-dressed ladies can endure it is astonishing to me. I am a poor man, and have always worked hard, but for all the time I have lived on a farm, I have never, even once, sat one hour, day or evening with my hat on in the family. What better education can children have than example? I never think of sitting down with my family without washing, combing my hair, and putting on a coat that I have not worn during the day. As soon as it is dark in the Fall, Winter

and Spring, we have the table set in the middle of the floor, the lamp lighted, and the shade on, for we never read or write an hour without a shade, and then we sit down to reading, writing and social conversation. Another thing; I always have my work, chores and all, done by dark, so as never to go to the barn in the evening, and thus I have time every night to read. I have long desired to see a reform among farmers in the particulars I have named, for there is no class of people who might, if they would, take so much comfort as farmers."

There is no doubt in the minds of a great many young women that if farmers as a rule were more observant of the amenities of life in their homes, the complaints of the scarcity of good farmers' wives would be fewer, and the young farmer would stand a more even chance with the professional man in winning the favor of the fair sex. The prospect of sitting every evening of one's life except Sundays in company with a pair of boots that have been worn all day in all kinds of work, with a suit of clothes odorous with anything but clover hay, isn't, to say the least, as pleasant as some other prospects we might describe. The girl who thinks it is, isn't a very tasteful girl or is very anxious to get married, and when she succeeds won't make a very agreeable home. As for the tobacco, a young lady runs about an even chance in any of the trades or professions for spending her days in inhaling the aroma of that fragrant sedative; farmers not monopolizing the habit.

But while the practices hinted at do

exist in various parts of the country, there are thousands of farmers' homes where as much refinement of manner and habit mark the daily life as in any of our city homes, and where under heavy boots, slouched hats and soiled linen beat manly hearts, as loyal to virtue and true to every noble sentiment as though they were habited in spotless broadcloth and snowy linen. It is natural for the honest son of rural toil to believe that real manliness does not consist in laundry or boot polish, in having ones hands immaculate and ones teeth pearly, in the parting of the hair behind and the mustache fashionably trimmed. These points so carefully guarded by our city gentlemen, seem as if they are in one sense quite immaterial when set off against the great issues of life and character, good crops, sturdy virtues, honest purpose. At the same time we will titho the mint if we can without neglecting justice, mercy, and the love of God.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

BE DILIGENT.

God's blessing waits upon the diligent. Not to idle loiterers, but faithful workers, does he reveal himself. Sluggards find themselves overlooked and passed by, while men who are "not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord," are honored of the Most High in the varied manifestations of his providence and of his grace.

Abraham was an active business man, with hundreds of servants, and numerous flocks and herds. Gen. xiv. 14; xxiv. 35. Job had thousands of

cattle, and was a man of enterprise, as well as of patience. Job. i. 3. Rebecca came not to be a mother of the faithful, through yawning over novels, and plying coquettish arts, but by drawing water for thirsty camels, and showing kindness to a wearied traveller (Gen. x. 15-28): just as Ruth, the young Moabitess, was taken into the family of the faithful, and made a mother of kings, and of Christ, not through any of the wiles or blandishments of fashionable life, but by gleaning for her widowed mother-in-law in the harvest fields of Biaz. Jacob was going on his way with cattle and flocks and household, when the angels of God met him; and he had but just turned aside to spend the night in prayer, when he found the wondrous stranger, who wrestled with him in the darkness, and blessed him as the morning broke. Gen. xxxii. Not by sad repinings at a cruel fate, but by constant fidelity, whether as a slave of Potiphar, or in the Egyptian prison-house did Joseph come to stand next the throne of Paraoah, and deliver Egypt and Israel in the days of sore distress. Gen. xxxix. xl. It was when Moses kept the flocks of Jericho in the wilderness of Midian, that God revealed himself in the burning bush. Ex. iii. 1-4. It was when Joshua stood before the walls of Jericho, that the angel appeared to him as the captain of the host of God Jo. hua v. 13-15. Gideon was threshing wheat by the oak-tree, when he was chosen to lead the nation, and discomfit the host of Midian. Judges vi. 11-16. Saul was hunting for his lost cattle when he was called to be leader of

God's people, and to deliver them from their foes. 1 Sam. ix. 10. David came fresh from watching over Jesse's sheep, to be anointed by Samuel as King of Israel. 1 Sam. xxii. 13. Elisha was plowing with twelve yoke of oxen in the field, when he felt the touch of Elijah's mantle, and left his labor to follow and succeed the man of God. 1 Kings xix. 19-21. Daniel had charge of the finances of the vast empire of Persia, and, even after the visions of God had astonished his soul, he still arose, and "did the King's business," as he had before. Dan. vi. 1 2; viii. 27. Nehemiah was cup-bearer to the King of Persia, when he was appointed to go up to Jerusalem and rebuild the holy city's fallen walls. Nehem. ii. 1-8. Zachariah was burning incense before the Lord, "in order of his course," when the birth of John the Baptist was foretold to him by the celestial messenger. Luke i. 8, 1. The shepherds of Bethlehem were watching their flocks by night, when the glory of the Lord appeared, the Savior's birth was announced, and angel-voices proclaimed, "Peace on earth, and good will to men." Luke ii. 8 14. Simeon and Anna had both gone up to the house of prayer, when they met the Messiah, for whose coming they so long had waited. Luke ii. 25-38. John was preaching and baptizing in Jordan, when the Lamb of God was revealed to his believing eyes. John i. 28-36. Matthew was sitting at the receipt of custom, when called of Christ to follow him. Matt. ix. 9. Simon and Andrew were casting a net into the sea, when Jesus summoned them to his service, and said that they

should be fishers of men. Mark i. 16-18. James and John were mending their nets when they were called to be disciples and apostles of the Lord. Mark i. 19-20. The woman of Samaria had come to Jacob's well to draw water, when she met the Savior, and heard him speak of that well that springeth up to everlasting life. John iv. 6-14. Lydia was by the river side, in the place where prayer was wont to be made, when she heard from Paul and Silas the words of grace and truth. Acts xvi. 13-15. And John, the beloved disciple, in the solitudes of Patmos, was already "in the spirit on the Lord's day," when Christ himself appeared in glory to his vision. Rev. i. 9-20.

The path of present duty and devotion is the path of safety, blessing, prosperity. It is not in listlessness and vain repinings for our lot, that we prepare ourselves for higher and more honored service; but it is in the faithful and constant performance of those homely, useful acts of common life, which serve to test our faith, and patience, and discipline us for more important ministries. He that is faithful in the least, will be faithful in that which is greater; and if God finds in us fidelity in the common things of earthly life, and use for his glory in this life, he may be expected to entrust us with true riches, and use us for his glory in this world, and call us at last to see his face and serve him in his presence forever.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Baptism and Remission of sins.....	409
Review of Rev. J. Atkins, Sr.....	412
Is the Bible Definite?.....	415
Temperance Societies.....	417
Math. xii: 29.....	418
Man and woman.....	419
Erastus the chamberlain.....	420
Perfection.....	423
Queries.....	423
Hymn books.....	429
Church News.....	429
Fireside	
Why cannot farmers be neat in their houses?.....	430
Be diligent.....	431

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 19.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MAY 7, 1874.

Memoirs of Jesus.

—
TRIAL OF JESUS BEFORE PONTIUS
PILATE [APRIL 7TH. A. D. 29.]
—

“And immediately, in the morning, the Chief Priests, together with the elders and the Scribes and the whole Sanhedrim, having held a consultation, and having led him away delivered him to Pontius Pilate.”

Pilate was then governor of Judea under the authority of Tiberius Cæsar emperor of Rome. It was therefore necessary that Jesus be tried in the presence of the Roman Governor.

Having conveyed their Prisoner to the Governor's palace in Jerusalem, the Jews, who appear not yet to have eaten the passover, refused to go in, lest they should become contaminated with Gentile impurity, and rendered unfit to partake of the paschal lamb! But what availed their external purification, while internally they were full of moral corruption?

As they refused to enter the palace of the Governor, “Pilate came out to them, and said :

“What accusation do you bring against this man?”

They, replying, said to him :

“If this man were not an evil-doer, we would not have delivered him to you.”

Then Pilate said to them :

“Take him yourselves, and try him according to your law.”

Then the Jews said to him :

“It is not lawful for us to put any one to death.”

[This they said], that the word of Jesus might be verified which he spoke signifying by what [kind of] death he was about to die.”

Turning back to Matthew, (c. xx., vv. 18, 19,) we may read the prediction of Jesus, and which was now about to be verified :

“See,” said Jesus to the twelve, “we are going up to Jerusalem ; and the Son of Man will be betrayed to the Chief Priests and the Scribes ; and they will condemn him to die, and will also deliver him over to the Gentiles to be mocked, whipped, and crucified ; and on the third day he will rise again.”

The young disciple should notice here, how literally, how minutely, how exactly every part of the Saviour's prediction is being fulfilled.

This will inspire him with confidence in Jesus, our great Prophet, Priest, and King.

Clarke's comment in this place is also worthy of note: "The punishment of the cross," says he, "was Roman, not Jewish; but the Chief Priests condemned him to it, and the Romans executed the sentence."

As Jesus was to be crucified, he had to be delivered over to those who punished by crucifying. And as the Gentiles were to become partakers of the benefits of Christ's death as well as the Jews, it was proper that they should share with those Jews the guilt, by helping them to commit the crime, of putting him to death.

But what did the priests mean, when they said, "It is not lawful for us to put any one to death?" It is presumed that the "power of life and death," (that is, the authority to take away the life and cause the death of a criminal,) had been taken away from the Jews by the Romans, and that, according to the Roman Law, they could not now execute the sentence of death. But, in an ecclesiastical sense, it certainly was lawful to put one to death by stoning; for, if they had had no authority from Moses or the Rabbins to put criminals to death, how could they, when Stephen was accused of blasphemy, have stoned him to death? (Acts vii. 59, 60.)

When Jesus was found guilty of Blasphemy, (according to the Chief Priests' erratic judgment,—Matth. xxvi. 65.) they pronounced him "worthy of death." And they said to Pilate: "We have a law; and according to our law, he ought to die;

because he made himself out* the Son of God." (John xix. 7.) But though they had sentenced Jesus to death, for calling himself the Son of God, they now tried to induce Pilate to execute their wish to have him put to death, by representing him as an enemy of the Roman Government.

Therefore, "they now began to accuse him, saying: "We found this man turning the people away [from their allegiance to the Roman Government,] and forbidding the paying of tax to Cæsar, saying that he himself is the Anointed One, [that is,] a king.'" But it was not true, that Jesus forbade tax-paying. And they only wished, by representing Jesus as setting himself up as a king, in opposition to the Government of Cæsar, to ingratiate themselves with Pilate, in order that he might execute their will to have Jesus crucified.

"Pilate then entered the Governor's palace again; and calling Jesus, said to him:

'Are you the King of the Jews?'

Jesus answering, said to him:

'Do you say this from yourself? or did others speak about me to you?'

Pilate replied:

'Am I a Jew? Your own nation, and the Chief Priests have delivered you to me. What have you done?'

Jesus answered:

'My kingdom is not from this world. If my kingdom were from this world, then my servants would fight, in order that I might not be

* "Made out" by many common people instead of "represented." But perhaps it would be better to read it "he represented himself as," etc.

delivered to the Jews. But now my kingdom is not from here?†

Then Pilate said to him:

'You are a king, then?'

Jesus replied:

'You say that I am a king. For this destiny I was born—for this purpose I came into the world that I might testify to the truth. Every one who is [a son] of truth listens to my voice.'

Pilate said to him:

'What is truth?'

Without waiting for Jesus to reply, the Governor went out again and spoke to the Chief Priests and to the crowds:

'I find no fault in this man.'

But they became the more urgent, and accusing him of many things, said:

'He excites the people, teaching throughout the whole of Judea, commencing in Galilee, [and continuing] to this place.'

Pilate, observing the silence of the prisoner during these false accusations, "said to Jesus:

'Do you offer no reply? See how many things they are testifying against you!'

But Jesus made no further reply so that Pilate was astonished."

Pilate, having heard the Jews mention Galilee, asked if the man were a Galilean. "And when he learned that he belonged to Herod's dominion, he sent him to Herod, who at that time was in Jerusalem."

Luke mentions, as a result of this act of courtesy, by which Pontius Pilate showed respect to Herod An-

tipas, Tetrach of Galilee, that "on the same day Pilate and Herod became friends to one another. (For before this, they had been at enmity with each other.)"

"When Herod saw Jesus, he rejoiced very much; for he had for a long time, desired to see some miracle performed by him. So he questioned him concerning many things; but,"—to Herod's great surprise and disgust,—"he made him no answer.

"Then the Chief Priests and the Scribes stood by, and vehemently accused him. But Herod and his guards treated him with contempt; and having mocked him, and put on him a gaudy robe, he sent him back to Pilate."

O, to think that the Son of God, the sinless One, should be treated so! But if he could bear such contemptuous treatment from those he died to save, cannot his disciples endure persecution, scorn, and ignominy on account of his name, and for the sake of salvation?

It is singular that Jesus did not say or do anything to gratify the curiosity of Herod. Did he despise Herod as an unworthy prince, because he had in his weakness caused the death of John the Baptist? He certainly did not acknowledge the Jurisdiction of Herod, or wish to be tried by him.

But when Jesus had been taken back to the Pretorium, "Pilate called together the Chief Priests and the rulers of the people."

THE SECOND APPEARANCE OF JESUS BEFORE PILATE—BARABBAS RELEASED, AND JESUS CONDEMNED TO BE CRUCIFIED.

Before commencing the proceedings

† The subject of war, suggested by this remark, will be the theme of the next chapter if the Lord is willing.

of this second part of Jesus' trial, Pilate took his seat as judge, upon a temporary throne, or judge's bench on the pavement, with Jesus near him, and the eager crowd around who were anxious to hear the Governor's decision. "While sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent a message to him saying :

'Have nothing to do with that righteous man; for to-day I have in a dream, suffered much on his account.'

We, of the present, may not believe much in dreams; but Pilate's wife did; and this dream of hers, which probably related to the innocence of the prisoner,—possibly warned her of the ultimate fate of her husband,† should he by passing sentence against Jesus, incur the guilt of his murder,—this "peculiar" dream must have been strongly impressed upon Mrs. Pilate's mind; otherwise she would not have sent to the Governor such a message at such a time.

Pilate, "knowing that it was through envy that the Jews had delivered up" Jesus to him to be put to death, now addressed them as follows: "You have brought to me this man, as [being] one that turns away the people; and see! I have examined him in your presence, and have found in the man no fault, respecting those things of which you accuse him. Nor, indeed, did Herod; for I sent you to him; and see! nothing deserving death has been done by him. I will, therefore, chastise and release him.'

For it was necessary for him, according to custom, to liberate one

[prisoner] during the Festival whom-ever they desired. And there was, lying bound with his fellow-insurgents, a noted prisoner, a robber,—named Barabbas, who had in the insurrection committed murder. And the crowd, crying out [with loud voices,] began to ask him to do "as he had always done for them."

But Pilate, knowing their wicked motives, "answered them saying :

'Do you wish me to release to you the King of the Jews?'

But the whole crowd being instigated by the Chief Priests, cried out :

'No, not this man; away with him, and release Barabbas to us.'

Then Pilate, desirous of liberating Jesus, called out to them again :

'What, then, do you wish me to do with him whom you call the Christ the King of the Jews?'

Again they cried out :

'Crucify him.'

He said to them the third time :

'Why? What evil hath he done?'

But they, urgently, with loud voices, answered :

'Crucify him, Crucify him.'

When Pilate saw that he gained nothing, but that, rather a tumult was rising, he took [some] water, and washed his hands before the crowd and said :

'I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man; you will see to it.'

And all the people, answering, said :

"[The guilt of] his blood be upon us and upon our children.'

Then Pilate, willing to gratify the crowd," yielded to the clamor of the enraged priests and excited people; and, releasing Barabbas, the robber

† Pilate is said to have committed suicide, (See Smith's Dict., Art. Pilate.)

and murderer, he sentenced the Righteous One to die on the Roman Cross.

"Pilate, therefore, took Jesus and whipped him. And the soldiers having plaited a crown of thorn-branches, put it upon his head; they also put on him a purple and scarlet robe, and, kneeling before him said in derision :

'Hail! King of the Jews!'

Then they struck him on the head with a reed," and "with their open hands."

They 'also "spit' on him," and, "bowing their knees," pretended to worship him.

These preliminary indignities having been wantonly bestowed upon the Savior, "Pilate came out again, and said to them :

'See! I am bringing him out to you, that you may know that I find no fault in him.'

Then Jesus came out, wearing the crown of thorn branches, and the purple robe. And Pilate said to them :

'Look upon the man!'

When the chief priests and their attendants saw him, they cried out saying :

'Crucify him, crucify him :

Pilate said to them :

'Do you take him, and crucify him for I find no fault in him.'

The Jews replied :

'We have a law; and according to our law, he ought to die, because he made himself out the Son of God.'

Then Pilate on hearing this word, was the more afraid; and [the soldiers conducted Jesus back into the hall,] he entered the governor's palace again, and said to Jesus :

'Where are you from?'

But Jesus made him no reply. Then Pilate said to him :

Do you not speak to me? Are you not aware that I have authority to crucify you, as well as authority to liberate you?'

Jesus replied :

'You could have no authority over me, had it not been given you from above. For this reason, he that delivered me to you has the greater sin.'

After this Pilate sought to release him. But the Jews cried out, saying :

'If you release this man, you are not Cæsar's friend. Every one who makes himself a king, speaks against Cæsar.'

Then Pilate hearing that word, led Jesus out "into the pavement, (called, in Hebrew the Gabbatha,) and took his seat on the Judge's bench again.

"It was now the preparation for the passover, and about the third hour" (9 o'clock in the morning,) and he said to the Jews :

'Look upon your king!'

But they cried out :

'Away with him! away with him! Crucify him!'

Pilate said to them :

'Shall I crucify your king?'

The Chief Priests replied :

'We have no king but Cæsar.'

Then he, therefore, delivered him to them to be crucified." (John xix. 16.)

"And the soldiers, "having derided him, took the purple robe off him, put his own clothes on him, and led him away to crucify him."

We shall let the scene close for the present till we silently meditate on what passed during those three

momentous hours. Perhaps we should say those nine long hours, during which Jesus endured "cruel mockings and scourgings," and "contradictions of sinners against himself."

It ought to make a deep and lasting impression on the mind of every attentive reader, who reads the narratives of the capture and trial of Jesus, to observe Peter's cowardice, and contrast it with his subsequent boldness; also, to see the caution hesitancy, and indecision of Pilate, when influenced by political considerations to act contrary to his most solemn convictions. Without any attempted analysis of the character of that pusillanimous prince, the commonest reader will be able to learn an important and valuable lesson.

W. PINKERTON.

Waynesfield O., April 18, 1874.

Reply to Dr. T. W. Brents.

(For the Gospel Advocate.)

TO THE REV. T. W. BRENTS.

Dear Sir: In the 12th of March No. of this paper, which accidentally fell into my hands, a month after its publication, I see you worry yourself to little purpose, over an article I furnished the *Christian Advocate*, on the question, "What is faith?" When I read what you had to say, I thought myself very fortunate that you had entirely missed your victim. For if the "railing accusation," of dishonesty and deceit in handling the word of God, were hurled at me with such anxiety to convict, while perfectly innocent of such wicked things, how would I have fared from your tender mercies, if you could

only have made out a case? No, Mr. Brents, you can win no laurels in that direction. We belong not to that crafty class of theological jugglers, who handle the word of God deceitfully. So far from it, you may find out before we are done, that we do not even handle you "deceitfully." The paragraph you quote from me, containing the objectionable passage, is as follows:

"The world was ruined by a falsehood; it must be restored by the truth. Man was lost by believing Satan; he must be saved by believing God. Therefore it is absolutely certain, that whatever else faith may be, it is to all men a question of the last importance. Its importance stands alone, as God has made it the only condition of eternal salvation. All other obligations divinely commanded, are connected with, or proceed from faith.

The considerations are inexpressibly glorious, or inconceivably dreadful. On this side, and on that, Eternal Truth has proclaimed, He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."

So, it seems what aroused your zealous denunciations was, "*Eternal truth has proclaimed; He that believeth shall be saved: he that believeth not shall be damned.*" This we gave as the great gospel axiom, declared by divine revelation. Not dependent by any means, upon the testimony of St. Mark alone, but sustained throughout the Holy Scriptures. We made the statement concise; and as the very words we selected are used by Mark, it was proper for them to appear as a quotation. We did not attempt to give the entire verse ver-

batism; nor did we cite chapter and verse, or the author's name. But Sir, we have charity enough to allow a good deal for your extreme sensitiveness on that passage. Will you never forget your debate with Ditzler on its spuriousness? But we forbear. Whether the passage be spurious or genuine, or whether "and is baptized," be retained or not, the verse clearly shows that faith is the only essential condition of salvation. If 'He that believeth not shall be damned,' cannot a child understand that the man is damned *for a want of faith, and not for a want of water baptism?* Had you the honesty and fairness you charge as wanting in me, you would have acknowledged that I made the proper relation of faith to baptism, when I said, "all other obligations divinely commanded are connected with or proceed from faith."

But how is it possible for you, or any other man to make water baptism the essential, or an essential condition of salvation? He that believes is an acting agent, faith being the exercise of his mind and heart; but he that is baptized, is a passive recipient; for no man can baptize himself; and he might be in circumstances where none could baptize him. What an idea! That the personal eternal salvation of one man is dependent on the will and action of another! Can you believe it, Sir? And yet you must believe it, absurd as it is, if you believe water baptism an essential condition to eternal salvation. From this clear conclusion there is no escape. It will certainly test your ecclesiastical honesty; and we do trust your candor will prevail. Now,

in all kindness, we desire to put a plain and important question to you; requesting, that without explanation or equivocation, you give a direct answer, *yea* or *nay*. *Will a man who believes on the Lord Jesus Christ be saved?*

If you answer *yea*, then you make faith the only condition of that man's salvation, and endorse the very truth you denounce in me as error. If you answer *nay*, then you flatly and pointedly contradict St. Paul and Silas both, who said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." We have written "Eternal truth has proclaimed, 'He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned.'" Now if this great truth is not revealed in the Holy Scriptures, there is nothing revealed. The Savior himself declares, "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." Jno. 3: 18.

This is plain, pointed, absolute. The very cause of a man's condemnation, and the only cause of his condemnation, is most specifically given; "because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." Jno. 3: 15. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." Jno. 3: 16. "He that heareth my words, and believeth on him that sent me, hath

everlasting life; and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." Jno. 5: 24. "He that believeth on me, shall never thirst." Jno. 6: 35. "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, hath everlasting life." Jno. 6: 47. "He that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth on me, shall never die. Believest thou this?" Jno. 11: 25-26. All the prophets unite their testimony; "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10: 43.

John the Baptist says, "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." Jno. 3: 36. There is no possible medium for water baptism, or any other supposed condition between believing on the Son, and "everlasting life." John the beloved[?] disciple says, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Jno. 1: 12. "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name." Jno. 20: 31.

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." 1st Jno. 5: 1.

"For whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world, and this is the victory which overcometh the world even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" 1st Jno. 5: 4-5.

"He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself," v. 10. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life. v. 12.

St. Peter says; "Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious." 1st Peter 1: 9-11.

"He that believeth on him shall not be confounded." v. 6. St. Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1: 16. "To declare I say at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier; of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3: 26.

Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith." v. 36.

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." 4: 5.

"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace." v. 16.

"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." 5: 1.

"For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." 10: 4.

"It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believed." 1st Cor. 1: 21.

"Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ that we might be justified by the faith of Christ." Gal. 2: 16.

"And the Scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham." Gal. 3; 8.

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." v. 26.

"In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance." Eph. 1: 13.

"For by grace are ye saved through faith." Eph. 2: 8.

"That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." v. 17.

"And for this cause, God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believe not the truth." 2nd Thes. 2: 12-13.

We have quoted much from this great Apostle, as you, Sir, appeal to his example for not handling "the word of God deceitfully" nor shunning "to declare the whole counsel of God." Neither Paul, nor any of the divine authorities, in their testimony here given, mention any other essential condition of salvation but *faith*. With what an ill grace would you charge them with "handling the word of God deceitfully," seeing they do not blend water baptism with faith, so as to make it an essential condition of salvation. Have they indeed handled the word of God deceitfully? Surely if making faith in Christ the only essential condition of eternal life, be a dishonest presentation of the Gospel, when made by an uninspired man, don't you think he is found in blessed company? But St. Paul is a very unfortunate witness for you Sir; so far from his regarding water baptism essential to salvation, he declares, "For Christ sent

me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." 1st Cor. 1: 17.

Yet he was sent to turn men "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." Acts 26: 18. How is this? Sent to accomplish, instrumentally, the eternal salvation of men; but not sent to perform an essential condition of that salvation! Then his mission, not embracing what was essential to its accomplishment, must have been a failure. Leaving others to judge, who it is that handles the word of God deceitfully; and you to your own reflections, we hope you will consult your candor and not your creed.

Respectfully,

F. E. PITTS.

Things that are Wanting.

Under the old Jewish dispensation form and ceremony in the performance of worship, were required. Under the new order of things, a certain amount of ceremony and form is still required. Enough at least, to require that all things be done decently, and in *order*.

In many of our churches we find much that is wanting. In some we see an effort to get away from ceremony, driving the members into abrupt, and unbecoming worship. Not long since, we heard a man pray somewhat after this manner: "O, Lord! Here we are—you know us—you know our wants—Come, and bless us—we want it now—come along now," etc., etc. Thus destroy-

ing every feeling of solemnity, on the occasion. Surely, when we come into the presence of the Great Jehovah, we should come, with reverence, and holy fear. Nor should we come hastily into the presence of God, lest we come unprepared to worship acceptably. Again, Some are so intensely bent on avoiding ceremony that in attending to the Lord's Supper, in a hasty and irreverent manner, that it is made to appear more as a burlesque, than as a reality. I saw not long since, a fearful perversion of this solemn worship. The minister (a Presbyterian) while the bread and wine were being passed, referred to the sufferings of the members, for Christ's sake, and called attention to the fact that as their children lay buried side by side in the cemetery close by, they should love each other, etc. Thus calling the attention of his flock, from the sufferings of Christ to their own, and as the bread and wine are intended to show forth the Lord's death—and not the death of our children—the worship was perverted.

Nor is it proper, as we have sometimes seen, to sing an invitation hymn, after the Supper inviting sinners to Christ. This should always precede the Supper, unless the Supper was first, and followed by a sermon. Even then we think it more consistent with the divine model, to sing a hymn after supper, and go out.

It is proper to leave the church impressed with the sufferings of Christ, for us. We are then strong to bear for him, the coming week, whatever our duty calls us to bear. A certain amount of ceremony and form in the worship, gives it solemnity, and power, and without it we cannot enjoy worship.

nity, and power, and without it we cannot enjoy worship.

Of course there are but few places where this will apply. Yet there are some, and such need to set in order the things that are wanting.

J. T. POE.

The Caskey and Price Debate.

I wish, in a few brief articles, to give some account of this debate, commencing Monday, April 13th, 1874, at Fort Worth, Texas, and continuing 8 days. A few words about the men and their methods of debate. Price is known in this country as the Baptist and Campbellite killer—is a Methodist. Age 47. Says he was born the same year that Campbellism was born. Low, stout, heavy-built, dark complexion, dark gray eyes. Makes some display of learning, and came to the debate with a trunk full of books. His manners are not clerical, though they are stereotyped, and so are his arguments. He is not an orator nor an extemporaneous speaker. Is a poor negative man. His speeches are all written, being culled from the various debates, from Campbell and Rice down to Wilkes-Ditzler. His voice is strong and as clear as a bugle blast. He is not a logician, and is both slow to see and to make an argument. He makes some show of candor, and is pleasant in conversation; though he frequently misrepresents his opponent's position. This is the result more of inability to perceive than intention to wrong.

Bro. T. W. Caskey, of Miss., is known to most of your readers by reputation, and to many in person.

To those who have seen and heard him, I need not say that there is but one T. W. Caskey on this globe. A man more peculiarly *sui generis*, I never saw. I believe he told me he is 57 years old. Is 6 feet, 3½ inches high. Is dry and humorous in conversation. I don't suppose he has shed a tear since his mother whipped him, and I doubt much whether he did then.

He is educated in the true, but not in the academic sense of the word: he is a thinker. His thoughts come sparkling from the mint of his own mind, and they are clothed with most chaste and select words. He never shells the woods, but fires with solid shot into the strong-hold of the enemy. He is both orator and logician. Two men could not well be more unlike than he and Price. The one is original in thought and method, the other, a mere plagiarist.

Bro. C.'s outfit for the debate was a New Testament, a scrap of blank paper and lead pencil. Price had debates, lexicons, commentaries, big blank books written full, etc., etc., ad infinitum.

A. C.

BAPTISM.

In the GOSPEL ADVOCATE, of March 26th. Bro. A. Clark thus writes on baptism: "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea. I like the word baptize: all baptism is immersion, but all immersion is not baptism. All the hosts of Israel, together with their flocks and herds, were immersed in the cloud and in the sea, but they were not all baptized unto Moses; only

those were baptized unto him who believed in him as their divinely-appointed leader. There is as much authority in this passage for animal baptism as for infant baptism.

Baptism is the obedience of faith; where there is no faith there can be no baptism. The immersion of an infidel is no more baptism than the immersion of a rock; neither is the immersion of a baby—the sprinkling of no one is baptism."

Why does Bro. Clark like the word baptize? Is it because it is a word that admits of so much controversy? Is it because it is a word whose meaning is so hard to settle? But I do not wish to press Bro. C. on this point. He has a perfect right to like the word if he desired to do so. But I do think his position on this subject extremely erroneous.

Baptism and immersion are synonymous terms. Therefore, the man who is immersed is baptized. "All immersion is not baptism." I wonder how Bro. C. found this out? Authors, Lexicographers, &c., tell us they are the same; but Bro. Clark seems to have discovered that baptism is necessarily "the obedience of faith." If he had said that baptism, in order to be acceptable, must be "the obedience of faith," no objections could have been raised, for this all must admit; but his position is that immersion is not baptism at all. This is genuine Pedobaptist doctrine on baptism. They tell us neither sprinkling, pouring, nor immersion is baptism, but "the obedience of faith." So the command is obeyed, they say, it matters not how it is done.

If baptize does not mean immerse, then as Pedoes say, immersion is not found in the Bible, and how are we to know what act is commanded? When we admit that baptism abstractly is not literal immersion, we place ourselves under the necessity of defending a practice for which we have no warrant in the Holy Oracles of God. I admit that none were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, except those who "believed in him as their divinely appointed leader." Although they were not baptized unto Moses nor unto any body else (*i. e.* the infants flocks, herds, &c.) yet they were baptized just as they were immersed. I admit that "there is as much authority in this passage for animal baptism as for infant baptism," for there is no authority for either. The simple fact that a thing casually transpired does not enjoin its repetition upon us. That "the immersion of an infidel is no more baptism than the immersion of a rock," is all very true, for both are baptism; one is the baptism of an infidel; the other, the baptism of a rock. No effect, however, is produced by either. Was not Naaman baptized when he dipped himself seven times in the Jordan? Did not the Pharisees baptize their hands after returning from market, before eating? When the Savior said to James and John; "Are you able to drink of the cup that I drink of and to be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with?" what kind of a baptism did he speak of? Was it "the obedience of faith," Bro. Clark speaks of? It was a figurative use of the word baptize, I admit; but what he called baptism was the overwhelm-

ing in grief, and sufferings. Inasmuch as I do not understand the Greek language, and have reason to believe Bro. C. does, I would thank him to give us the definition of the original *baptidzo* from reliable authority. This would probably settle the question as to whether baptize and immerse are synonymous terms or not.

I claim that a man may be baptized or immersed without faith; but he cannot be baptized into Christ, without faith, which works by love and purifies the heart.

PESŒSIMUS.

Marietta, Miss. April 13th, 1874.

Deserving Fellowship.

Dear Bro. Adams: I am still trying to uphold the ancient gospel in this section of country with but little success however. The people seem anxious to hear and sometimes I have large audiences and at other times quite small. I fear that I shall have to quit preaching altogether. You know something of how hard I have to labor for a living, not only myself but my wife toils in the field every day and with all we can both do, I can see nothing in the future but privation and want. Our crop last year was a failure both in corn and cotton. I did not get out of debt. How I am to get through this year the Lord only knows. I can buy neither bread nor meat without money and that I have not. The few brethren scattered over this country are as poor as myself. I wish you would write to Bro. Lipscomb and give him a statement of my case asking him to lay it before

his readers : peradventure the Lord will put it into some Christian heart to help me a little. I will thank you if you will do this, even if it results in nothing. Give my regards to your family and the brethren.

Yours in the hope of eternal life,

N. B. SHAW.

Bell's Landing, Monroe Co., Ala.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: I have just received a letter from Bro. N. B. Shaw, who has been trying to preach and work on the farm for a support for himself and wife. Last year he made almost a complete failure in a crop, as many others did—he has no children—he is trying to make a crop this year and preach, but he tells me that if he does not get some assistance he will have to abandon preaching.

Bro. Shaw is a good preacher—he presents the truth forcibly, clearly and with effect. You know the situation of our people here I presume. We have made three consecutive failures in crops, and our people are really in a worse condition than they have been at any time since the close of the late war.

Bro. S. requests me to lay his case before you to see if you can do anything for his relief by presenting his case to the brotherhood through the *ADVOCATE*, or, I would suggest, privately if you think best.

I think if you could contrive to get up one hundred (100) dollars for Bro. S.'s benefit he could get through with that amount this year. I suggest this amount without any advice from him.

I hope you will consider Bro. S.'s case favorably if you think it would

be prudent to lay such a request before the brethren,—I would cheerfully submit this however to your own good judgment.

Bro. Shaw is the only man now in the field in a large portion of country here—he lives about one hundred miles from Bro. Barnes or Jordan and there is not a preacher in the field to represent our brotherhood from one to the other except the little work that I am doing in the vicinity of him—at least so far as known to me.

I have been working hard to be able to devote myself to preaching again. I have some hope of being able to do so next year—when it goes well with me I will remember the *ADVOCATE*—I esteem it in some respects the best publication of the brotherhood. I am very sorry I have not been able to do more for its circulation.

I will enclose with this Bro. N. B. Shaw's letter to me.

Yours truly,

DAVID ADAMS.

Pine Apple, Ala. March 30th, 1874.

We publish the foregoing letter, believing it is a case that calls for it. We have been cautious in publishing begging appeals from either individuals or churches. We believe the circumstances rare, that justify either churches or individuals in coming before the public as beggars.

There is as much demoralization to a church and as much loss of respect on the part of the community when a church puts itself before the community as a public beggar for the purpose of building a finer house than it is able to build, or other pur-

pose of life. as there would be in a family begging aid of the public to build itself a mansion because forsooth, it was too proud to live in a house it was able to build itself, or some rich friends who had fine houses would not visit it in such a house as it was able to build of itself. The whole principle of making beggars of individuals or churches demoralizes them and destroys the respect of the people for them.

The constant habit of doing these things has already so destroyed the expectations of communities for churches, that it is not now greatly noticed; but it has so much the greater influence for evil. An evil so common as not to be noticed is a double evil. Individuals should appeal for aid only when in really necessitous circumstances, when providential causes have caused want. When drought, famine, war, pestilence or disease has been heavily laid upon a community or on individuals they may properly without loss of self-respect ask aid. When individuals are in want, they should appeal to their own families first, then to the congregation. We have no sympathy with the habit of traveling around as public beggars, no matter what the condition of the individual, when the community and the Church at home is in an ordinary condition, when no destructive blight has fallen upon it. The man that thus starts out as a beggar will soon become a hypocrite if he is not when he begins.

We have refused to publish personal and individual and church appeals for help, because we believed they had a demoralizing effect on the

church and community and on the brethren scattered abroad and the public. We have made enemies but we believe we pursued the proper course.

If a family is not able to build a fine mansion it ought to build a plain comfortable dwelling suited to its means. If not able to build a brick, build a frame, if not a frame, a log house—if not a good hewed log house take an unhewed log cabin.

This is recognized as right in families whether in the city or country. We cannot see why a church, a family of God should act differently.

The fine people will not attend such a church you say. I say the sensible honest hearted people will respect and honor such a congregation. Then if a church is not able to build a fine stately edifice with a "Catherine window, stained glass and a dim religious light" let it build a plain brick with square widows, clear glass and the bright light as it comes, fresh and pure from the hand of God.

The religion that loves a dim or dark light, Christ did not approve. If they are not able to build a brick, take a frame, if not this then a log house. We would much prefer to worship in a log cabin in the heart of New York City, than in a fine, fashionable, unpaid for house or if paid for, so done at the expense of self respect, and the respect of the people by making themselves public beggars.

We believe the whole system wrong and most hurtful. If neighboring congregations see fit to aid a weak congregation it is all proper, of course, but Brethren for the sake of the Son of God, do not make his

children public beggars. Let us freely give of our own substance and then be content to worship in just such a house as we are able to build.

We say these things not with reference to the case presented, but with reference to several appeals of persons or churches, in communities well to do, that we must decline publishing. Do not expect these things of us brethren and then you will not be disappointed.

Bro. Shaw lives in a section of country on which for several successive years, drought and blight have fallen. The earth has refused to yield her fruits. Many of those able have left the country. Others are now striving to get away. Many are not able to leave. Bro. Shaw labors among them. You see his statement to Bro. Adams. I doubt not they are strictly true. I think it a case that needs help from abroad. Bro. Havener in South Carolina and Bro. Shaw in his section should have been helped.

They should be now; any help sent us for bro. Shaw will be cheerfully forwarded. We trust brethren as we are cautious that no unworthy appeal should be made the worthy ones will be promptly responded to.

D. L.

Commendatory.

A few weeks since we urged upon the brethren the propriety of encouraging Bro. Wadkins in his work among the colored people. We now publish a letter of commendation from the first congregation of disciples in Nashville whom our beloved Bro. P. S. Fall serves. Bro. Wad-

kins has never severed his connection with this congregation and is as the letter attests, approved by them as a teacher with his race. The congregation is not wealthy and in addition to its regular support of Bro. Fall, and of the poor connected with the congregation and the aid given to transient objects, is contributing freely to aid Bros. Johnson and Todd in their work in the destitute fields in the adjoining counties. I mention this to indicate that they are not in condition to greatly aid Bro. Wadkins. To Bro. Wadkins' credit, we will state that owing to the healthy tone of his lectures and teaching to his race a number of the oldest and most substantial citizens of Nashville who have known him for 30 or 40 years; of other communions and of no church associations, contribute something to help him in his work every year. Under these circumstances we believe that brethren ought to feel free to encourage and aid him in the work. Those living in communities where colored people are numerous can address him at Nashville. Should any desire to aid him in his work if they will remit to us, we will acknowledge receipt through the Advocate and see it properly appropriated.

D. L.

The first Congregation of Christ, worshipping on Church Street, Nashville, Tennessee; To all whom it may concern, Greeting:

This shall certify that Bro. Daniel Wadkins (colored) has been for thirty years a member of this congregation, and is in regular standing as such. He has been long engaged in preaching the word, and is hereby

authorized to do so wherever, in the providence of God, an opportunity may offer. He is commended, as a disciple of Christ and as a Christian Teacher to the attention of the brotherhood.

In behalf of the elders and deacons of the said congregation, and by their order, Lord's Day, March 29, 1874.

P. S. FALL.

QUERIES.

Bros. L. & S.: Please explain the meaning of the 8th chapter of St. Matthew, beginning at 10th, down to the 13th verse. Please answer through the Advocate and you will oblige

Your brother in Christ,

F. C. TAYLOR.

Near Franklin, Tenn., April 28, 1874.

The tenth verse runs thus: "When Jesus heard it he marvelled, and said to them that followed, verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." A centurion had just approached Jesus, and told of his servant, who was sick of the palsy. Jesus proposed to go and heal him. But the centurion said, speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed. When Jesus saw what faith this man had in him, he made the remarks found in the above verse. This centurion was willing to trust in the word of the Savior, with perfect assurance that whatever he said would come to pass. If men had that sort of confidence to-day in the words of Jesus, all might be saved. But when he says, "he that believeth and is baptized shall

be saved," the people say, but that is not enough; something more must be done. He has spoken the word, but the people are not like the centurion; they are not satisfied with the word only. They now wait for some direct work, of which they have no promise. And certain it is, that those who will not trust the word of God, have no promise of being saved at all. We need not wait for miracles or direct work now. The eleventh verse teaches that people from all nations will be saved, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God; that other nations will be saved through Christ, as well as the Jews. The twelfth verse says, "the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." That is, the children of Satan's kingdom, the wicked. The thirteenth verse, simply gives the promise to the centurion, that as he had believed, so it should be done to him.

But this passage is sometimes used at the present time, to prove to the sinner that if he will believe on Christ, he will be saved by faith only. Such a conclusion is wholly unwarrantable from the passage. The Savior only required faith of the centurion in order to heal his servant. If he had required other things, and he had not done them, he would not have healed his servant. The Savior now requires of us, repentance, confession of his name, and baptism, in addition to our faith, and if we do not do them, we have no promise at all of being saved. It is a palpable perversion of the word of God to apply such passages as this thirteenth verse to the conversion of sinners un-

der the new dispensation. Those miracles, as John says, in the closing part of his gospel, were performed to convince the people that Jesus was what he claimed to be, the Son of God, and that is exactly what they are written for, and that is the use we must make of those miracles. But if we wish to become Christians, we must go to the preaching of the apostles, after Jesus ascended to heaven, and the Holy Spirit came upon them to guide them into all the truth. If preachers would only learn how to divide the Scriptures, they would save the world a vast amount of perplexity and trouble. Instead of going to the Acts of Apostles, where they were preaching to make Christians, they go to the miracles of Christ that were performed to prove him what he claimed to be, the Son of God. There will always be confusion while this is done.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: If you are not crowded in the columns of the Advocate with something more important, I would like for you to answer a question for myself, and probably others.

Also, I wish to know where there are charges against a brother in the church, whether evidence of the world is to be taken or not. Please answer soon and oblige

Yours truly,

S. G. B.

Shady Grove, Tenn. April 27,
1874.

There are some difficulties connected with this question. It would

certainly be a bad precedent to establish, to take testimony from the world, upon which to deal with members of the church. And yet there are many men of the world, whose statements are perfectly reliable, even more so than a good many who claim to be members of the church. And when men of undoubted veracity make statements of facts regarding the conduct of a member, we think it not proper for a church to ignore and overlook the matter just because the person or persons who chanced to be cognizant of the facts in the case are not members. When the people of the world know that a member is guilty of certain misdemeanor, and the church passes over, and lets such member go along without notice, such a church will certainly lose its influence with the world.

But when a church proceeds against a member upon what the world says, it should be done with good judgment, and great caution, or mischief to the cause will be the result. Good sense of propriety, and a sincere desire for the good of the cause must be used in such cases.

Bros. L. & S.: In 1 Cor. viii: 39, we have this language, "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will: only in the Lord."

Does the apostle here include widows only, or does he include those also who have never been married? Please answer as soon as you can

through the Advocate and oblige one who wishes to know.

A CHRISTIAN.

We can see no reason in the world why it does not embrace unmarried women, just the same as widows. We think also, that the same principle applies to widowers and young men. Christians, in our judgment, should always marry Christians, when they marry at all. This is certainly the principle taught by Paul in the above passage.

You will please explain through the Advocate whom the pronoun "they" refers to in 1st verse of the 2nd chapter of Acts of the Apostles? Does it refer to any but the twelve apostles? And also, what is meant by the "last days" spoken of in the 17th verse, and whom the devout men in the 5th verse refers to.

Yours, &c,
W. K. ELDER.

A literal construction of the passage will refer the pronoun *they*, in this passage, to the word *apostles*, in the last verse of the first chapter. That says they cast their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven apostles. And they, the apostles, were assembled together in one place, and the Spirit came upon *them*, and *they*, the apostles, were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak in other tongues.

The last days spoken of refer to the time then present. The time of the establishment of the New Insti-

tution, which is the last one that God will ever make on this earth.

E. G. S.

Death of Brother T. Fanning.

Just as this number is going to press, we reached home, to hear the sad intelligence of the sudden and unexpected death of this veteran soldier of the cross. We have not been able to learn the particulars of his death, and only have time to make this short announcement. A more extended one will follow soon. Truly this life is uncertain.

It is needful to trust as well as to pray,—to believe that strength will come, to reach out the hand of faith to receive it.

If the gates of heaven were suddenly to swing open, and all mankind be asked on equal terms to enter into the kingdom, don't you know some people who would pause to see what some other people were going to do about it, and some who would refuse altogether if they saw so-and-so about to enter?—*Boston Transcript*.

Obituaries.

Bro. A. Lawrence departed this life, on 27th of Feb. last. Had he lived till the 11th inst. the years of his earthly pilgrimage, would have been sixty five.

Bro. L. leaves, on this side of the dark river six or seven children, (the mother of whom, having passed over, about two years in advance of Bro. L.) Sister Lawrence, his second and surviving wife, and one child (an infant) and three step daughters two of whom are just passing from the state of girl to womanhood, the same were buried with their Lord in baptism a few days before the demise of Bro. L. (by the writer).

We have been thus minute that Bro. L.'s influence may be illustrated in its practical force, for good. If you wish to learn a man's true character, read in the circle, in which he spends the most of his time. Bro. Lawrence was a preacher of the word, and had emphatic confidence in its power! and believed the Savior, really intended to make his promise good when He said—"blessed is he, who hears the word of God and does it." The bereaved ones have the sympathy of the writer and that of many others, and infinitely better the divine protections.

W. T. BUSH.

Salado Bell, Co' Texas Apr. 3, 1874.

Review please Copy.

Bros. L. & S: Permit me to record the death of my dear parents. W. A. Clark was born Sept, 1st 1824, and departed this life April 20th 1868. N. M. Clark was born Jan. 15. 1829, and died Sept. 9 1871. They had both been members of the church of Christ 20 years. No one ever had a better father and mother. They leave only three children to mourn and bear their loss. But we mourn not as those who have no hope. Also my little sister, Blanche Clark, was born Sept 2, 1871, Also my little baby, Willie Wagner, He was born Sept. 18, 1870, and died July 27, 1872. It was hard to give him up, though I know he has gone to a better world.

LIZZIE WAGNER.

Near Treuton Tenn. t March 22, 1874.

Died at his residence in Moulton township, Auglaize' Co, Ohio on the fifth day of Feb. 1874, Elder John Crow. Aged fifty-six years and one month. Brother Crow has been a member of the Church of Christ in this township for about eleven years. And of him it may be truly said that "he walked worthy of the vocation wherewith he was called, in all lowliness and meekness with longsuffering and forbearance."

W. D. TAYLOR.

Buckland O. March 1874

Died in the Lord, April 23, James P. Davis, at the residence of his father, Bro. F. H. Davis in Williamson Co., Tenn., aged twenty-two years, seven months, and 29 days.

Bro James has been a member of the church of God, at Leipers Fork, Tennessee for about four and a half years. The disease which carried off our young brother, was Typhoid fever. Thus when just emerging into manhood, he was ruthlessly cut down by the hand of death. All that could be done by medical aid and kind friends was done, during his four weeks illness; and his family has the consolation of knowing they did what they could for him, and better than all the hope of the glories of immortality and eternal life, to comfort and con-

sole their hearts in this their sad bereavement. He is done with all the toils and sufferings of earth, and with the hope of the Gospel before them, his father, brothers and sisters will be able to look with joyful anticipations to a meeting where parting will be no more. We deeply sympathize with them in the loss of their son and brother.

"Go to thy rest; and while

Thy absence we deplore,

One thought our sorrow shall beguile,

For soon with a celestial smile,

We meet to part no more."

E. G. S.

With sadness we chronicle the death by that fell destroyer, consumption—of our esteemed sister in the Lord, Mrs Mary Ellen Owen. She died on the morning of the 27th aged just 27 years. She was a daughter of Bro. Ragsdale of this place; was immersed at a meeting held in Franklin, in 1865 by brethren Jesse and E. G. Sewell: was married in 1867 to Mr. Wm. P. Owen, a merchant of this place. She leaves a bright little six year old daughter and as great a number of friends as she had acquaintances. To mourn her departure, in the very incipency of her usefulness.

HENRY.

Franklin, Tenn.. April 30 1873.

The Gospel Plan of Salvation.

BY T. W. BRENTS.

A copy of this work has been on our table for several weeks. Its contents are presented on our advertising page. The thoroughness, the terse, vigorous and pointed style of Bro. Brents in handling these questions, is so well known to our readers that it is hardly worth while to speak a word concerning it. Bro. Brents is a popular writer for the common people. They read his writings gladly; because they understand them readily. The treatment of his subjects, is his own. No man has a more marked individuality as a thinker and writer than Bro. Brents. His association of subjects is also his own. Then the book occupies a place of its own in Christian literature.

Much of the matter was published in the Gospel Advocate, and afterwards issued in tract form. We know of no work more eagerly read or more successful in disseminating the truth than were these tracts.

There is a fuller examination of the subject of baptism and a more copious collection of authorities on this subject, than can be found elsewhere. Our Methodist friends are making peculiarly earnest efforts to find authority for their practice on this subject. It is opportune that such full authorities should be presented.

We then commend heartily the circulation of the book, among all classes who can be induced to read it. It will build up and strengthen the faith of the Christian. It will do much to convince the unbeliever and silence the gainsayer.

We will reserve our criticism for Bro. Brents' own ear.

D. L.

A Misrepresentation.

The *Gospel Advocate*, of April 23d, contains an article, headed "Kentucky University," from the pen of Bro. David Lipscomb, which does great injustice to the brethren in this State. After stating the fact that the Kentucky churches failed to obtain what they asked for at the hands of the last Legislature, Bro. L. says: "The members of the church, especially the leading ones, connected with the University propose to make this a political question in the next election. That is, they propose to enter the political arena, and become a party to its strifes, for purposes of

the church."—Now we do not for one moment suppose that Bro. Lipscomb would intentionally misrepresent any one; but that he has allowed himself to publish to the world as true what probably reached him as a mere rumor, and what is utterly untrue, is very certain. If there is a disciple in Kentucky who proposes to make this University matter a "political question in the next election," we have not heard of him; and we are positively sure that there is not a leading brother in the State who would entertain such a thought for a moment. We hope that Bro. Lipscomb, as an act of justice to his Kentucky brethren, will correct the mistake into which he has fallen.—*Apostolic Times*.

We certainly have no desire to misrepresent our Kentucky brethren. We certainly have seen and heard recommendations that brethren vote for no man for the legislature, that will not agree to favor the control of the school to the control of the churches. Nor do we see how brethren who vote, and regard the question of the University of importance can avoid this. The appeal to the legislature itself makes it in one sense a political question.

If these brethren think it of first importance to save the University, and purpose to do it, through electing men favorable to their views we do not see how they can avoid it. But as the *Times* says it is not true. I suppose they have a way of settling it without making it a political question and we rejoice at it.

D. L.

Church News.

Dear Bro. Sewell: I have just resigned my care as preacher of the word of two congregations in West Tenn., to go to another field of labor. I leave these churches in good working order—meeting regularly on the first day of the week to break bread and administer the ordinances as first delivered by infallible teachers. Last year, there were many valuable accessions to the cause in this field, but there have been none this year, but we think we are holding our own so far. I leave the brethren at this place, and also at Clover-Port with regret.

They are a true and noble hearted band of brothers and sisters, and have been liberal in my support. This is a very inviting field for a young preacher, and I am very sorry that the force of circumstances calls me away. I feel a very deep interest in the prosperity of the good cause in these places where I have been sowing the good seed of the kingdom. My heart's desire and prayer to God is that they may be saved—saved from apostasy, saved from error of every sort and finally saved in the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Brethren, let us rather give diligence to make our calling and election sure. Should we never be called to labor among you again in this life we hope to meet again where we will be called from labor to rest. Let this hope inspire us to renewed zeal for the Master. We shall not lose our reward, only let us be faithful to Him who has loved us and washed us in

his own blood and made us Kings and priests to God.

J. O. OLIVER.

Henderson Station, Tenn. Apr. 24th, 1874.

 Evangelizing.

Bro. Sewell: Last Lord's day I met with the saints at Pilot Point, Denton Co. This is a beautiful village, surrounded by a fertile country. We found the brethren zealous—meeting upon the first day—although they had not heard any preaching for a year. Would that more would emulate them. Too many churches are dead weights to the cause.

Bro. John Ellis, of Mo., had begun the meeting. After spending two days with the brethren and witnessing one confession, I left the meeting in the hands of Bro. Ellis, hoping to hear of its good success soon. The hospitality of the brethren was indicative of spiritual life, and their liberality toward me showed that they realized their obligation to aid in sounding out the truth. They want to get a preacher to labor in their village and vicinage.

Bro. Ellis lately preached the word to some of the Indians just across the river from Texas. About twenty, hearing, believed and were baptized in Red River. Bro. Ellis is to return and preach to them soon. I count this a good work. The whole Territory invites the pure gospel, and are dissatisfied with sectarianism. The brethren of North Texas should see that Bro. E. wants for nothing while in the field. This is missionary work on the Bible plan.

Yours in Christ,
C. M. WILMETH.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

Wayside Blessings.

There is many a gem in the path of life,
Which we pass in our idle pleasure,
That is richer far than the jeweled crown
Or the miser's hoard of treasure;
It may be the love of a little child
Or a mother's prayer to heaven,
Or only a beggar's grateful thanks
For a cup of water given.

Children and Toys.

There are many curious things to the curious, many men of many minds, and all these have ways of their own. I never saw two faces or two minds just alike. The rich have rich ways and there are divers manners of showing their importance. They stick out their sign. When I see a picture of a boot and shoe before a door I am satisfied a shoe-maker keeps within. If I see a gun pictured out for the public gaze I guess almost with certainty what the man means. I passed a little house on the road-side once, with a deer's horn nailed over the door and the words "take a" just before it. This was no uncertain language, though the man did not mean just what he said, for the horn within was deadly while that without was harmless from the time of the death of the buck that once carried it. Pride and ambition have much to do with the desire of gain and the making of it and its display. There was a man once who had a whole Island to himself, in the ocean. He did not prize it or boast of it, but just as

soon as opportunity presented itself he left it. There were no eyes to admire his possessions or flatter his possessions or honor his lordship. The notoriety that a man gains from wealth is like that which goes along with fine clothes. 'Tis borrowed. When men steal the the writings of others, build themselves up thereby, and from this source gain importance it is called plagiarism. Now what should it be termed when a character with no intrinsic worth, is made attractive by something worn or possessed? These shine in "borrowed lustre." Man is said to be "creation's master-piece," and when he acts the part that falls to his lot, he is worth looking at and of himself draws the attention of the thoughtful. What a sad reflection, yes, what a poor use of all the valuable capital invested in him when all that is in man is unnoticed, unconsidered, unthought of, and the things around and about him arrest the attention of the passer by. What a poor display of useful fruits when so much as there is in man is allowed to lie latent, and he can only be seen in money bags, large acres, cloth, silk and things of a kin.

I have been accustomed to seeing dolls all my life, but never did I often know one wee bit of a child to have twenty. The proud mother of this innocent said with an air of satisfaction as she pointed to the big dolls little dolls, white and black dolls, china, wax, plaster of Paris, and dough-face dolls, squeaking, crying, blinking dolls, "my daughter has all of her toys, I have always taught her to take good care of them." Then they were in the corner of a well-

furnished parlor, behind the divan. Besides there were squeaking cats and dogs on the mantel-piece, with many exhibitions of lavish outlay in this direction. I have never bought my boy a toy yet. In addition to the foolish expenditure of money it is useless, and falls far short of the object intended. My baby boy received as a present, a horse with nice head, bridle and all. His mother took much pains to train him to ride it, for appreciation if nothing else, but he has never exchanged long at a time Beck and Bet for it or any other inanimate baby animal. Now Beck is an umbrella staff with the handle turned walking-cane fashion. I have noticed the finest toys engage the attention of children only for a short time. They will leave the most costly of these for a corn-cob or a stick. I have seen on our floor a hammer, little hatchet, saw, home-made wagon, shovel, several pieces of plank, a stick to cut, a barlow, a calfbell, four or five stick horses (prominent among them Beck) nails, various pebbles, and strings. Oh! who would supply or attempt to supply or circumscribe the demands of a child's mind by purchases from the confectionery. They ought to think, they ought to invent playthings. Let them invent playthings, let them learn early to look for themselves. Their numerous playthings will pass through their hands and come under notice in a day. Who would be so foolish as to try to suit the taste of a child by buying. I visited a family in the city once. The Father had just brought home a wheelbarrow. He said that was the second or third, besides two wagons and

seemed pleased that he was able and had the will to gratify sonny so. "Yes" said a member of the family, "father has spent fifty dollars for buddy" I will venture to guess this early in Young America's history. He will always be a toy himself and men better drilled than himself will play with him.

But the thing that most attracted my attention was the corner of dolls of course, but the earnest remark of mamma called forth serious reflections "My daughter has all of her toys, I would not let her break or spoil them" 'This is tithing the mint anise and cummin and neglecting the weightier matter. I do not see any impropriety in teaching children lessons of economy and frugality, 'tis right. But 'tis the duty of the parent to impress upon the mind of the child to properly appreciate God's blessings. But why be so particular about things unprofitable, and pass unnoticed the great matters of life. You may guess that my mind rests now, upon many things to eat, drink and wear, but I will speak only of the waste or improper use of time. Men and women are placed here on earth for some great good. I pass by a forty-horse-power engine with all the necessary machinery for business and it lies all up, unmoved; I say what a pity there is so much good in that piece of machinery and 'tis turned to no good or profit. There never was such a structure as man. There is an incalculable amount of good in him. There are thousands of ways of being useful. He that raises corn, wheat, meat or anything to eat or wear performs a good part in life. He that stands ready to minister to

the distressed is a noble agent of the Lord. But how lamentable! man—the best engine on earth is run to no purpose, or profit or not run at all. There is a preparation for life. Parents often struggle arduously to fit up their children in life. They work themselves to keep their children from hard labor. But the mark is missed. I believe I would be safe in saying that those whom I know to be working hardest and making the most unsuccessful battle with life, are the children of the rich. 'Tis well, if rich, to have reserve forces to fall back on, 'Tis better if rich and skilled in the wisdom of this world to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness who when we fail in the great hour of death, will receive us into everlasting habitations. These are the weightier concerns of life.

Supply all a child's wants even to its play things, try to keep it from the exercise of its own faculties, and these powers, physical, mental and moral will be undeveloped. I will venture to guess that the same young body who is the owner of the property afore-mentioned and has taken such pains and care in the keeping thereof, does not remember and cannot tell some of the simplest facts in the history of Christ. Which is of more value, a fact, a truth or a doll? Oh! did a mother say, my son or daughter stores away every truth heard or otherwise learned, and treasures them up for further use and has them all well cared for and loses none of them, it would be a wise and consistent course. How much time is lost by the young and old, that might be devoted to searching after lessons of

profit and happiness. If a person spends time in getting something to help in this life or insure the bliss of the next, 'tis time well spent, and those who do in this way, can draw satisfaction from such a course. But ah what folly to boast of having preserved toys, novels or Jewels when solid truth and genuine worth are not looked after. 'Tis well to preserve a good book, or still more wise to preserve the sentiments it contains. The best legacy parents can leave is truth and the love of it.

Once when Dr. Martin lay ill himself and the physician felt his pulse, and found him changed for the worse, he said, "Here I am, I stand and rest here on the will of God. To Him I have entirely given myself up. He will make it right. For this I know certainly: I shall not die, for He is the Resurrection and the Life, and whosoever liveth and believeth in Him shall never die, and even if he die, he shall live. Therefore, I commit it all to His will, and leave Him to order all."—*Life of Luther.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Memoirs of Jesus	433
Reply to Bro. T W. Brents.....	438
Things that are wanting.....	441
The Caskey and Price Debate.....	442
Baptism.....	443
Deserving Fellowship.....	444
Commendatory	447
Queries.....	448
Death of Bro. T. Fanning.....	450
Obituaries	450
The Gospel Plan of Salvation.....	451
A Misrepresentation.....	452
Church News.....	453
Evangelizing.....	453
Fireside.	
Wayside Blessings.....	454
Children and Toys.....	454

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 20.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MAY 14, 1874.

The Last Phase of the Temperance
Movement.

The secular and many of the religious papers have given great space to the reports of what is termed by them the "Temperance Crusade." Our readers are all doubtless familiar with the mode of operation. A general account of the course adopted in the States of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois and other Western States, was given in the Advocate a few weeks ago. We have not seen fit to say more in reference to it. But the question has so frequently come to us, "Is it right for Christian women in this manner to engage in a war upon intemperance?" that we think it right to remain silent no longer.

The movement has called forth quite a discussion from the religious teachers north of us, as to the merits of total abstinence as a religious duty. Some have taken the ground that the moderate use of wines, beers, ales, etc., is not conducive to intemperance. Others that total abstinence from all use of fermented as well as distilled or spirituous liquors, is the only ground of safety. The Romanists

and Jews especially take ground in favor of the moderate use of wine, ale and beer. Drunkenness is not common we believe among the Jewish people in this country. What their habit is in reference to the use of wine and fermented liquors we know not. But the masses of the Romish population in this country and we are credibly informed in all Romish countries, are so given to besotting drunkenness, that their habits would drive all right-thinking people to follow some other than their example in promoting temperance. It behooves their teachers above all others to advise their flocks to stand aloof from contact with that which so degrades them. If the condition of the populations belonging to the Romish communion be the result of the free use of wine and beer, all prudent people should certainly refrain from using them.

Our observation has been that persons who use the milder stimulants soon acquire an appetite for the stronger and more powerful liquors.

The temperance movement takes a double phase, 1st, a religious one, in which the end to be gained is sought

through religious influences. 2ndly, a political one; in which the evil of intemperance is sought to be suppressed by legislation. Of the 2nd, we will first speak. It seems natural to us that those who have confidence in the efficacy of legislation to improve or protect the morals of a community should seek to stay the ravages of intemperance through legislation. Were strychnine and arsenic to kill or work ruin to society in one hundredth part of the number that intoxicating liquors do these would be prohibited by law.

Although it is rare that life is destroyed by strychnine, or arsenic, yet their sale is closely regulated by law.

If any plant was raised that caused one tenth part of the want, shame, degradation, and death, that alcoholic spirits do, its production would be prohibited. Can any one tell why it is less harm to kill a man with whiskey than strychnine? Why is it more of a crime to sell a man strychnia with which to destroy himself, than it is to sell him whiskey with which to destroy his mind and body, impoverish and abuse his family, and bring it to degradation and ruin as well as to disturb and curse the community? A man who destroys his life with a quick, cold poison, does infinitely less harm to his family and the community than does he who destroys his life by the poison that is slow, but which warms, exhilarates and inebriates as it destroys life, and insomuch as it is slower in its operations, and pleasant in its work, by so much more is it wide-spread and effective in its influences for evil.

No article that did not warm and lull and inebriate would ever be tolerated to work one hundredth of the evil in society that intoxicating drinks do. It is so universally used, the majority are its slaves, are its friends. But we have not the least particle of confidence in legislating sobriety or morality into people. No widespread evil will ever be corrected by legislative enactments. If for no other reason, because the same persons who cherish the evil, elect the legislatures. The stream must rise above its fountain before such a thing is done.

It is a moral and religious question. It is wrong for religious people to force their religion, or any part of it, on others. Their acceptance of it must be voluntary. It must be done in faith. Temperance is a part of my religion. I can no more force it on people than I can my faith or my baptism. Then it is properly a religious question to be dealt with by religious people, on religious principle. We do not say it is not a question that affects politics or morality, and as such should be treated by moral men and politicians. I, as a Christian, doing all that I do in my master's name must treat it purely and solely as a religious question, that is, as Jesus did and would treat it.

This much premised, we state that on the subject of intemperance we have given no uncertain sound. We believe it legitimate to use wine for sicknesses and ills. The inspired men never recommended anything stronger. Their recommending it for this, amounts to a prohibition of it for all other purposes. When Paul says to Timothy, "drink no

longer water (only) but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities," he implied clearly it should be used for no other purposes. It shows too that Timothy although sick, was using water exclusively, was refraining from wine. "No longer" do this, shows plainly what was his habit.

The alcoholic beverages now used as medicine, nine times out of ten, not only destroy mind, morals, and self-respect—all that makes life desirable—but life itself, before the disease would. We have no patience with men who make drunkards of themselves under such a pretext. Better die sober early, than to live a drunkard, bring shame and sorrow to your family, and fill a drunkard's grave. It is better for yourself. It is better for your families. We deny utterly that there is one word of encouragement in the Bible for the use of alcoholic or spirituous beverages.

The flood of evils they bring upon the community is so great, that they should be avoided. All should strive to keep out of temptation as the only safe ground. Some religious people keep spirits in their families under one pretext or another, some for camphor, some for cuts and bruises and sores and some preachers for "snake bites." The snake in the bottle is to be feared by such, a thousand-fold more than any other snake. Go to those preachers' families and you will find a hundred bites from the serpent of the still, where you find one from another serpent. It should be more dreaded by them than the poison of the asp or the viper. We think a man, a christian man, sins, whenever he takes a

drink of spirituous liquors for other than strictly medical purposes. We think when he keeps it in his family or uses alcohol in any of its shapes as a beverage, he is cultivating an appetite that will most likely ruin himself and his family. We believe the habit of keeping it is an unnecessary and hurtful one. We think a Christian who frequents the saloons or groceries where it is sold, and takes a drink, sins against his fellowman and his God, as well as against himself. We believe the church ought to deal with all such cases. With this expression of our conviction of the wrong of manufacturing, using, selling or keeping alcoholic or spirituous liquors, we speak freely our convictions of the last religious phase of the Temperance movement.

Great revolutions work slowly. Spasmodic efforts soon exhaust themselves and cease. Spasms and excitements are signs of weakness. God does not so work. We are constitutionally incapable of appreciating, either panics or spasmodic excitements of the opposite character, or paroxysms of virtue or piety. They are short-lived.

Religious spasms frequently leave the community more irreligious than before they seized it. We fear it will be so with temperance spasms.

We believe that temperance is to be attained in society like other moral good, through living a life of good. Through years of living righteously and training children to avoid temptation. These temperance workers are new converts to temperance, we fear. We would like to know how many of these women who are so enthusiastically and noisily working

now for temperance (?) set the tempting glass before their youthful friends last Christmas or New Year's day—and how many of them, when this frenzy is over will do it next Christmas or sooner. We would like to see into their closets, and find how many cordials and beverages and confections even now there conceal the serpent that will bite husband, son or youthful visitor. We see some clergy and editors quite enthusiastic in the movement, the report concerning whom has reached us, that they are accustomed, or have been, to freely take the social glass (a full one at that) with Christian brethren.

We confess we are doubtful of the work of these new converts. Their work looks too much like a mere paroxysm of excitement—a mushroom growth, a stony-soil production that will not endure the day of temptation or trial.

This move is an outcropping, no doubt, of a revulsion in public sentiment against the free use and sale of alcoholic poisons, and we hope may be an indication of an improvement. But the danger is, that the real sentiment for reformation will spend its force in mere excitement and exhaust its activity in empty parade and when a reaction comes, temperance will be at a lower ebb than before the movement. These most noisy street praters will likely then be the worst seducers of youth and age to intemperance.

But this is a religious movement against intemperance. The chief means used is public prayer in the whiskey saloons and on the streets, and that by women. We recognize fully that woman is deeply interested

in the cause of temperance, both on account of her interest in our common humanity and for the sake of her own sufferings. She ought to be a worker for it, and prayer is a potent means for furthering temperance, as every other good. But both may be misplaced so as to work evil instead of good. Women should begin work at home. She should be careful to cultivate and excite no taste for ardent spirits in her own home in cordials, wines, or viands of any kind or character, that she places before her family or visitors. She ought to discourage its use in social life, both with her own family and her acquaintances. Here she can work most effectively. Here is the most important point to guard. Here woman can work in her universally admitted sphere and can do the work most greatly needed to be done. Give moral tone and stamina to society on this question. But when she enters upon the street and saloon crusade, in a public manner, challenging the jeer, the taunt, the lewd jest, the insult of the rabble, we doubt. Mother, would you wish your daughter there—the young, tender, guileless girl? Would you, father? would you wish your wife, your sister in such a rabble? If not, do not countenance any other mother or father's daughter, any other man's wife, sister or friend there. This is doing as you would be done by. It is the golden rule, the safe rule.

Woman has more influence with the whiskey-seller and buyer than man, only because man has in this country cultivated a kind of chivalrous reverence and respect for wom-

an. Because woman is gentle, modest, retiring, because of her genuine delicacy of feeling, maintained by avoiding the contamination of too rude a contact with the corrupting influence of a brazen publicity. Much of the work she is doing here is calculated to destroy her influence. By destroying her modesty, meekness, forbearance, she divests herself of her most potent weapon.

I do not blame women for an intense interest on this subject. I do not see how any can feel otherwise. I do not say they should not pray earnestly and fervently on this subject. I do not think Christians can work effectively in any good without earnest, faithful prayer. It is right that Christians should unite in prayer to God.

But prayer must be prayer to God. We do not say that women ought not to make personal appeals to whiskey drinkers, to whiskey buyers, to whiskey sellers. It ought to be done in an earnest, modest, womanly manner. It ought not to have the appearance of force. It ought to be an appeal to the conscience. Woman's work done by violence and force, is not woman's work. Religion and religious services ought not to be forced on unwilling hearts. To force religious service on unwilling people is contrary to the spirit and principles of the Christian religion.

To go to a man's private house, or to his business house and turn his premises into uses without his approval is to violate his rights and the laws of the land, as well as the laws of God. A Christian cannot do this. Christ never did this. The public authorities ought not to be

blamed for suppressing this character of violation of right. Religious service ought not to be forced on people in such way as to provoke violence. The women are responsible for the violence in many cases.

Then prayer should be made to God, not to man. The prayer made to be heard of man is an abomination in the sight of God. The prayer made in the "saloons and on the streets" is not in appearance made to God, but to be heard of men. The whole idea seems to me to be that the saloon keeper will catch the contagion of enthusiasm into which they work themselves by prayer and singing and be carried away with it. They never think of God's hearing the prayer and so overruling as to bring about the good. Such a use of prayer is a disheartening and distressing perversion of it. It degrades religion. It brings reproach upon religion and upon prayer and destroys man's confidence in prayer. It is a bitter shame for Christians to put it to a use so base. God can hear the prayer in the secret closet at home, or made in the church assembly, where prayer is "wont to be made" full as well as in the saloon, or standing in public places and on the corners of the streets.

God blesses only when work is done in accordance with His will. The enthusiasm and excitement engendered by the exercises of prayer are not the answer of God to prayer. Addressing prayer to God merely to affect man by his hearing what is said, merely to arouse his sympathies and kindle enthusiasm, seems to me nigh akin to sacrilege.

We do not say that women, Chris-

tian women should not actively engage in the work. They should make their influence felt. Let it first be felt at home; in the social circle, in the church. Let them implead and entreat, singly and collectively the young and the old to avoid temptation, to lend no countenance to the evil. They may certainly appeal to their friends without and to the sellers of liquor. But let it not be done through force—through overwhelming numbers, a violation of any principle of modesty or womanly dignity and self-respect. It would be entirely proper for a few discreet, prudent women, quietly and privately to approach every saloon-keeper in the land and lay before him the evil that his occupation brings and appeal to him in behalf of humanity, in the name of every manly principle that can move a human being to desist from such a course—that brings evil to the public and evil to himself and family. The same appeal ought to be made to every drinker of the poison. This would reach the conscience—a victory won thus would be a complete victory. This would be leading him out of the evil to a better light. The other has a tendency to excite his opposition, and the reliance is to worry him out by persistent, overpowering force. Christ our example never offered prayer under such circumstances, nor endeavored to effect good or overcome by such a course. No enlightened Christian will do it. Again the prayer is ostensibly made for the saloon-keeper. Is he the chief sinner in the case?

It is said Mr. Douglas once taunted Mr. Lincoln with having sold

liquor. The ready wit of the latter responded, "You and I only occupied different sides of the counter in the traffic." It was a happy hit (if true.) Why can the man that sells the liquor be regarded as a worse sinner than he who deliberately and habitually buys it. There are those overcome with temptation, that yield through weakness, that are in my judgment less guilty. But the cool, deliberate, persistent buyer of spirits, I cannot see why or how he is less guilty than the seller.

Especially, if he is a professed Christian buyer, he is worse than the seller. He degrades our holy religion to the destructive work of encouraging the use of the seductive poison. This class of encouragers of the traffic ought to be first looked after, ought to be prayed for most earnestly and faithfully. Ought to be warned, entreated, prayed to, but not under the pretence of praying to God. When the church has made an honest effort to cast the beam out of its own eye, to purify itself, it will be much better qualified to work with the world.

Its influence will be felt. A united, earnest effort to bring the church to the true standard of Biblical practice on this subject is what is needed by the church and by the world. Our women need to be taught not to create in their husbands, sons, friends an appetite for drink by concealing the fatal poison in their viands. The old men should be taught to avoid all encouragement of its use or sale, to avoid with religious devotion, all countenance of and association with those who lounge around the drinking saloons, the young men ought to

be taught and trained to avoid the use of all that intoxicates as they would the poison of asps, to shun the dens that sell as they would the pitfalls of hell—and the influences that bring poverty, shame, dishonor and disgrace on them.

If Christians will only bear the true, proper testimony by precept and example against the destructive and degrading influence of the buying, the selling, the using of the poison, a healthy influence will be exerted in society and by the effect of their example a moral sentiment will be brought about, that will enable those who make laws to so restrain the use as to greatly remove the temptation from youth. And a true sentiment will slowly but surely grow up that will remove the evil from our midst, by proper legitimate means, without destroying modesty, and purity, the true strength and power of our women, or insulting God by putting him to public trial, in a way contrary to his teaching or making a mockery and a pretence of prayer, and so bringing shame and disrepute upon our holy religion. What will be done will be for permanent and lasting good.

D. L.

A SCENE.

Having an appointment for the third Lord's day in March, at Opposition, in Lawrence Co., Bro. W. J. Ball's place of business, I left home on Thursday before, it being some 45 miles east of this. On my way, I addressed a note to the brethren at Evening Shade, county-seat of Sharp County, stating, all things concur-

ring, I would preach on Monday evening as I returned.

But when I reached the above-mentioned place, I found a meeting in progress, "a union meeting," as such meetings are sometimes called. However no one seemed to be engaged only Cumberland Presbyterians and Southern Methodists.

The preaching was being done by a Mr. (perhaps I should say) Dr. Sims, son of Col. Sims, formerly of Rutherford Co., Tennessee.

He had made his *debut*, some time during the week before, had gone to the press, and had quite a number of hand bills printed, and circulated them pretty extensively.

The import of the first sentence, as well as I now recall it, (not having a copy) is, "All things are now ready." I thought this a good text, so I still think. As the circumstances forbade an effort on my part to attempt to preach, indeed the brethren seeing the circumstances, made no effort to publish any appointment. So I concluded to be a hearer, during the "evening's services." I took my seat as near the scene of action as I could, to be courteous, not wishing to go into the "altar of prayer."

Mr. Sims is a nice man in appearance, I judge him to be about 35 years of age, I suppose five feet ten inches in stature, auburn hair and beard, speaks flippantly, is at no loss for words, I suppose a pretty well-educated man. Is as I judge what the world calls an orator, and a revivalist.

His forte is rhetoric, not logic. He seems not to see the troubles behind or before him, but plunges right on to the main object, which is a re-

vival of religion. Now come some of the troubles, which I thought I saw.

He prayed in his opening prayer to the Lord to come, and convert many, or all those persons round about Evening Shade, and get to thyself a great name!

It was quite singular, that the God of the universe has made the heavens and the earth, and garnished all things with beauty and grandeur, and by the word of his power upholds all things.

Besides it is so clearly stated that God so loved the world as to give his only-begotten Son to die that whosoever believes in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life, and yet with some men, God must come and do some wonderful feat in order to get to himself a great name!

"All things are ready," said the Sabian, as quoted in the hand-bill alluded to above, but the preacher and those aiding in getting up the revival would pray the Lord to come and do the work, that is, do more than has been done, notwithstanding, "all things are now ready," and Jesus before he left the earth and went to heaven, said, "I have finished the work my father gave me to do." "To-day is the day of salvation." "God is not willing that any perish."

In the discourse referred to above, God was represented as standing with outstretched arms, willing to be gracious, but the sinner is not willing.

But toward the close of the "service" the preacher made a proposition to the audience, that next day should be a day of fasting and prayer, stating that he hardly ever succeeded in *persuading* God without

fasting and prayer. Those in favor of the move, were invited to come forward and give their hand, and several did so.

The object of the fasting and prayer, was expressly declared to be, to *persuade* God, *i. e.*, persuade God to convert the people, thereby get to himself a great name!

The course the apostle to the Gentiles pursued was quite the reverse of the one pursued on this occasion. "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord we persuade *men*." 2 Cor. 5: 11. God gave the ministry of reconciliation to the apostles, they were ambassadors of Christ, therefore they prayed the people to be reconciled to God. 2 Cor. 5: 18-20. From the course pursued during the evening, it would seem at one time God was willing, at another he was unwilling.

For when some three or four, perhaps five young persons went forward to the "altar of prayer," matters some way changed, and forthwith, some of the old brethren were called on to pray, and they did so, the import of which was for the Lord to come, and convert the mourners, and produce a revival of religion, one prayed to the Lord to revive "pure and undefiled religion." But that religion is "to visit the fatherless and the widow in their afflictions and to keep himself unspotted from the world." See James 1: 27.

I thought perhaps, if they had went on to the work, they would feel better, and likely if the people were revived a little by gospel teaching, they would be willing to obey Jesus the Christ. But is it a fact, that when persons become willing to be

saved, and manifest that willingness by coming forward as they are told and exhorted to do, that God changes and gets out of the notion? and has to be prayed to, and entreated until he returns to the same state of mind that he was in, when the preacher was telling them, God is willing to be gracious, and standing with outstretched arms?

"All things are now ready."

Those young persons were left without one word of gospel instruction; they seemed to be anxious about their soul's eternal interest.

If they are not saved, where will the guilt fall? God is willing, all things on his part are ready, the mourners by going to the "altar of prayer" manifested their willingness to be saved? Why keep the people in ignorance? Why not preach the word of the Lord as did Paul and Silas? Why stand in the way of the people? Not a ray of light flashed from the mind of the eloquent preacher to illuminate the hearts of these young mourners, who perhaps for the first time in life, had determined to seek the light that is in Jesus Christ.

Poor mourners, compelled to return home with their minds, and hearts as dark as Erebus, so far as gospel light was concerned! And if their hearts were turned to God, they could not tell whether God was willing to save them or not, for at times they were told "all things are now ready."

Then again, they heard their friends say God must be persuaded, still again God is besought to come, and convert the sinners.

There remains one more question

of note. Viz: What will the Lord do with such teachers, in the last day?

"I have not sent these prophets yet they ran, I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in my counsel, and caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings. He that hath my word let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff, to the wheat? Is not my word like as a fire, saith the Lord, and like as a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces?" Jer. 2: 3.

Here the curtain, and the pen both go down.

G. W. CONE.

The Fort Worth Debate No. 2.

Price led off on the first proposition, "Infants are proper subjects of baptism" and church membership. He developed nothing new in the way of argument, his speeches being a mere rehash of Rice, Hughey & Co.'s speeches. He argued that God never had made but one covenant, and per consequence never had made but one church, that church was established in the days of Abraham, and infants were members; therefore infants have a right to church membership now. Then by a kind of a posteriori reasoning, he argued that those who are entitled to church membership are entitled to that which introduces them into the church. This was baptism under the Jewish dispensation, and baptism its substitute, in the Christian. These are merely different dispensations of the same church. Says

that circumcision was repealed by the council of apostles, as recorded in Acts 15; and baptism enacted in its stead. Here, as Bro. Caskey showed was the anomaly of the substitution of one law for another without the substituted law being once mentioned. After proving that babies were in the Abrahamic church and trying to prove that there was no change in the church, he called on Bro. C. to put them out.

Bro. C. replied that he would not do that thankless task, but would make him do it. Admitting, said C. according to your teaching that circumcision was the law of introduction, and that baptism is substituted for it, in this substitution you have repealed every essential feature of the law and have therefore destroyed the law. The administrator, the time when, the subject and the purpose for which the thing was done are all gone. Fathers circumcised children; fathers do not baptize. Male children eight days old were circumcised; both male and female children of all ages, and grown persons are baptized by Bro. P.

P. next made this logical (?) argument. Justified persons are entitled to baptism. Infants are justified; therefore infants are so entitled. "I wonder whether P. knows anything about universal and particular as used in logic. Why not go further? Idiots are justified in the same sense that infants are, they do not sin; therefore idiots are entitled to baptism."

He next found baptism for the infant in the commission, baptize the nations. Bro. C. found as much for

the infidel. P. renders Mark 16: 16, thus; he that believeth, having been baptized (when a baby) shall be saved. Bro. C. showed that there were none such in the days of the apostles. But the strangest thing on this prop. is yet to come.

A. C.

Church News.

Embracing first Lord's day in this month I held a meeting with the Bethel Congregation in Maury Co. Tenn. resulting in eleven additions.

J. M. F. SMITHSON.

May 7th 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: As an item of news I will give you the following:

The disciples have been trying to meet nearly every first day of the week, to read the Scriptures, etc. Several would attend who were not members of the body of Christ. And you know there is a very popular party who are very suspicious. They must have a *Sabbath* school, but not allow the *Bible* in it. Some of the neighbors said then "I will send my children to the other school where the Bible is read. Then they agreed to have the Bible in *their* school.

To-day I had the chance to attend their school and it was opened by a loud prayer for a *Holy Sabbath* day's journey toward that heavenly Canaan.

The superintendent caught or had the disease (suspicion) arose and said; "No question to be asked but what we read, and no answer from any other verse. You are not allowed to refer any other verse, to get the answer to any question that may be asked;" and down he sat.

Cæsar being on his side, of course my mouth was locked. We read of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Samuel, David and Daniel and a great many others and when we were through, our superior (at least for that time) said, now for the questions. But says he, I see none. However, there was a sort of home-guard preacher there; he asked one, and spoke a few words, but our guide said that will do. We will be dismissed.

So you see our Holy Sabbath day's journey was quite short. In fact it was going backwards to be there and not allowed to ask or answer a question. Such is the blindness of sectarianism.

Truly,
JOSEPH WHEELER.

Dry Cove, Jackson Co., Ala., Apr. 26, 1874.

Disciples---Societies.

"A poor disciple who cannot let his benevolence flow through the channels of the different societies of the times is far behind the times; and a poor preacher who can do nothing in the way of public speaking but old-fashioned preaching, will rarely enjoy the inspiration given by a crowded house."—*A. Clark, Advocate, April 23rd.*

I am jealous, for the honor of Christ. I would ascribe to His name, all glory, now and forever, He is worthy. Many of our good brethren, in their zeal for temperance, or other human Societies, are led to say, and do much, that the experience of years may cause them to regret. I know Bro. Clark by reputa-

tion—an earnest, successful preacher of the Gospel, and I supposed him a man who was committed to the gospel and to Christ, soul and body.

Bro. C. seems to have been very much hurt, because some "old foggy" Christians could not, or would not sign the pledge of a Temperance Society. He thinks them a little too scrupulous, when they are not willing to let their benevolence flow through the different human societies. Bro. Clark, did you forget, that we are to do *all*—word or deed—in the name of the Lord Jesus? Is there not room enough in the Church, for the exercise of benevolence, for the reformation of drunkards, as well as for thieves, or liars? The Gospel is God's plan of reformation, and you certainly will not recommend that we try any human plan, instead of God's plan.

Again. What do you mean, Bro. Clark, in your reference to old-fashioned preaching, as above? You certainly do not mean we have an old-fashioned way of preaching something which is not the gospel. Nor, do I think you meant, we should preach something else than the gospel. You surely do not mean that we shall get up sensational discourses, in order that we may enjoy the inspiration of a crowded house?

Make the church the best Temperance Society on earth. And Bro. Clark, let us work in that, or if some of our brethren are too conscientious to go with us into Societies, and prefer to work alone in the name of Jesus, let us honor them for their fidelity to Christ, and throw not a straw in their way.

In Christian love,

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville, Texas, April 28, 1874.

Hopkinsville School.

BY A PRESBYTERIAN PREACHER.

Dear Brethren: I visited a church school, and minister of your order in Hopkinsville, Ky., a short time ago and hope I will not be considered as presumptuous in giving my impressions to your readers. I feel the more at liberty as you kindly lent me your pages on a former occasion.

Hopkinsville on the South Eastern R. R. is distant almost three hours from Nashville. The population is some 4000, of which an enormous proportion is from Virginia. In fact it seemed like a Virginia town. At every turn I met faces and heard names familiar to me from childhood, and identified with various communities of the Old Dominion, in which I lived in other days. The Dades, the Greys, the Gaines, the Greens, the Venables, the Mortons, and scores of other families, identified with all the State has of noble, are represented by descendants who do not appear to have degenerated from ancestral glory.

Mr. Crenshaw, the President of the Female College is himself a native of Old Powhatan, brought up in the Presbyterian faith, he was in early days as the apostle Paul puts it, "taken with guile" and left the fat pastures of the sheep, to graze on the thorns and prickles; which grow in the desert where the Campbells do browse. But owing no doubt to good training and in spite of later noxious influence, he is a large-hearted refined Catholic-spirited Christian, such as it has not been often my lot to meet in any church. I was his

guest for several days and had thus an opportunity of observing the inner workings of his school, I found that altho' it was a church building, he had selected his strong corps of assistants with no reference to religious views. Especially did it please my Sectarian heart to find in the establishment, a Miltonic Abdiel, in the person of Mr. Crenshaw's own sister, Miss Mary, who alone has been faithful in the family defection and whose religion here is of that true blue color in which, you and I brethren, would both agree that angels rejoice, altho' as to the nature of the angels thus rejoicing we might not be in exact accord. I preached Sunday night for Mr. Crenshaw and was so kindly and affectionately greeted by numbers of the brethren that I felt no more fears for my life, than if I had been surrounded by a flock of Presbyterian sheep. It is so pleasant to meet with people who can rise above denominational difference and who force us to feel that in spite of lower lives there is a higher plane of unity upon which all Christians can be one.

The great ornament of Hopkinsville is the South Ky. Female College It is on a high hill that overlooks the town and is surrounded by a grove of oaks. The building is very handsome. I lectured there on Friday night and in connection with which there was a musical and forensic exhibition and other exercises on the part of the pupils. Altho' the time for preparation had been but a few days everything went off in the best style. The question of the right of women to vote was discussed and on both sides was discussed ably. The articles named would have reflected

credit on mature minds, and written rapidly as they were by girls so young, showed that they had been thoroughly trained. The music was excellent. In short, I admired every thing about the school and if the president had not wandered from the "true faith," (true faith, brethren, always means my church, whatever my church happens to be,) I do not see how it could be improved. The Faculty is an able one, and as one of the members of it was once a pupil of my own I had a fractional amount of grand-parent pride in the attainment of the pupils.

I am aware that an article semi-jesting and personal like this is not in accordance with the tone of the *ADVOCATE*. If you publish it, I hope you and your readers will see in it, nothing but a desire that is an earnest one; albeit it is playfully expressed, to utter just words of commendation concerning some who tho "they walk not with us" radiate the shining white of the gospel grace, so that all can see that they have been with Jesus.

'Respectfully,

W. STODDARD.

Missionary Evangelist Work.

Bros. L. & S: Bro. Wadkins our colored brother, made us a visit a short time since. He came well recommended and endorsed by the Nashville brethren. He is also favorably known here, by some of the principal men of our congregation. This brother desires to devote all his time, to preaching the gospel to the colored race. This is a noble desire. He ought to be encouraged. He is

a man of intelligence, and, I understand, of good speaking talent. God thus, in his providence, affords us, a good opportunity of accomplishing something in this department of service. Shall we not avail ourselves of it? Let the churches take it into hand and while so much is being done for the freedmen of the Mississippi; let us endeavor, by the help of the Lord, to do something for those of Tennessee.

2. I am glad to see the movement of the brethren in West Tennessee, for co-operative effort in that portion of the State. That is right, brethren. I hope the example will be followed by Middle and East Tennessee. We shall never accomplish much, without a well-connected co-operative effort.

We ought to have an evangelist for Middle Tennessee, to devote the whole of his time, to the work, in this section. There should likewise be one in East Tennessee. That division of the State, greatly needs this kind of work. I presume, one part of the work to be done by the convention in West Tennessee, will be, to send out an evangelist to labor, through that section of the State. In addition to this, we should have a general evangelist to travel throughout the whole State, East, West, and Middle Tennessee.

With these four evangelists, one for each division of the State; men of the proper stamp; wholly consecrated to the work; with the cooperation of the brotherhood, and under the blessing of God, a great change would soon be made, in the face of things spiritual. 'The wilderness would rejoice, and the desert blossom as a rose.'

In order to accomplish these ends, we must have a co-operation of the churches, not only in the three divisions of the State, but of the whole State. Many matters, pertaining to the interests and promotion of the good cause, would be furthered, by such a co-operation. I, therefore, respectfully, and deferentially, move, God willing, that we call a convention of the brotherhood of the whole State, looking to such a co-operative effort. Who will second this motion? The place and time, could be determined by further consultation. I would suggest, respectfully, Murfreesboro, the place; November as the time. If Nashville, or any other place, could be shown to have superior advantages in location; or an earlier period should be deemed preferable, we would not be dogmatic in our suggestion.

Beloved brethren, don't let these suggestions fall, "still born." Let them be thoroughly canvassed. Christ has a great work for us to do in Tennessee. Don't let us lie supinely on our backs, and see our state bound hands and feet, in the fetters of Secularism. Speak out, brethren, and let us act out.

Fraternally,

G. W. ABELL.

P. S. The preceding suggestions, are independent, of, and in addition to, local and sub-district preaching, which we take for granted, is already being accomplished in the different divisions of the State; though doubtless not as effectively as it should.

Southern Kentucky, and Northern Alabama, from their geographical position, could very properly co-operate with us in this good work. Let

us hear from you, speedily, brethren, in regard to this matter. To the ADVOCATE we look to have the subject brought before the brethren. We wish everything done according to the oracles of God. We place the day for meeting, remote, that the different portions of the State, may have an opportunity to canvass the matter and send up a full delegation.

G. W. A.

Murfreesboro, April 24th. 1874.

For the Disciples in Wilson and Sumner Counties.

Having traveled over much of the territory of Sumner and Wilson, and met with many of the congregations therein; I think I am prepared to state some of the facts, with reference to the progress of the cause of Christ in these two Counties: Facts which are not pleasant for the contemplation of those who love the cause of the cause of the blessed Redeemer.

There are no less than eighteen congregations in the Counties of Wilson and Sumner; of this number only three are doing anything for the advancement of the cause by aiding in preaching the Gospel of Christ and these contribute only a small amount that they may have preaching once a month. Having visited and met with thirteen of these congregations, I think it a small calculation to say there are fifteen hundred members of the Christian church in these counties; if these fifteen hundred would give to the Lord the very small sum of one dollar each per annum, two evangelists could be sustained in this great field of labor

presenting the word of life to the people; many of whom are ignorant of the way of salvation as it is in Christ Jesus. The reason these churches are not doing something for the upbuilding and advancement of the cause is simple. Each congregation feels its inability to sustain a preacher without the assistance of other congregations; this is the great difficulty and one that can be removed only by a concert of action among the churches.

These being facts which demand the earnest consideration and prompt action of the lovers of Christ, will not some of the prominent men of the Christian Church in the Counties of Sumner and Wilson call for a consultation or mass meeting, to be composed of representatives of the different congregations, to be held at a suitable time and place, for the purpose of consulting together with reference to the best mode (in harmony with the Bible) of working for the upbuilding of the cause of Christ; the spread of his kingdom upon earth, and the salvation of immortal souls.

W. H. COOKE.

Gallatin, Tenn. April 24th 1874.

QUERIES.

Messrs. L. & S: Please let me hear from you on foot-washing. I have asked several of your members and they could not tell me any more about it than that it was a Jewish ceremony. I hope that you will be able to tell me more than that. I will be glad if you will send a preacher to Thomasville, Ga. You must come to our town.

W. ARTHUR LITTLE.

Thomasville, Apr. 16th.

The only trouble about foot-washing is, that some suppose it to be a church ordinance, and attend to it as such, while others do not think so and do not observe it. The practice is but twice mentioned in the New Testament. The first is where Christ washed the feet of his disciples. This was not done, as we think, as a divine institution in connection with the Lord's supper, but was done after an ordinary supper, as a custom then prevalent in that country, and the Savior washed their feet as an act of kindness, and to give the disciples an example of kindness and courtesy towards one another. If the disciples ever attended to it as a divine institution, such as the Lord's Supper, we have no account of it. We have an account of the disciples continuing to meet regularly on the first day of the week to break bread, but no account of their ever meeting a single time to wash one another's feet. But on the contrary, Paul speaks of it as a private duty, in the case of a widow. "If she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work." 1 Tim. 5, 10. In this case the apostle speaks of private duties, that were done at home, and in the private walks of life, and not in the assembly of the saints. The washing of feet therefore, as mentioned in the New Testament, as we think, was a private, home duty, arising from the circumstances and customs of the times. They wore sandals then, which only covered the bottoms of their feet, and most of the year in that country was dry and dusty, and

their feet needed washing more frequently than now. When Christians are hospitable towards one another, and wait upon each other kindly in whatever is needed at their homes, according to the surroundings, we think it precisely the same principle that was embraced in the foot-washing of New Testament times.

We know of no preacher that we could send to Thomasville, nor is it in our power to go, on account of other obligations.

A sister also asks, why many Christians stand in prayer instead of kneeling. We cannot tell. We think from what we can learn on the subject from the Scriptures, that kneeling is nearer the examples of Scripture than standing. We read of one instance, where the brethren accompanied Paul, to the sea shore, that they all kneeled down and prayed, when they were to separate from each other. And there seems to us, at least, to be more humility, and more manifestation of dependence in kneeling than in standing. But we feel not disposed to argue the matter at length, at present, though the common practice, in some churches, of always standing to pray, we are free to say, does not suit our notions of humility before the Lord. But others may think and act for themselves in this matter.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S.: Please give me your views of the 14th verse of the 7th chapter of First Corinthians especially the words "else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." Answer through the ADVO-

CATE as soon as convenient and oblige,
Yours in the one faith,

E. J. HINELY.

Springfield, Effingham Co., Ga., Apr. 8th. 1874.

In those early days of Christianity, when it was first introduced, it frequently occurred that a husband would become a Christian and the wife would not; or the wife would become a Christian and husband not. Then it became a question as to whether the believing husband should put away the unbelieving wife, or the believing wife should put away the unbelieving husband. Paul tells them, no. That the believing one will sanctify the unbelieving one. Otherwise, they would be living in adultery to live any longer together, and children born to them in this condition would be illegitimate. But Paul teaches them that they can still live together, unless the unbelieving one departs on account of the other being a believer; in that case, he shows that the believing one is no longer bound by the marriage tie. Let the unbeliever go, rather than the believer depart from the faith in order to live with the unbeliever. But if the unbelieving husband die, then the believing widow is not permitted to marry another unbeliever; but if she marry at all, it must be in the Lord. Christians therefore are certainly not permitted to marry unbelievers.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S.: I notice in the 16th number of the ADVOCATE a Bro. writing from this place wishes to know if it is right for Christians

to partake of the Lord's Supper with Pedobaptists: to which you replied, that if a disciple could not find an assembly of the Lord's people, you could see nothing wrong in partaking of the Lord's Supper with them. But if we can meet with the Lord's people we ought to do so. Now brethren, if Pedobaptists are not the Lord's people, is the supper they may set the Lord's Supper? If it is not, is it right for us to partake of it with them? If we do, do we not acknowledge to the world that they are the Lord's people, and should we not claim them as brethren? I ask these questions; not to be contentious, but I desire to learn the truth as it is in Christ Jesus and walk accordingly, that I may have a right to the tree of life and may enter in through the gates into the city. Please answer.

Your Bro. in Christ,

A. S. DERRYBERRY.

Pickensville, Ala. Apr. 29th 1874.

Our brother should remember that the validity of an ordinance of God does not depend upon the administrator. The bread is the emblem of the Lord's body, and the wine is the emblem of his shed blood. If a Christian partakes of these with a pure desire to remember the Savior's death, even though it be with Pedobaptists we think it will be acceptable, when that is the best we can do. But we again repeat, a Christian should always meet with his own brethren, the disciples of Christ, when there are any to meet with. But when a Christian man, when he cannot meet with the disciples, meets with Pedobaptists, and takes the Supper with them he certainly does not by that act en-

dorse their errors. When we meet with our own brethren, each man has to examine himself, and not another, and eat himself. And though every man in the assembly should be a hypocrite but one and thus deceive him, and he eats with an earnest heart, discerning the Lord's body, it would be just as acceptable to God as if all had been true Christians. The design of the Lord's Supper is to show his death till he comes, and where a Christian man can get hold of the bread and wine and partake of it, he can thus show the Lord's death and thereby honor God, and strengthen his own heart. But we only say these things in cases where a Christian can do no better. When a disciple of Christ forsakes the assembly of his own brethren, and goes off to assemble with others, he certainly does not manifest a very high appreciation of the cause of truth, as contrasted with error. Hence we do not wish anything we have said to be construed into a compromise of the truth, or an endorsement of error. But there is such a thing as going to extremes, and we wish to avoid that.

E. G. S.

Friends L. & S: An explanation through the columns of the GOSPEL ADVOCATE upon the 25th verse of 5th chapter of Matthew would be of great satisfaction to me. The verse reads as follows,

"Agree with thine adversary quickly while thou art in the way with him," &c.

Please explain what is the adversary spoken of by the Savior, as there are difference of opinions concerning

it. Will you explain? Hoping to hear from you soon,

Very Truly, Yours,

JOHN W. HALE.

Newburg, Tenn. April 25th. 1874.

We scarcely know how to make any explanation of this passage that will be any plainer than the language itself. The word adversary means one that opposes an enemy. Literally it means an opponent in law. And the Savior meant to teach his disciples that they must always live upon principles of equity and justice, and that they should always settle their difficulties with men upon these principles of justice and peace, and not wait to settle them upon principles of human wisdom and human laws. A Christian that has to be forced to do right by human laws, has a very poor claim to be a child of God. When a Christian man wrongs another, or in any way gets into a difficulty with a man of the world, he should at once go to that man, and upon principles of love and gentleness settle the matter with him, and never wait to settle it by the laws of the land.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S: On last Lord's day Bro. E. M. Heath, — Superintendent of the Sunday School at this place, — submitted a few questions to the members of the same for their consideration until to-day when they were to be answered.

This among others was propounded: "What is the gift of the Holy Ghost?"

When the query was put to the School to-day, some said, that "it is

the Holy Ghost itself." Others something else etc., etc. Now will you please answer the query in accordance with the Bible teaching, at as early a period as convenient for you to spare the space in the G. A., and oblige a brother.

J. A. POWERS.

Caddo, Johnson Co., Texas, 26th. 1874.

This question has been answered a number of times through the ADVOCATE, but as new readers are constantly coming in, we will try again. We have ever believed, and still believe, that the gift of the Holy Spirit spoken of in this passage, means the Spirit itself. We are assured elsewhere that the Spirit itself dwells in the Christian, Paul says, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." 1 Cor. 3, 16. So the Spirit dwells in Christians. Every one who would repent and be baptized on the day of Pentecost was promised the gift of the Spirit. All such were also promised the remission of sins; and when they did it they were Christians. This construction of the passage perfectly harmonizes with all others on the subject. And Paul teaches that by the Spirit which dwells in us, our mortal bodies shall be quickened. Rom. 8. 11.

E. G. S.

Life of Elder Walter Scott.

The above is the title of a book just published by Bosworth, Chase & Hall of Cincinnati Ohio, written by bro. Wm. Baxter. As bro. Scott was one of the co-laborers of Bro Camp bell, history necessarily contains

much that is deeply interesting concerning the labors and struggles of those who were then engaged in the great work in which we as a people are now engaged. It is worth the time and money of any one to read such a history. Especially would we recommend our young brethren to purchase and read this book. They will find much in the life of bro. Scott to stimulate and encourage them in the work of the Lord. The book is written in a chaste, clear, and simple style. We have not as yet given the book a critical examination, but so far as we have examined it, we are pleased with the book, and to that extent, we can heartily recommend it. The book is printed on good paper, a little tinted, and neatly bound in cloth. The publishers are anxious to secure agents for this book everywhere. The book can be obtained from the publishers, post paid for \$2.25.

E. G. S.

Obituaries.

Bros. L. & S: It becomes my duty to record the death of sister Elizabeth Ann Williams, who departed this life April 13th 1874, at her residence on Carson Fork, Cannon County Tenn. aged about 52 years. She leaves 10 children, many relatives and friends to mourn her loss. Sister Williams was a daughter of brother John and sister Delila Petty, who were among the first settlers of the County. She was married in early life to Mr. John William who was killed in 1859. She has raised all her family without any help except the aid of him on whose strong arm she always leaned for support. She has been a member of the church of Christ about 30 years and was proverbial for her piety and devotion to the cause of her master. The poor never left her door destitute, if it was in her power to supply their wants, and kept herself unspotted from the world. So we know that if we follow in her footsteps, while we live in this present evil world, we shall see her again in peace. Her death was caused by consumption, from which

she had long been a sufferer; we can truthfully say of her a mother has fallen in Israel.

Your brother in the one hope

J. E. CARNES.

Readyville Tenn. April 16th 1874.

Bros. L. & S: By request I attempt to pen a few lines to the memory of my little niece and namesake, Daisy Melvina Lindsey, in ant daughter of G. M. and S. A. Lindsey. Little Daisy was born Nov. the 13th '72 and died at the home of her parents at Dickson station, Ala., on the 11th of Sept. '73- Though she lived but a few months, it was long enough for her to wind herself like tendrils around the affections of her parents, dear John and Sarah, while I sympathize with you, I thank my dear Father that the pure and precious bud which has been nipped in its beauty, has the promise of being with Jesus: for he said, "suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Let us continue faithful and we will meet little Daisy on the glorious resurrection morn.

MELVINA B.

Apr. 24th 1874.

MUSIC.

Benham's Musical Review for May is on our table, and contains some interesting articles, and a pretty song, "Summer Stars," and an instrumental piece, "Feast of Roses," besides some other short pieces. The Review is published monthly, at one dollar a year. Single copies, ten cents.

Address, Henry L. Benham, Indianapolis, Ind.

CHURCH'S MUSICAL VISITOR for April is received, and contains the song, "The old house at Home," one or two instrumental pieces, and one or two other little songs, and several pages also of reading matter. Published monthly, at \$1.50 a year, 15 cts. single copy.

Address John Church & Co., Cincinnati, O.

Also we have received two songs, "Don't go near the Bar Room father," and "Father drinks no more," pub-

lished by T. W. Helmick, Cincinnati, Ohio, from whom they can be received, postage paid, at 40 cts each.

Correspondence.

Brethren L. & S: The army of the Lord at this place has been disciplining itself, and edifying itself in love, during the winter months preparatory to an advance movement early in the Spring. The church being full of life and wide awake, and on the lookout for a favorable opportunity to fall on, surprise and capture the enemy in its strong-hold, accidentally our much-esteemed and worthy brother J. M. F. Smithson (the blind preacher) came into our midst, we called on him to take command of the forces, and he took the stand and commenced to teach the people. It was soon noised abroad that the blind man was the preacher after all for the masses. The interest of the meeting increased from day to day until our house would not contain all who wanted to hear. In the mean time the enemy's forces were surrendering "one by one" until last night, (the meeting having commenced ten days previous) when it was found that we had in our camp 16 noble souls, as harmless as doves and as innocent and lovely as lambs, and a large number left on the field badly wounded, so much so that they will never do efficient service in the enemy's ranks any more.

Brother Smithson did us great good, and endeared himself to us in the strongest ties of Christian love. May he long live to edify his brethren and show unto the people the way of salvation. There were 116 added

to the faithful in Warren County last year. Shall we stop with less this year? I say no. So let us buckle on the whole armor and never lay it aside until the victory is won for the Savior. To the Lord be glory and dominion forever more.

Yours in the one faith,
H. L. WALLING.

Earnest activity in the churches everywhere is the sure forerunner of success in converting souls to God. Will not our brethren everywhere heartily bestir themselves in the master's work? We ought to be steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, for we know that our labor in the Lord is not in vain.

D. L.

Search the Scriptures daily. Let error alone; look for truth. Do not allow yourself to play around a hook which dangles before you, though it may be baited with very flattering doctrine. They used to call in derision Tottenham Court Chapel, in London, "Whitefield's soul-trap." Other soul-traps there are in this world, which may be seriously named. Glorious captivity is that when the soul is truly caught for Christ; awful slavery is that, when the soul is in bondage to Satan. "O, never mind them," said the sainted Venn to his Bible class, when the revilers told them his religion was all extravagance; "never mind them; never answer them; read your Bible; press forward, dear lads, and you cannot miss of Heaven with a lamp to your feet."—*Robinson.*

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

BEWARE.

The Bible is a book ; more, it is the book that Christians should place in the hands of their children, their neighbors and all who will read, for instruction. It is the great store-house of heavenly knowledge, to which the children of God go for the bread of life, for themselves. Therein is found the Gospel the power of God to salvation to every one that believes. This too is the life-giving power by which Paul begat the Corinthians, and others can still be affected by it. Here is the ever-living seed by which Peter said, men, in his time, were born again. There are many hard things met, in this age of infidelity in the church and out of it. Nothing short of the word of the Lord that breaketh the rock in pieces, can successfully overpower the errors, yeas, isms that petrify the hearts of men. It becomes the lovers of truth to throw promptly the sledge-hammer of the Lord at all sin, unrighteousness and falsehood. The word is God's hammer. I am sorry that so many of us are found so ignorant of what is written. Ask, where is the charity chapter? Where is "Be not overcome of evil but overcome evil with good"? Where is "abstain from every appearance of evil"? and "don't know," don't know, don't know goes around until the metre is changed by some brother who adds, "It is thar somewhar tho'." There is a power

in God's word. It is a sword, but it must be wielded to do execution. It is a hammer, but is powerless until properly used. It is a seed, but must be sown to bring fruit to God's glory. Jesus cast out devils by his word. We can not do this, but we can drive from the hearts of men evil thoughts, adulteries, fornication, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness; for these are in the heart; this is purified by faith and this comes from hearing the word and hearing is produced by one who preaches. Here is the work of the children of the kingdom. It is the business of the salt of the earth to save. Christian, if you save no one to the truth, you may know you have lost your savor. How can you teach when you know not what to teach and cannot even go to the book and find it? How can you give bread that you have not and cannot tell where it is? Oh! it is a shame, an outrageous shame for men and women, to be called lights, when they cannot tell where the simplest duties are laid down. Poor recollections are the scape-goat upon which all sins of ignorance of this kind are laid. This is not the subject that was in my mind when I set out.

I have seen two strange Bibles of late ; I have found in the Bible, yes a book with HOLY BIBLE labelled on it, both Campbellite and sprinkling for baptism. They were sold by a man claiming to be a disciple of Christ. No. 1 has a list of the different sects or denominations. Look!!! "Campbellites, see disciples of Christ" "Disciples of Christ, called also Campbellites ; a sect founded by Alexan-

der Campbell," and goes on to say they seceded from the Presbyterians &c.' Now how do you like that, found in the Bible too. Here is a Campbellite Bible at last. I have heard of it a long time, but it has never been my misfortune to see one before. In No. 1, there is an index and dictionary. Baptism is defined, "washing by sprinkling, affusion and dipping." There it is again in black and white. Here is a thus saith the Bible for Sprinkling. Again I say, beware! and I trust all our papers will put the brethren on the look-out. Sincerely on the subject, I have seen a number of these Bibles and every brother has been deceived in getting them. It is understood that the old Bible, the dear, blessed Bible, the family Bible, is to lie on the stand from year to year, from generation to generation. Now who wants to transmit to others such envious misrepresentation and abominable falsehood as this. Who wants a publisher guilty of such conduct, to have his money to get up more of such corruption. I had rather my Bible had no backs on it and to have its bright pages soiled by the foulest filth than for a falsehood, to pollute it. The truth is, I do not want God's word to be burdened with such misrepresentation and untruth and be made to carry them to the world. This is a wily and insinuating way of circulating things that have not the strength to go alone.

Must the word of God be loaded down with men's doctrines? These notions can not be found in the Bible, and they will put it there and sell it as genuine. Sprinkling for baptism cannot be found there, and those who would dare add to God's

word have put it in. 'Tis known we are not Campbellites, 'tis known we did not start with Campbell, or the Presbyterians, or Baptists, but men want it so, and put it in the Bible and they think place, position and company will give it respectability and character. If you were buying bread and you were to find something filthy on it, the article would be rejected, then beware of that which defiles the truth for this feeds the Spiritual man. Hand your Bible down to your children, and what they find in papa's and mamma's Bible, they will think is right. You should not deliver to them things loathsome to lovers of truth.

J. M. BARNES.

The Little People of Sorrow.

It is a touching fact in the life of Horace Greeley, and illustrates at once the practical qualities of his heart, that the only bequest made by him in his last will to any public charity was one to the Society whose efficiency in rescuing the wretched little street-children of New York had excited his profound respect and sympathy. The recent issue of the twenty-first annual report of the Children's Aid Society, from the pen of its distinguished Secretary, Mr. Charles D. Brace, is a new reminder—if any were needed—of the worth of an organization which has now reached its majority, and whose manifold operations of wise kindness and expert generosity must stir unmingled pleasure in every heart that is not a stranger to pity. There are some forms of systematized benevo-

lence concerning which even good people may have their doubts. There can be no hesitation about the work of the Children's Aid Society. It deals with sorrow in those who have not brought it on by their own sin; it deals with sin before it has hardened into criminality. It takes hold of human lives at their outset, and grasping all the possibilities of the future, and getting the start even of Satan himself in the race for possession, it plucks human bodies and it transplants them from circumstances that are sure to destroy into those which are likely to save.

There are several forms of benevolence to the neglected little ones of our city that the Children's Aid Society engages in; but that form which is the best known, because it is the most picturesque and the most strikingly useful, consists in gathering up the children who have no homes and in placing them in families where they will have homes and the chance of a fresh start in life. There is something about this so palpably benign and successful, that all who hear of it can perceive its utility. The records of the Society show that ninety out of every hundred of the children whom it thus provides with country-homes are saved—exactly the proportion probably, of those who would have been lost had they been left in the city. Thus the Society, so far as its work extends, turns tables on the forces of evil, and inverts the ancient balance between woe and happiness in the world. During the first year of its existence it provided homes for two hundred and seven children; and that seem-

ed at the time a marvelous exploit of benevolence. But each year since then has witnessed an increase in the number of rescued ones, so that the last year is also the best year, and reaches the number of three thousand and seven hundred and one. Therefore, during 1873, by the interposition of this single agency, at least ten children every day have been caught up out of the filth and misery of our city slums and borne away into scenes which will open for them lives of happiness and honor. Whoever will imagine to himself the wrong-doing and the woe prevented in the case of one human being by such a change of circumstances, and multiply this by ten for every day that passes over him, will have some conception of one part of the good which this noble society is achieving. And how the angels must look down with joy upon an organized power which, in this separate form of its operations, during the period of twenty-one years, has rescued from destruction 'thirty' thousand children!

In looking over the schedule showing the number sent to each State during the past year, together with the nationality and parentage of each child, one meets with facts that are very significant. As is natural, New York State exceeds all others in the number of children received from the city, namely, 497. Next comes the State of Illinois, which receives 402. New Jersey comes next, its number being 265; and the States immediately following are Iowa, which takes 260; Missouri, 217, and Ohio, 208. All other States are below 200. But the differences be-

tween them are surprising. Why, for instance should Indiana receive only 58, when Wisconsin receives 170? And what domestic reasons can account for great States like Pennsylvania and Massachusetts receiving only 80, and 33 respectively, when several times those numbers are received by the little State of New Jersey? Of the Southern States, Virginia receives only 10, Kentucky receives none; and no State south of Virginia and Kentucky receives any. The items respecting the nationality of the children are also interesting. Of the 3,701 placed by the Society in the country during the past year, 1,576 were born in this; 626 were born in Ireland; 607, in Germany; 332, in England; and 145, in Sweden. Is it not creditable to Scottish thrift that only 25 are set down to Scotland? It is also remarkable that while 21 are Hungarians, and 34 are Poles, only 14 are French, the latter being the nationality least represented in the ranks of juvenile wretchedness and deliverance. Moreover, of the nearly four thousand children provided with homes during the past year, 774 had both parents living, 191 had fathers living, 405 had mothers living, 1,366 were without fathers or mothers, while 397 were of unknown parentage—human waifs on the face of the earth, without mortal sympathy or protection until Providence made this noble Society its gracious almoner.—*Selected.*

English Mothers.

It is a marked feature of social life in England, and certainly one of its especial charms, that mothers and

daughters are so uniformly seen together at home. Not only is the first lady to whom you are introduced at the house where you visit, but mistress of the ceremonies throughout; not only does she preside at the dinner table, but in the evening she sits as queen. Whatever may be your first impression of such an arrangement—if it happens that your sympathies are with the younger ladies you will very soon learn to think that the mothers absence would very sincerely regretted by the daughters. As a picture, all must admit the arrangement to be perfect. The portly form and matronly dignity of the mother are an exquisite foil to the youthful beauty and maiden coyness of the daughter. And you will find nothing to mar but everything to enhance, the interest of the picture. The mother's presence never seems to act as an unwelcome restraint.

Between her and her daughters you will mark the most joyous, playful, loving freedom, without the sacrifice of a little parental dignity and authority on the one hand, or of sweet and graceful filial duty on the other. It may be said of English families generally, that these two things are eminently characteristic, namely: uniform parental authority, and the most charming freedom of intercourse between parents and children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The last Phase of the Temperance Movement.....	457
A Science.....	463
The Fort worth Debate, No. 2.....	463
Church News.....	406
Disciples Societies.....	467
Hopknsville School.....	468
Missionary evangels work.....	469
For the disciples in Wilson and Sumner Counties.....	470
Queries.....	471
Life of Elder Walter Scott.....	474
Obituaries.....	475
Music.....	475
Correspondence.....	475
FIRESIDE.	
Beware.....	477
The Little people of sorrow.....	478
English Mothers.....	480

Bro. Manning 492

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 21.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MAY 21, 1874.

Visit to Locust Grove Meeting House
in Warren Co, Ky, Embracing Second
Lordsday in May.

Taking the train at Nashville at 1-55 P. M. on Sat. May the 9th, we had a pleasant run of near three hours, to Rich Pond Station, about three miles f. om Locust Grove. At this station we delivered a discourse that night, on the Gospel as the power of God unto Salvation, to those who believe and obey the same. The Gospel is declared to be the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. This being true, we must know what the Gospel is, that we may know precisely through what channel to seek salvatson. In 15th of 1 Corinthians, Paul defines the gospel to be the death, burial and resurrection of Christ from the dead. But these Gospel facts do not propose to save men without their compliance with their divine requisitions. Paul teaches in his second letter to the Thessalonians, that those who "obey not the Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory

of his power.' Hence, in order to reach the power of God for our salvation, we must obey the Gospel of Christ. The commission clearly shows this. "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be damned." But it may be asked, "Is not God every where, and can he not save us as well one way as another?" It is not our purpose to enquire where God is *not*, nor to inquire what he can, or cannot do, but to inquire what he has promised to do, and where his power is to pardon sins.

It is not claimed that God has confined all his power to the Gospel of Christ, but that all his power by which he proposes to save man is there. All the power God has, is confined to no one channel, for man's good. Water is God's power to quench thirst, but no one can suppose that all the power that God possesses for man's good is confined to this one channel. But the power to accomplish this end, is confined there, and we need not look for that power anywherg else. And no matter where God is,

nor how much power he has, water is his ordained means to quench thirst and he will not put it elsewhere. Food is his ordained means to allay hunger, and promote physical growth and strength. Not that all his power is there, but his power for the accomplishment of that end is there, and it need not be looked for elsewhere. The man who ceases to eat, will cease to live, no matter how much he may seek and pray for these blessings through some other channel. So we must use food, or forever do without the blessings of life and health and strength. The air is God's power to sustain life through breathing. And this power can be found nowhere else. Nor does it matter how much power there is in the air to perpetuate life through breathing, that power will benefit no one who places himself where he cannot breathe it. Yet no one would suppose for a moment all the power of God for the benefit of man is in the air we breathe, but only the power necessary for the accomplishment of that one end. So it is with the Gospel of Christ. All the power that is necessary for man's salvation is in the gospel, and every one who will obey the gospel has the promise of the benefits of this power. But he who will not obey it, has no such promise. As well might a man expect to quench thirst without water, allay hunger without food, or breathe without air, as to expect salvation without obeying the Gospel, wherein the power of God is for salvation. In order to enjoy any blessing from God, we must come to the channel in which that blessing is placed. And further in regard to to the question

of God being everywhere, he never has proposed to pardon sins except through certain appointments.

In the Jewish economy, God placed his name and power in the tabernacle, and in the temple of Solomon, and through the sin offerings appointed to be offered there, he proposed to pardon those who brought them. His name and power were in the Temple, and though they might offer precisely the same offerings somewhere else, it did them no good for God was not there to bless them. And when the Jews sought to obtain his favors by sacrificing elsewhere, it always resulted in their rejection and ruin, instead of a blessing. None have ever been able in any age, to obtain blessings from God, except through his appointed means. And if it be asked where God is to pardon sins under the New institution, Paul answers the question, as follows: "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold all things are become new. And all things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." 2 Cor. 5, 17-19. From this we learn that God is in Christ, in order to reconcile and save rebellious man. And as it was necessary in the Jewish age to go to the temple where God's name was recorded and there offer the sin offerings in order to receive pardon, so now we must come into Christ, where the name of God is, in order to reach the promise

of the remission of sins. It is required that we be in Christ, in order to be new creatures. And there is a specific way of entering into Christ, and that is definitely laid down by Paul in sixth of Romans, where he says, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" By baptism then, we enter into Christ, and according to Paul and Christ himself, we are saved whenever we get into Christ. Jesus says in tenth of John, "I am the door; by me if any man enter in he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." We have the promise of pardon when we enter into Christ, where God is, but not while we remain out of him. The heart is prepared by the power of the gospel through faith. The conduct, the character is humbled and turned to God by repentance. And upon a confession of the name of Christ, the individual puts him on by baptism. When this is done, the heart, the life, and the state are turned to God and Christ, and the individual has entered these great and glorious names. Jesus said to the apostles, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them (in) into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," and having thus entered into Christ, Paul says, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Eph. 1.

Thus by obeying the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation, we have the full promise of pardon. And those who do not obey the gospel, have no such promise. Persons who act otherwise, have no divine assurance of pardon. But in do-

ing them, we have every assurance that we could desire. Such was the body of the discourse. There was a good congregation present, and they listened with profound attention; they listened in a way that indicated that they understood what they heard, and that they were deeply interested in it. At the end of the discourse, one Methodist lady came forward and made the good confession, and arrangements were made for her burial with Christ in baptism. On Lord's day morning we went to Locust Grove meeting house, which was built for all to preach in, but none were to establish churches there, except the Methodists, and they have had a church there for a long while, and have held the ground with almost undisputed sway. We reported a meeting there some two months ago with seven additions. The next time afterwards that the Methodist preacher came round there, he attempted a heavy attack upon us. But the brethren and friends said he missed his mark all the while, and made no points against us. This indeed, is usually the case. His speech resulted much more to his own injury than ours, as he did not do it in as kind a spirit as might have been. So when we learned all the facts in the case, we made no allusion to it whatever in our discourse last Lord's day. There was a very large concourse of people assembled on this occasion, and we endeavored to present the truth of God as plainly, and as mildly as we were able. At the close of the discourse, one Rev. Mr. Lewis, a Methodist preacher, came forward and asked permission to announce

that the discourse would be replied to, at some future time. We readily granted him the privilege, as the discourse was then public property. He then announced that he would have it replied to on the fifth Lord's day of this month, stating that he felt fully competent to the task of overturning it himself, only that he was not physically able to undergo the labor. But insisted that the discourse could easily be set aside, and that he would have it done at the time above mentioned. We then arose and announced that we would be present on that occasion, to hear the reply if the Lord permitted, and that we would make a response to the reply, by permission, which was then granted.

And so the arrangement stands, that on the fifth Lord's day of this month the discourse is to be replied to in that same house, together with our response to the same. We know not who the man will be. There were various conjectures before we left, as to who the man would be, but nothing definite was known. We propose at some future time, to give a presentation of the leading items of that discourse, as also the result of the work done on the fifth Lord's day. We continued the meeting on Monday and Monday night, and received one more addition from the Methodists; a lady who had once been a disciple, but through force of surrounding influences had gone to the Methodists, but said she had never been satisfied, and that she desired to return and live with the brethren. There are some eighteen or twenty disciples in this community, and on Tuesday all met at Rich-

Pond Station again, and enrolled their names, and agreed to try to keep house for the Lord at that place. They will meet for the present in the school house, where Bro. Rogers is carrying on a flourishing school, and who will also preach for the brethren there and elsewhere in that community. Bro. Rogers is a useful man, and we wish him good success. We also had the pleasure of meeting with a brother Sweatt at this meeting, formerly of Wilson Co., Tenn., who is an earnest, faithful preacher of the word, and is doing much good. We also had the presence of Bro. W. H. Goodloe, on Lord's day evening. He is now preaching one-half of his time for the church at Bowling Green, Ky. He is a good singer as well as a good preacher, and he, together with other brethren from Bowling Green, and several of the good brethren and sisters from Franklin, Ky., charmed and edified us with their good singing. Among those from Franklin, we mention Bro. A. T. Blankenship, a brother well known to many of the brethren of Tennessee and elsewhere. He is distinguished for his love for, and devotion to, the pure word of God, his devotion to the cause of Christ, and his utter want of confidence in human wisdom and human schemes in religion. He is satisfied with nothing in matters of faith and practice, except what he can read from the Scriptures. On Monday night and Tuesday, we were greatly encouraged, gladdened and aided by the presence of Bro. Collier, who labors considerably with the brethren beyond Bowling Green, and is doing, we doubt not a good work for the

Cause where he labors. He is a warm-hearted, earnest man, who loves the truth, and is neither afraid nor ashamed to plead for it anywhere. It is truly cheering to meet with such brethren. May he long live to labor for the Cause of the Master. We were much delighted with the kindness, hospitality, and friendship of the people of this entire community. We hope the truth may prosper yet more among them. Tuesday afternoon we took the train for home, where we were thankful to arrive in safety, and find all well.

E. G. S.

The Fort Worth Debate. No. 3.

I said in a former article that Price developed nothing new. I am, however, disposed to think his Pentecost argument a new one. It is a two-fold argument based on the 41st verse: "Those who gladly received the word were baptized;" these were adults. There were *besides* these 3,000 added; these were infants, and were baptized, as this is the only way of adding to the church. These 3,000 babies were added to those who gladly received the word. The 2nd part of the argument was based on the word *souls*. Several texts were quoted to show that the word soul is a generic term, embracing men, women and children; therefore—a universal from a particular—children are embraced here.

Bro. Caskey had only to refer to the eight *souls* saved in the ark, and asked Bro. P. how many babies were there.

One other which is also new to me, and as ridiculous as new, I will give,

and this must suffice for the infant proposition. Mat. 18: 5. "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me." Now all the lawyers in Philadelphia might be put to guessing at the argument drawn from this text, and would fail. Christ was instructing his apostles with regard to the character of persons that they should receive into his church; hence children are to be received. How? In his name. He commanded them to baptize in his name; therefore to receive a child in his name is to baptize it!! Then, said Bro. C., "to give a cup of cold water in the name of Christ" is to baptize it. And he who receives the child receives the Savior. Who receives the child by baptizing it? The preacher. Then the preacher receives the Christ every time he sprinkles a babe. Bro. P. ought to be a very good man; but what of the poor laymen who don't get to receive their Savior?

Eleven hours were devoted to this proposition; and the unanimous decision of impartial hearers is, that Price totally failed to sustain his proposition. Bro. Caskey is the best negative man I ever heard. He follows his opponent like a blood-hound on the fresh trail. An amusing thing occurred during the discussion of this proposition. Price took occasion to repeat some Greek words. When Caskey reached this part of the speech in his reply, he stretched out his long neck, and out came a jumble of words that would have put Ditzler's Arabic to shame. "Now," said he, "you understand as much of mine as you did of Bro. P.'s. That answers his Greek." It was Guinea.

P. affirmed that affusion is Scriptural baptism, but would not discuss the proposition because Bro. C. would not ramble with him all over Ditzler's and Wilkes' Hebrew and Greek jungle. "Go on," said C., "you may amuse yourself with your Hebrew and Greek plagiarisms, if you wish. I will give you half my time, but shall not make a donkey of myself by rambling after you in languages that you nor I neither could translate if we were to be hung. He did not go on.

A. C.

County Meeting of the Christian Church.

According to previous arrangements, the brethren met at Concord Christian County, Ky. on Saturday before the 2nd Lord's day in Apr. After reading and prayer the brethren desired Bro. Poindexter to preside over the meeting and Bro. V. M. Metcalf to act as Secretary. Brethren reported from the following churches: Concord: brethren Dulin, Kincaid Callis and McReynolds. Liberty: Brethren, G. B. Cayce, Wm. Adams and Jas. Cayce. Hopkinsville: Brethren Crenshaw, Poindexter and Metcalf. Bro. Cotton from Pleasant Grove, Bro. Pardo, from Henry Co. Although there was not a large representation from the church, yet there was good attendance by the brethren and sisters in the neighborhood.

Bros. Dulin and Cotton gave us encouraging reports from their labors as evangelists in the county. Some of the Brethren complained that the Evangelists were not receiving that financial support that they should

have. But Bro. Dulin said he was willing to leave it entirely with the Brethren, and that he was willing to trust it to the Lord and the brethren. After two hours very pleasant discussion on this and other important subjects, participated in by Brethren Poindexter, Crenshaw, Dulin, Metcalf and others, the meeting decided to send messengers to Louisville to meet with the Brethren from various parts of the State to take into consideration our educational interest. Bro. Poindexter and Crenshaw were selected as suitable brethren to attend. There was much interest manifested on this subject, and there appears to be a determination on the part of the brethren to guard our schools more than heretofore. By invitation, our next meeting will be with the Church at Pleasant Grove on Thursday before the 2nd Lord's day in July. Bro. Crenshaw was selected to deliver an address on Friday at said meeting on the subject of Evangelizing. Bro. Harding was selected to deliver an address on Sunday School work.

Brethren Crenshaw, Pardo and Metcalf were requested to deliver an address to the brethren of the County, and urge them to the great work, and also to prepare the order of business for next meeting. All the brethren present were much edified, and strengthened for the great work, and a greater determination on their part to sustain our evangelist.

GEO. POINDEXTER, Chairman,
V. M. METCALF, Secty.

LEIPER'S FORK CONGREGATION.

Embracing the first Lord's day, and Saturday previous, of this month,

May, we enjoyed a pleasant visit, (except the mud we had to encounter on the way) to the above-named congregation, eight miles West of Franklin, Tenn. We had much rain during the meeting, but still the people turned out well, and we had fair congregations all the time, and preached four times for them, in which they seemed much interested. This is a good working congregation. There are some as earnest brethren in this congregation, as we have had the pleasure of meeting anywhere; and if they will continue to work earnestly in the Lord's vineyard, and cultivate the Spirit of Christ, the spirit of love and humility to the cause of truth and towards one another, there is a bright and successful future before them.

E. G. S.

Correspondence.

Dear Brother Sewell: At the age of nine years, I joined the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, where I remained a member about eighteen years, until the Fall of '71 when listening to your preaching, my eyes were opened to the truth. Being raised by strict Sectarians, and having but few opportunities of hearing the Gospel as taught by the so called Campbellites, of course I was very blind with prejudice, was sprinkled when an infant by the Methodists, but was never satisfied with that long at a time, had a sincere desire to enjoy Religion, but did not. Now I know this to be the experience of many, who are yet too blind to see the truth when presented. Oh! how I sympathize with them, yet I know by ex-

perience, that much Preaching to strongly prejudice'd often does more harm than good. I would say to all who are anxious to have their friends come out of Babylon, that to follow Christ, in everyday life, in all we do or say, will have more influence toward removing prejudice than anything else. Whenever that is removed, then the word of God, rightly presented will have effect.

Observing the Christian deportment of my old Father-in-law, did more toward removing my prejudice than all the preaching he could have done in years.

A few days before I heard you preach, I remarked to my husband, whose eyes had been open for some time, and who was very anxious to join the church, I did not think that I would ever join the Campbellites, yet I intended to try to throw aside all prejudice. I heard you preach five discourses, had never heard the Gospel presented in so plain a light before. I saw my duty plainly, was determined to obey the Gospel, although I knew that such a step would not meet the approval of any of my denominational friends. My husband and I both joined the church and were baptized by you, a proceeding we have never regretted. Although we have had but few opportunities of enjoying Christian fellowship since then, we can truly say that we never enjoyed religion before. Oh! may our lives prove to friends and relatives who are yet wearing the shackles of Sectarianism that there is really peace and happiness in following our Savior instead of the opinions of men. Scattered around and among us on every side

are poor honest-hearted people who never hear preaching of any kind, they say that Churches around here are too fine for poor people—few beside the fashionable go to church here. The nearest Christian Church in our vicinity is three miles off. Many who would like to go cannot get there. I believe every member of Christ's body, should be active and doing while it is day, for the night cometh when no man worketh. I do not approve of the selfishness of a Church letting the preacher do all. If all the members would only open their eyes and hearts to the poor around them and would forget their own poverty and find plenty of work, in the doing of it they would not only relieve many an aching heart, but would add God's blessings upon themselves.

With the Bible, the ADVOCATE and God's help, we are trying to do all that we can. I have no doubt but that if some preacher of the truth would come to our neighborhood, take his stand in the open air, if no house convenient, present the word of God plainly, that much good could be done. I do not think that Churches need preachers, as greatly as they need the willingness to sustain a preacher, to preach to the very poor who are not able to go to church.

Our much beloved Brother E. P. Fraser is preaching for us this year, at Fountain Creek Church, has promised to come and preach as soon as convenient in our neighborhood, and I think the people will like to hear him. We deeply sympathize with you and family in having to part with your little baby girl. About four years ago we were

called to give up a little girl just the age of yours. Although we knew that God was good, and was doing all things for our good, yet it was hard indeed to give her up. Since God has taken one of our children to himself, we are trying harder to raise those left us in the good and right way, that they may be prepared to meet their angel sister in a better world than this.

May God ever bless your efforts to present his word to our deluded fellow Beings is my prayer.

Your sister in Christ,

C. E. KERR.

Near Culleoka, Tenn. May 10th. 1874.

Death of Bro. J. C. Oliver.

We are pained to find in the *Christian Weekly* of this week, an announcement of the death of this excellent young brother, just in the very vigor and strength of life, as we had supposed. We have known brother Oliver personally, for many years, being by marriage related to him. We knew him while he was a Baptist preacher, and had the pleasure of aiding him in reaching a clear understanding of the truth as it is in Jesus. We also had enjoyed the pleasure of receiving him into the church at Owen's Chapel Tennessee. When he became convinced of the truth, he determined to do everything understandingly, and being dissatisfied with his former baptism, he was, by our own hands, buried with his Lord in baptism, in the waters of Little Harpeth, Williamson County, Tennessee. Since that time he has been an earnest laborer in the cause of truth. He loved the cause of God more than earthly

pleasures or treasures. He fell asleep the second day of this month, May, but we have learned none of the particulars. Brother J. M. Pickens promises to give them, as soon as he can get them, through his paper. Brother Oliver was not only a public proclaimer of the word of God, but he was also an acceptable writer. His writings have been published, some through the *ADVOCATE*, but more through the *Christian Weekly*, published by Brother Pickens. But our brother is gone from us, to meet us no more, till we meet around the judgment seat of Christ. So then, sad as it is, we have to say farewell, till the resurrection morn.

E. G. S.

In Memoriam.

Many friends, relations, and Christian brethren, will mourn when they learn Bro. Henry McCulloch fell asleep in the Savior, May the 2nd, 1874, at his home, amidst his own family (minus two) and friends.

Bro. McCulloch was near 65 years of age when he departed this life, possibly his age is not precisely known, as the family record does not show it. His disease was "typhoid," or what the Drs. call "Malaria typhoid." He lay near twelve weeks, seemed not to suffer a great deal, retained the balance of mind to the very last. The writer of this notice thinks Bro. McCulloch was born in Rutherford Co., Tennessee. He was among the first to embrace the gospel as advocated by the old pioneers of truth in Tennessee viz: Brethren Fanning, Craig, Hall, Curlee, Adams, and others; was baptized by Bro. Dr.

Adams, in the neighborhood of Old Jefferson, near forty years ago.

When the writer of this notice first became acquainted with the deceased he worked at the black-smith's trade, after which he went to school, and obtained a pretty fair education; his great delight was in the English language, which he taught for several years by lectures.

He never would consent to be called a preacher, yet when opportunity offered would teach and exhort the brethren, and sinners, to trust in the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world. The last discourse he ever delivered was on the character of the Savior founded on Matt. 16; the answer of Peter, thou art the Son of the living God. During several of his past years, he was emphatically a "One book" man, and a man of one theme. "Jesus is the Christ the Son of God," was nearly all his talk, and preaching. His patience and resignation during his sickness were unparalleled. Bro. McCulloch was married in 1846, to Lizzie Bigham, daughter of Bro. Elihu Bigham and Mary Bigham of Rutherford Co., Tennessee, after which he moved to Lewisburg, Marshall Co., Tenu., where he lived a few years, then to Izard Co., Arkansas, eighteen years ago, last October. To-day is the day of his burial, and mourning among his Christian brethren and friends in this section; of the latter there are not a few, of the former many.

He leaves a sister, wife, and nine children to mourn his loss, in church, State, and society, but he died in full assurance of the Christian faith, and not one who has no hope. Here are

orrow and joy commingled. How cheering to see Christians fall asleep in Jesus the Christ who is the way, the truth, life, and the resurrection. The subject of this notice had a large acquaintance in Rutherford, Cannon, Bedford and Marshall Counties, Tenn., who will sympathize with the bereaved wife and children, some of whom are blooming for the journey, and will soon take up the line of march in the way our dear old brother has gone.

Brethren, pardon this rather too extensive notice of our brother's departure of this life. I could not well see, according to our long acquaintance, how I could epitomize.

G. W. CONE.

Newburgh, Izard Co., Ark.

QUERIES.

Brethren L. & S: Please explain, through the GOSPEL ADVOCATE, the 5th, 6th 7th 8th 9th and 10th verses, also the last clause of the 13th verse 11th chapter of Luke. and oblige

A SINCERE INQUIRER.

Jordan, Ky. April 22nd 1874.

In the preceding verses of this chapter, the apostle gave a form of prayer to his disciples, which is usually called the Lord's prayer. And in the verses referred to in the above he is showing the efficacy of earnest, and continued prayers of his people, his followers. He declares in these verses, he that asks receives, he that seeks finds, and to him that knocks, it shall be opened. But this promise is all based upon the condition that they ask, knock, and seek, according to his will. John says, we know that if we ask ac-

ording to his will he heareth us, and that if he hear us we have the petitions we desired. It is not enough that a man prays God, to give him what he needs, he must be a doer of his will. John also teaches that whatsoever we ask of him we receive, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight. No man need pray for the blessing of God, unless he is at the same time striving to do his will. God for instance, requires the believer to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and he might pray all his days out without doing these things, and he could never have the least shadow of a promise of pardon. No one can have any promise of remission of sins, or of an entrance into the kingdom of Christ short of a full obedience to the Gospel of Christ, no matter how much he prays or seeks through prayer. The thirteenth verse, latter part, promises the Holy Spirit to those that ask him. This is of the same character as the others. We must ask for the Spirit through an humble obedience to the will of the Lord. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit was promised to all who would repent and be baptized. Those who refused to repent and be baptized evidently could not obtain the Spirit, no matter how much they might pray. Paul said to the Galatians, "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts crying Abba Father." Here the Spirit was given because they were already sons, not to make them sons. The Savior told the apostles, when he promised them the Holy Spirit,

that the world could not receive it. John 14. Paul also informed the Corinthians that they were the temple of God, and that the Spirit dwelt in them. No use therefore for those who do not obey the Gospel of Christ, to pray for the Spirit. Yet notwithstanding the plainness of these Scriptures, and many others of like character which might be given, still thousands of religious people are teaching that the alien sinner who lives outside of the kingdom of Christ is authorized to expect the Holy Spirit through prayer only. Nothing can be more thoroughly inconsistent with the word of God. Only the obedient therefore, are authorized to expect these promises.

Brethren L. & S: For the benefit of the Bible Class at this place, and for the ADVOCATE will you let us hear from you through your columns, what you understand the fourteenth verse of the sixth chapter of second Corinthians to teach? Also the thirtieth verse of the XI. chapter of First Corinthians—the whole verse—more particularly the word sleep—whether natural death is meant? "*Quærimus Verum.*"

Fraternally,
G. K. SMITH.

1. The verse reads, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? We think there are many things that would be comprehended in this. To engage

with worldly men in any way to do the work that the religion of Christ requires of us, we think would be embraced in it. Paul complained at these Corinthians in his first letter to them, for attempting to settle their differences and difficulties before unbelievers, worldly tribunals, instead of before the church. Entering into societies of human wisdom to do that which the word of God requires us as Christians, as the disciples of Christ, to do in his name, by his authority, would be, in our judgment, embraced in this passage. Christians are required to do all that they do, in word or deed, in the name, by the authority of, the Lord Jesus.

And if all would do this, the beauty of the religion of Christ would be seen to much better advantage, and the cause would prosper more rapidly in the earth.

2. The sleeping that is spoken of in the eleventh chapter and thirteenth verse of 1 Cor. is inactivity—is the doing nothing in the cause of Christ as Christians. Some had been desecrating the Lord's supper, by their worldly manner of partaking it; while others, on account of it were indifferent, inactive, doing nothing for the advancement of truth. They were losing their interest on the subject, when they saw the religion of Christ brought down to a level with the world. The religion of Jesus must be kept pure from the corruptions of the world in every respect, if it be expected to prosper.

E. G. S.

BROTHER T. FANNING

This long laborer in the vineyard of the Lord was born in Cannon County, Tennessee, May 10th, 1810. At the age of eight years, his parents moved to Lauderdale County, Alabama, where he remained till nineteen years of age. He was raised up on a farm, where he had to spend most of his time in manual labor. He had an opportunity of going to school generally some three or four months in the year; sometimes as much as six. In this way, by the aid of good teachers to whom he had the good fortune to be sent, he laid the foundation of a good practical education. He became fond of study in early life, and on this account made good use of his opportunities. In 1831, he entered the University of Nashville, in which he graduated in 1835. His early religious training was that of the denominations generally. His mother was a strict and pious Baptist, of the Old Virginia School, and the preachers he heard generally were Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians; his father not being at that time a member of any church. At the age of sixteen, he heard Ephraim D. Moore, and James E. Mathews preach, who, at that time "called themselves Christian preachers." Up to this time, he supposed, like most others of his time, that conversion had to be wrought in the heart of the sinner by a direct secret work of the Spirit, and that there was very little importance attached to the study of the word of God. But from the preaching of these men, he was encouraged, for the first time in life, to look into the New Testament with

the confidence that he could learn therefrom how to become a Christian. In a short time he found this to be a very plain guide. In the first of October, 1827, he understandingly obeyed the gospel under the preaching of brother Mathews, near Florence, in North Alabama.

Not long after becoming a Christian, he began the proclamation of the pure word of truth, just as recorded in the Scriptures, and to contend against the delusions of abstract Spiritual influence. In two years after his introduction into the kingdom, he was sent forth to preach the word by the church at Republican, where he obeyed the Lord. From that time forward he has been much of his time engaged in studying and teaching the Scriptures. During his College days, he also continued to preach as opportunity afforded, and made tours, one of which was with brother A. Campbell, to Kentucky and Ohio, during which he held a successful debate at Perryville, Ky., with a Methodist preacher by the name of Rice. He spent the Spring and Summer of 1836, in travelling with brother Campbell through Ohio, New York, Canada, and some of the New England States and cities. And in the year following, he was married to Charlotte Fall, and in the same year opened a female School at Franklin, Tennessee. In 1840 he removed to the location where he has spent the remainder of his days, five miles east of Nashville, Tenn., where he also established a female school.

The year 1842 he spent mostly in travelling and preaching through Alabama and Mississippi, during which he did much toward establish-

ing the cause of truth in those sections, and many additions were made to the army of the faithful. In 1843 he began the erection of Franklin College. The buildings were completed in 1844, and in October of that year he was elected president of the institution, which position he held till 1861, when he resigned the position to bro. W. D. Carnes. Bro. Fanning was a very successful teacher, in which business he spent much of the vigor of life.

There are now hundreds of men and women, scattered in almost every section of our country who were educated by him, and from whose instruction they have gone out to benefit and bless the generation in which they live. As a teacher, he was always forcible and positive, and deeply stamped the impress of his own character and characteristics upon his pupils. The study of the Scriptures was always prominent in his schools, and in no department of education did he more deeply impress his pupils, than in regard to the true meaning and interpretation of the Scriptures. He repudiated every source of light on the subject of religion, save the Holy Scriptures, of which he was ever a close student from the time he became a follower of Jesus; always repudiating man's wisdom and feelings, and impulses as dangerous to man's most sacred interests. Few men of his generation have done more to place the pure word of God in the hands of the people, stripped of all the traditions of men, than Bro. Fanning. He was a man of positive character in everything he touched. As an agriculturalist and stock-grower, he had but few superiors, and was of

much service to society in these regards. Indeed he was well posted in almost everything pertaining to practical life. By economy and industry he obtained more than a competency of the goods of this world. And while he struggled much with the world, so much so as to make some think his heart was too much set on money, he was at the same time liberal with his means, where he thought he could accomplish good. He always did these things unostentatiously, and few beyond the receivers knew anything of his benefactions. Many there are, scattered all over this good land today who were educated in whole or in part through his liberalities, and who are making useful men and women, and proving a blessing to the generation in which they live. As a writer and editor, his career is too well known to need that much should be said in a sketch like this. He never had much confidence in human plans and human schemes in religion by which to do the work of the church, and as he advanced in life, and studied the Scriptures more, he had less and less. His writings are clear and pointed on this subject, and by many of his brethren, he has been regarded as an extremist. Yet he thought it difficult for any one to go to an extreme in adhering closely to the word of God. He has for many years thought that some of our brethren are in some errors, in what is commonly called "Church organization," and in regard to "Church officers." He wrote much on these subjects in the later years of his life, and likely studied them more than he did any other, except perhaps, in reference to the Scriptures being the only possible source of light from God.

In this we may possibly say he excelled, and generations yet unborn will thank God for the light he has thrown on this subject. As a public speaker he was widely known. His utterance was clear and distinct, his person tall and commanding, his voice pleasant and clear, and blest with an almost perfect self possession, he seldom failed to command the undivided attention of his audience, whether they believed or disbelieved what he said. And in Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, and in other States, there are perhaps hundreds of communities that are indebted to his public preaching for their first knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and through which some thousands have been led into the kingdom of the Savior. As a speaker of pure English, we are sure we have never seen his superior. And as a reader, we are satisfied we have never met his equal. His pronunciation, accent, tone, and emphasis was superior to any we have ever heard, according to our judgment. In his physical stature he was much above the masses of men, weighing if we remember correctly from two hundred to two hundred and fifty. Much of his time, about two hundred and forty. He had a tall, large frame and was never burdened much with flesh. He was a man of great activity and energy, and being blest with a strong physical constitution there was scarcely any end to his toil and endurance. It was nothing unusual with him to spend the whole day in hearing his classes in school, and looking after his business on the farm, and then sit up and write till twelve, one, and two o'clock at night and then up in due time next morn-

ing, to attend to the same round of labor again. Being a man naturally of positive character, possessing a powerful brain, and of strong impulses, he was almost unyielding in anything to which he set his heart to accomplish or to oppose; and on this account he was by some considered overbearing and selfish in his disposition, so resolute and determined was he in what he set his heart to do. That he did sometimes err in these respects, perhaps no one will deny. This was one of his weak points, and where can any man be found that has none? We hope his survivors will remember and follow his virtues, and forget his faults and imperfections. We wish to say some things regarding the leading aims of the last few years of his life, but we have not space in this. In reference to the particulars of his death, the brethren everywhere are anxious to hear. We have thought for the past two years, that we have seen evidences of a gradual giving way in his whole system. He seemed to stoop forward a little more, and often presented a wearied and jaded appearance, and did not move about with the elastic step that he was wont to do, while his voice also at times gave signs of growing weakness. These changes it is true were slight, but still discoverable. All the first part of the week of his illness, he was complaining some of Rheumatism and Dispepsia, but not at all confined. He went about and attended to his business matters until Thursday evening, April 30th. That evening he went out to a shop not far from his house, to see about some work, where he was suddenly seized by a

very excruciating pain in his left side or breast, and had to be assisted to the house. From this he found no relief any more. The physicians seemed to think the leading trouble was inflammation of the Liver. He continued to grow worse till Lord's day, May. 3. At the usual hour for service that day, about ten, or half past ten, he asked the brethren and sisters present to come into his room, and break bread with him. This they did and thus gave him one more opportunity of remembering the Savior. When the supper was over, he asked them to sing, which they also did. Then about half past twelve, just after he for the last time on earth had shown the Savior's death, he quietly breathed his last, and his Spirit returned to God who gave it. He retained his mind till the last, but was suffering too severely to talk much. Thus has passed from earth one of our greatest and most useful men. And to say that he will be greatly missed from our ranks, would be but a feeble expression. He has left a vacancy that will be hard to fill. We all feel great loss from his departure. And we all feel it the more deeply, because it was so unexpected; we were so little prepared for it. But he is gone, and we shall meet him no more, till we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, to receive our final reward. To sister Fanning we tender our deepest sympathies, in her sad bereavement, and hope she will ever lean upon the strong arm and precious promises of God for support, strength and comfort in this her sore trial.

"Life's labor done as sinks the clay,
Light from its load the Spirit flies.
While heaven and earth combine to say,
How blest the righteous when he dies"

E. G. S.

The Birth of the Spirit.

Bro. Lipscomb: In answer to my little article you say, "the birth of the water and of the Spirit are one and the same birth." See John iii: 5. Our Savior says to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

I understand from this, that a man who has been born of water and the Spirit, can enter, and will enter, into the kingdom of God. This is life eternal.

I believe all who are born of water and the Spirit, are prepared to enter into the kingdom of heaven without any other qualifications.

Do you believe your one and the same birth as you call it, fits a man for the kingdom of God, and eternity, without any other qualifications? According to what our Savior says, if you have been born of water and the Spirit, which you say is so, you ought, and will enter into the kingdom of God as you are? I for one, cannot see it that way. I see what our Savior says. I understand him. I believe him. After attaining unto your two births however, you go on, and speak of a begetting, and growth of the Spirit, as a farther necessary qualification; of which our Savior says nothing. He told Nicodemus he must be born of water and the Spirit to enter into the kingdom of God; nothing more, nothing less, will do; but you require more.—With Christ this lets a man into the kingdom, but with you it does not.

But you say no fair construction of our Savior's language can make but one birth of this passage. In

Matth. iii: 11, John says he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. I think I have seen in your writings where you could find two births in this passage, and if two can be found here, why not two be found where our Savior says you must be born of water and of the Spirit? but you say it is one and the same birth. Will you show me by what rule you find so much difference in the construction of these two sentences?

No, my brother, all the learned brethren are tangled here. Here are the great lava beds. Here the contending hosts have taken shelter, for the last sixteen centuries, dodging and sallying forth to make their attacks as the circumstances would justify each hero of these mighty divisions, with their never ending wars that have raged from that time until now, to the purification of none, but injury of all.

Now I intend by your permission and help of you and the brethren, to make a thorough drive through these fastnesses, and force a dislodgement of the different combatants to an open field fight, and then capture all the good soldiers each hero has, and make valiant warriors of them, and put them into our captain's army, and arm them with the word of God, which is quick and powerful, and sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

In the hands, then, of these valiants with such an implement of destruction, we will go forth conquering and to conquer, until we have com-

pletely routed every contending foe.

Then Bro. L, let us work for an open field fight, for we have all to gain, and nothing to lose. Our line of march then, through these lava beds, shall be to the following stakes:

1st. But one has been born, or quickened by the Holy Spirit.

2nd. We are children of promise.

3rd. There has not in fact a sin been pardoned since Christ left the earth.

4th. War to the hilt, asking no quarters, and granting no favors.

5th. Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted shall be cut down.

6th. All the religious literature of the last sixteen centuries is to be thrown into heaps, and burned.

7th. All obscure men are ordered to the front.

8th. All soldiers are to be weighed, and the heavy (mighty) men are to be reduced to a uniform standard weight.

9th. All who love the truth of our Lord Jesus Christ from every source to report to these headquarters ready for the march in one moment's warning.

10th. No doctrine to be received for truth, that is the wisdom of men.

Now brethren every man of you to your posts; none to be found asleep. The contest may wax hot for a while, but the victory is sure in the end.

V. B. WALKER.

Paris, Tenn.

Even were we and the whole Christian world to admit all that brother Walker claims in reference to the birth of the Spirit, we do not see that

the wonderful results of which he speaks, would follow.

But we fail to see a single reason for the ground he occupies. It is no new ground. Bro. B. K. Smith has taken it and argued it time and again if we are not mistaken, in the prints. Bro. Walter Scott held it we think. Others have frequently maintained it. It is not a great while since we received a lengthy article in favor of it from a brother in West Tennessee, Bro. Osborne, I think, that we did not publish because of a press on our room at the time and the unpractical nature of the question. We do not think our theory on the subject either retards or promotes our reception of the help of the Spirit. God, in his mercy to us, has suspended his blessings to us, on other than mere theories about religion.

Without following the order of Bro. W's queries, we say we believe the one birth of the Spirit and the water, necessarily and always puts the subject of it into the kingdom of God. There is no other way revealed in the Bible for entering that kingdom. Whoever is born of that birth is translated into the kingdom of God. Is prepared by this for all the blessings of that kingdom. The birth is the passage into the kingdom. The trouble with Bro. Walker is he does not seem to recognize the kingdom as existing in this world, while the prophets, Christ and the Apostles do most fully recognize this truth.

Daniel prophesied of this kingdom in connection, and in contrast with the earthly kingdoms. He says, "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall

never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. 2-44. It was to be in contact with them, hence must be where they are, on this earth. The 34th and 5th verses of same chapter speaking of the stone which represented in the vision, God's kingdom destroying the kingdoms of the earth and taking their place, says, "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and break them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the Summer's threshing floor; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." The stone represented the kingdom of God. It was set up or cut out of the mountain in the days of the kingdom represented by the iron. It broke in pieces this and the remnants of all others. "It became a great mountain and filled the whole earth."

Christ in the days of the kings of this kingdom says, "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Here Peter bears the keys and binds and looses—or closes and opens the door on earth.

Then that kingdom was on earth in Peter's day.

The apostle Paul speaks of receiving the kingdom which cannot be moved. Hebrews 12-28. The kingdom preached, was pressed into in the days of Christ, was then present in its elements among the people, though not fully set up, every stone in its proper place. Jesus told them there were some present who should not taste of death, until they saw the kingdom of God, Luke 9 27. It was preached from the days of John the Baptist. Then the kingdom of God is here on earth and embodies the churches and followers of the Lord. Jesus Christ was simply and only telling Nickodemus how he should enter that kingdom here on earth.

But an entrance into that kingdom on earth fully prepares us for entrance into the kingdom above, whether it be the same or another kingdom. (I believe it the same,) without any other preparation. The work of life is to maintain that preparation. Should a man be called away from earth, the moment of his birth of the water and of the Spirit into the kingdom, he is fully prepared as a child of God to enter heaven above. Should he stay here on earth he must maintain that preparation, and in maintaining that preparation, he must comply with the laws of childhood or citizenship in Christ, and that involves a course of life that promotes growth in grace. A man is innocent, is sinless as a little child when he is born into the kingdom of God. His sins are forgiven, are blotted out of the book of God's remembrance. He must maintain that sinless state by conformity to the requirements of God.

There is certainly a birth of the Spirit and of water and then spiritual growth. A growth in grace and in the knowledge of the truth is the spiritual growth. They are fed on the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby. But the growth of an infant makes him not a whit more the child of his father. He may be a larger child, but no more a child, no more an heir.

But the state and privileges of childhood demand duties which, if neglected, cause us to forfeit the birthright privileges, the rights of heirs. We will be cut off for unworthy childhood. The evil shall be cast out of the kingdom, the Savior teaches, at the day when he comes to judge the world.

Whenever a man enters the church of God on earth by a birth of the water and the Spirit, he is pardoned, accepted, forgiven. He is that moment fit for heaven. If he is not immediately called away, he must maintain that fitness, by avoiding all violation of God's law, so remaining sinless. While doing this he will grow to be a larger, more robust child but no more of a child, or an heir.

I never spoke of a begetting of the Spirit after the birth; the begetting of the Spirit is in the beginning of the birth process. The individual is begotten, born, and grows, if he lives a healthy life. If our brother's position were true, the Savior should have said, you must be born twice, again and again, first of the water, then of the Spirit. But he only said once—again, and then explains, to be born again was to be born of Spirit and water. That birth

puts us into the kingdom of God. As it stands, we may just as reasonably conclude the birth of the water is at the resurrection as the birth of the Spirit. The reason we say the baptism of Spirit and of fire refer to two distinct baptisms is, the Savior so explains them. The reason we say the birth of water and of Spirit refers to only one birth, is because the Savior so explains it. You shall be born again. You shall be born of water and of Spirit, is the explanation. The Savior limits it to one birth. You confine your construction to one single detached sentence from each paragraph. To do it justice you should regard the whole connection.

Our brother's series of assertions are certainly strange at least. Christ says, It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life." That is they are full of the Spirit and life-giving power. Then the Spirit, through the word, is the quickening power. Whatever is attributed to the word then must be from the Spirit. Paul, full of the Spirit says, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." Peter says, "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." * * * And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Persons must be quickened before born. James says, "Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth."

The Spirit of God must dwell in us and quicken our spirits here that it may quicken our mortal bodies

into life eternal in the resurrection. Romans viii: 11. "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." The spirit is quickened here, conformed to God, the body at the resurrection. It is not possible that God's spirit dwells in man and fails to quicken him, to make him alive in Christ Jesus. Hence Paul says, Ephesians ii, "You who were dead in trespasses and in sins, hath he quickened." * * v., "Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."

We are certainly children of promise. But not till our sins are pardoned have we any promise.

The 3rd proposition is so glaringly contradictory to the whole teaching of the Bible we do not know where to begin to reply to it. Christ told them, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." God has stamped upon every page of revelation, the truth that no man can be saved in his sins.

The Holy Spirit said, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Christ for the remission of sins." Again, "repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out and that times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Paul says to the Romans, "Ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine delivered you. Being then (or having been) made free from sin." How a man can be free from sin and yet unpar-

doned we know not. Such positions seem to us to be making war to the hilt upon the truth of the Bible and we can see only evil to come from such positions.

The remaining propositions we do not understand, the meaning or purport of, and hence make no comment. We ought to be very slow to accept, and we should be doubly careful in promulgating new and strange theories. Even granting that the surroundings of the religious world for the last fifteen centuries have been unfavorable for appreciating the truth; still amid all these unfavorable surroundings, the masses of individuals have been searching after truth, and while their surroundings built up hierarchies and systems and those systems demanded practice adverse to the Christian religion, we find when interpreting specific texts and positions we have found the mass of Biblical critics safe. So much so, that when we find ourself opposed to them we doubt and hesitate. They are much in the same condition as those spoken of by the Savior, "They say and do not."

D. L.

Explanation.

We had requested our aged and beloved P. S. Fall to write a sketch of the life of our departed brother T. Fanning. But he has been absent from home almost ever since Bro. F.'s death, and could not attend to it. Knowing that the brethren were anxious to hear something more of the matter, we have written and placed in this number a short sketch, which we hope will be

satisfactory for the present, and we hope brother Fall will give us something more on the subject yet.

E. G. S.

Supply.

We now have on hand a good supply of The Gospel Plan of Salvation by brother T. W. Brents, and can now promptly fill all orders. All who wish a copy of this book and have not met with an agent, can obtain from us at agents prices, 2.50, with 28 cts. added for postage, when ordered by mail. Send on brethren, and we will send the book by return mail, or call, or send by hand to our office and get a copy. You will be delighted with it, and get a fund of information which would require the reading of volumes to get elsewhere.

E. G. S.

E. G. Sewell: Dear Sir. I am a subscriber to the Advocate, and seeing your name Sewell, I would ask you if you ever knew one Rufus Sewell, who came to Texas many years ago and obtained large grants of land from the Republic. If the heirs of Rufus Sewell can be found, I can place them on the track of a large amount of Texas land that now belongs to them. If Rufus is not of your family please give me the address of any other Sewells you may know, or any that you may have heard of, or any clue to the heirs of the said Rufus.

Very truly,

J. H. JENKINS.

McKinney, Texas, May 10, 1874.

We give the above, so that if the Advocate falls into the hands of any who may know this man, the matter may be traced up. E. G. S.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

To the Little Folks. No. 8.

"Uncle Joe, I heard a preacher say that we deny there is any Holy Ghost baptism in this age of the world; and that in denying this we deny that there is any Holy Ghost."

This is a strange idea. To deny there is now any Holy Ghost baptism is to deny that there is any Holy Ghost? Then I suppose if a man deny there is any water baptism, it would be denying there is any water.

"He said that when Peter told the people on Pentecost to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, he meant Holy Ghost baptism."

I would like to know how he found that out. I do not find that the Scriptures anywhere command a man to be baptized in the Holy Spirit. I nowhere find where the apostles or any of the disciples were authorized to baptize in the Holy Spirit. The apostles, by their miraculous powers conferred spiritual gifts; but this was not baptism. But even if it should be so considered, it is no evidence that baptism exists now; for none could impart these gifts but the apostles; and after the death of the apostles imparting these gifts ceased. The work was not to be perpetuated. John the Baptist in allusion to Christ, said He should baptize people in the Holy Spirit; but it is not said that any one else should, or ever did.

"He said, Holy Ghost baptism manifested the action of water baptism; and that as the Holy Ghost baptism on Pentecost was a pouring out of the Spirit; therefore, water baptism is a pouring."

Why, then does he sprinkle water upon persons? Or, when he finds one who will be satisfied with nothing short of immersion, why does he immerse him? If pouring is baptism, sprinkling is not; for sprinkling is not pouring. Neither is immersion baptism, if pouring is; for immersion is not pouring. Besides this, if either sprinkling or pouring is baptism, then it is the water that is baptized and not the person. But in immersion it is the person and not the water that is baptized. The pouring out the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was not baptism. It was only preparatory to the disciples being baptized in the Spirit.

"He said, that when Paul says, we are buried by baptism he alludes to Spiritual baptism."

And how did he find this out? At Pentecost, because the Spirit was poured out, preparatory to baptism, he says the pouring was the baptism, and manifests what water baptism is. When Paul says we are buried by baptism, that is a spiritual baptism: Then if spiritual baptism is a burial, and the action of Spiritual baptism is a burial, and the action of Spiritual baptism manifests the action of water baptism, why is not water baptism a burial? there is a Spiritual baptism and a water baptism, he makes two baptisms, and therefore contradicts Paul.

"This preacher said no man can

tell what is the true meaning of the ordinance of baptism."

Then, how does he know when he has baptized a person, if he does not know what the word means? If he does not know what the act is, how dare he say, "by the authority of Jesus Christ I baptize you into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," and then sprinkle a little water upon the subject, or pour water upon it; or immerse it; or do any other act. If he cannot tell what baptize means, how can he tell what it is? And yet he says "I baptize you!" How can he say this, when he does not know what the act is—what the word means? How does he know but what the word means beeswax? I affirm, that, if he speaks truly when he says "no man can tell the real meaning of the word," that he does not know that it does not mean beeswax. Admit that there is a word in the original that means beeswax, and that that word is not the one in question, used by the Savior and his apostles, yet, there are often two or more words frequently signifying the same thing. Therefore, I repeat, if your preacher does not know what the word means, he cannot know but what it means beeswax.

UNCLE JOE.

JUSTIFYING JONAH.

By S. S.

Jonah's attempt to run away from the Lord when commanded to go to Nineveh was a foolish and wicked act, all must admit; but there is one thing told of him that is very much

to his credit; "he paid his fare" on board the ship that was to bear him away to Tarshish.

To be sure he was directly disobeying God, and he knew it, but then he settled his bill with the sea captain. He was leaving that great city wherein were more than six-score thousand persons to perish unwarned, but he fulfilled his obligations to the ship-owners in the matter of passage money. He involved his shipmates in the fearful storm that was already gathering for his arrest; but, he would not cheat them out of their due. He was turning his back upon one of the grandest opportunities ever given to mortal; but, he handed over his money at the office like a prince.

He was evidently none of your mean sneaks who, in running to destruction try to go as *dead-heads*. Jonah went on his way like a man.

How often by some such reasoning as the above we have heard men make out a good case for themselves or for others in the face of flagrant and atrocious acts. Only yesterday, talking with a young man who has become almost a common drunkard, turning away from home, duty and great prospects of usefulness, he admitted the evil state of the case, but soon became eloquent over his refusal to play off some wicked joke upon a comrade, and declaring, "You'll never catch me going back on a fellow like that," became apparently as self-complacent as if the score was fully righted.

A man passes me often, frequently speaks of his present deplorable condition, especially if a little worse for liquor; but swears he is no hypocrite "all the bad there is in old J—he

shows right out." And uses this single virtue to cover the destruction of home, family and manhood.

A woman often admits to me the neglect of duties that she owes to God, herself and household but gains a full modicum of comfort from the fact that she "always goes to church rain or shine."

There is much of this Jonah business on every hand. Men are sharp in their dealings, even to rank dishonesty, but they talk well and profess better. They cheat and shave right hand and left, but they found a scholarship or seminary, endow a college or build a church. They are helping to undermine every good institution in a community: but, they are kind and obliging neighbors. They bribe and buy their places of power and honor; but then, they are on our side, sound on the main issue. They kill men with bludgeons, shoot them with concealed weapons, but they were once good Sabbath-school boys, or have a frank and interesting countenance.

Because the men that cheat, swindle and murder us are possessed of some single excellent virtue we are asked to set it over against their many nefarious acts and terrible failures in character and life, and call it even.

Well! if the Lord is satisfied we will try to be. How is it? We read that in spite of all this honesty and promptness in the payment of this bill, a great wind was sent out into the sea, that would not subside until the runaway was thrown overboard and brought to terms; teaching, as it would seem, by the voice of the winds and the waves that a man needs something more than a single virtue to justify him before his Maker.

Not that we would undervalue nor despise the admirable traits that sometimes appear in wicked and debased lives; we only utter our protest against the attempt, so often made, to make them atone for the sin with which they are surrounded.

It would seem as if we were in a measure all associated together in this, poor Jonahs all of us, satisfied with one little pet virtue, that blooms, perhaps, like a flower adorning a corpse. One has *faith*, or what passes for it; Peter tells us to add to it *vim*, but the possessor is satisfied without any addition, and becomes a dawdler. One has *vim* or virtue, storms around, and tramps roughshod over the sensibilities of finer natures. The apology offered for all the unnecessary pain inflicted is: "I am always pretty plain spoken, and believe in giving my mind." And it is fully expected that this excellence of plain speech will excuse all the harshness with which it was uttered and the sugering it caused.

The way we help one another to this same self over wrong is, perhaps the worst part of the story.

Suppose when the prophet was thrown overboard, in that storm of which we read, the whale had not swallowed him and carried him safely to land, but he had been thoroughly and terribly drowned, his body been thrown upon the beach, dead, and some of us ministers had been called to preach his funeral sermon. Don't you think we could have made enough of that one virtue to have about rounded Jonah into a perfect character?

Of course we should have passed lightly over his rank disobedience,

making some general remarks upon the difficulty of always recognizing duty; the cruelty of leaving a great city unwarned of its impending destruction would not be dwelt upon; the meanness of involving others in the destruction that was seeking him would be passed over altogether; but when we came to the fare business, now look out for the enlargement. An honest act. Honesty a good thing itself, helps to keep business upon a sure basis. This act revealed an admirable character; showed that the man had regard for the rights of his fellows, etc., etc., etc.

If we remember rightly we have heard funeral discourses that were built on some such plan as that. A pyramid standing on its apex, very satisfactory, without doubt, to the minister as a work of art; very consoling, it is to be hoped, to the friends; very false and dangerous in the eyes of every body else.

Not that we would have had Jonah's grand mistake dwelt upon over his dead body, provided he had died; but least of all would we have conveyed in funeral discourse, or in any other manner, the impression that a single virtue atones for a life of disobedience, or can take the place of fellowship with God, and whole-hearted service of our fellow men. If by reason of imperfect knowledge and feeble authority we cannot imitate the beautiful truthfulness of Scripture in setting forth men's faults, we can, at all events, in its simple and honest treatment of their virtues.—
The Christian Union.

make men feel that while the church is the great feeding-

ground of the world, the world of business is the drilling-ground where the strength of those who are in the church is to be used. We are to make them feel that that love is poor and superficial which does not actuate their every-day life; that being a Christian is carrying one's self lovingly in the place where God put his ordinary life, and performing the duties of the higher life with a full beneficence and consecration; that, to be a true worshiper of God, one must carry the spirit of the Sabbath into all the week, and not treat Sunday as if it were the sacred day, and all the rest of the days unsacred. We are to make them feel that they are to go from religion to their business, and that the sphere of their business is the place where their religion should develop itself.

Fellowship for Bro. Shaw.

We have received from brethren at Lebanon, Tenn.,	\$3.00
From a brother at Owen's Station, Tenn.,	\$5.00
From a brother at Lynchburg, Tenn.,	\$10.00
From a sister near Petersburg, Tenn.,	\$1.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Visit to Locust Grove	481
The Fort Worth Debate, No. 3.....	485
County Meeting of the Christian Church...	486
Leipers Fork Congregation.....	486
Correspondence.....	487
Death of Bro. J. C. Oliver.....	483
In Memoriam.....	489
Queries.....	490
Brother T. Fanning.....	492
The Birth of the Spirit.....	405
Explanation	500
Supply	500
Fireside.	
To the Little Folks No. 8.....	581
Justifying Jonah.....	582

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 22

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, MAY 28, 1874.

Jacob and Esau--Election and Predestination.

Bro. Lipscomb: Some time back I read in the Advocate from under your hand I believe, the following. I thought I would re-write and send you those thoughts. I have concluded to send them just as they are.

"It is undeniably true, that before the children were born, and had done any good or evil, God chose Jacob as the person through whom the *seed should be reconciled*, instead of Esau, the first-born, while the children were yet in the womb, they *struggled*, and became the subject of prophetic teaching. God tells Rebecca, two nations are in thy womb, and *two people* shall be separated from thy bowels, and the one shall be stronger than the other, (no way to avoid it) and the elder shall (of necessity) serve the younger. He chose Jacob because *he foresaw* he would be more faithful to God. Choosing depends upon character. The expression, 'Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated,' was not said of them before their birth." But before their birth he said "the elder shall serve the

younger;" is there no hatred, Bro. Lipscomb, in God's decreeing that you, the older brother of your father and mother, should serve your younger brother, if God had so decreed? And you say, "He chose Jacob because he foresaw he would be more faithful to God" and again you say, "God chose Jacob, as the person through whom the *seed* should be *reconciled* instead of Esau." Now, Bro. L., could Jacob have been less faithful to God than he was, so faithless as to have to buy Esau's place, and could Esau have been more faithful—so faithful as to have taken Jacob's place, he and his posterity been the promised seed? If not, had we better not adopt Paul's illustration of the subject as it is recorded in the 9th chapter of Romans, "For the children being not yet born, neither having done good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works (not that the choosing of God depends upon the character the man gives himself by works) but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but

Esau have I hated" does not Paul here connect the love of God toward Jacob, and the hatred toward Esau, while they were in their mother's womb, "neither having done any good or evil (in that) that the purpose of God according to election (of God) might stand? If so, why say, "He never said he hated Esau until after he rejected God?" You say, "The Lord prophesied the character, course and destiny of the children before their birth, chose Jacob a *preferred one*, no doubt because he foresaw he would trust God, and his course would be in harmony of his will." Paul says these things were done "that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of (the) works (of Jacob) but of him that calleth." "Hath not the potter (God) power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel (Jacob) unto honor, and another (Esau) unto dishonor." "What if God, willing to show his wrath and make his power known, endureth with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath (Esau and family—all the ungodly) fitted to destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy (Jacob and family—all the promised seed) which he had afore prepared unto glory." Brother Lipscomb, if God chose Jacob because he foresaw that Jacob would be faithful, why is it, he does not foresee all the faithful and choose them, "That the purpose of God according to election might (may) stand?"

It seems to me that it would have been more in harmony of this teaching of Paul to have said, The Lord determined (instead of prophesied)

the character, course and destiny of the children before their birth.

J. M. WILKINSON.

Pelham, Tenn., April 15th, 1874.

The word *reconciled* is a typographical error. We wrote *reckoned*—the printers put it *reconciled*, which makes nonsense—but we supposed most readers would know what was meant.

Our brother Wilkerson will permit us to say that this is not the only passage of Scripture in the Bible. There are others just as much the word of God and just as true as this, that cannot possibly be harmonized with the construction he places upon this passage. He then forces a construction upon this passage that contradicts God's statements in other passages. It is unfair to treat any person's language thus. The fair manner of dealing with an author is to construe his language in different places and at different times in the light of each other and if there be a construction that harmonizes all the statements, that must be accepted as the true one. If there is no possible manner of harmonizing them, from their clear contradictions and antagonism, we must simply admit they contradict each other and are utterly unworthy of credit, or we may admit we do not understand one passage. Now our brother's position on this passage stands in such direct antagonism to the frequently declared will and manner of God's working with man, that if there be no other construction possible, one of two conclusions I must come to. I utterly misunderstand the teaching of other passages or the Bible is untrue. But

the other passages are so much more numerous—teach the same thing under so many different forms and ways, that about it there can be no mistake. Then the construction that our brother places upon this passage, confessedly difficult, must be wrong or the Bible is certainly contradictory.

For instance. Our brother's position is that Esau could not have been more faithful than he was, Jacob could not have been less faithful than he was. That is, they were both of them from necessity, just exactly as God had decreed they should be. It would have been just as difficult for Jacob to be more faithful than God decreed he should be than that he should be less faithful. It would have been just as difficult for Esau to have been less faithful as it was he should be more faithful. This our brother must admit, I think. He will further admit that God decreed them to be just precisely as he wished them to be. Now is it true that Jacob and his posterity, (for they constitute Jacob) were just as God wished them to be? Is not the whole history of God's dealing with Israel, a continual protest, that they were not living as God desired and commanded them to live? Did he not command them to do as he desired them to do? Did they do it? The prophecies are one continued series of entreaties, protests, chidings that God had blessed them, taught them, loved them, desired them to be obedient and they had refused.

You dare not say God desired man to act in one way and decreed he should act in another. Now let us take an example. Ezekiel 18: 3,

33: 11, says to Israel, "Therefore speak ye thus to them, If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live? Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel." There God says he has pleasure in the wicked turning from his evil way, escaping death and so living. He certainly decrees nothing contrary to his will or wish or pleasure. God has no wish or desire that any shall sin or die. He does not decree they will or shall. Hear again his protest through Zachariah. God commanded them, 7: 11, "Execute true judgment and show mercy and compassion every man to his brother; and oppress not the widow, nor the fatherless, nor the stranger, nor the poor: and let none of you imagine evil against his neighbor in your heart. But they refused to hearken, and pulled away the shoulder, and stopped their ears that they should not hear. Yea they made their hearts as adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in his Spirit by the former prophets; therefore came a great wrath from the Lord of hosts." Therefore it is come to pass, that as he cried, and they would not hear; so they cried and I would not hear, saith the Lord of hosts. But I scattered them as a whirlwind among all the nations which they knew not," etc. Now is it possible God commanded the Jews to do one thing and decreed they should not do

what he commanded them and then destroyed them for doing as he decreed they should do? 'Is this possible? Are God's decrees contrary to his commands? Where do we find any account of the decrees of God as separate from his commandments? Did God command Adam to do one thing and decree him to do the contrary? Who dare make such a charge against the Almighty? Will our brother tell us in what chapter he learns concerning the decrees of the Almighty that are contrary to his commands? Jesus not only recognizes that the Jews had done contrary to the will and commands of God, but he, looking upon Jerusalem, exclaims, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! Thou hast killed the prophets and stoned them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not.'" Matt. 23: 37. Now this is a recognition surely that these Jews had gone contrary to the will of God concerning them. He had sent them the prophets to persuade them to obey God, he had sent unto them his servants for the same purpose. They killed and stoned them. Did God through his prophets persuade them to be his servants, and through his decrees make them slay the prophets and persecute his servants? Is this your estimate of God's character? Is this your conception of the tender mercy of our Heavenly Father?

But Jesus desired to gather these children of Israel as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and they would not. Did the Father decree they should not? Did Christ the

Son desire and work to undo the eternal decrees of the Father? If so they are not one.

It does seem to me that these things ought to make our ultra-Calvinistic brethren see how their positions make confusion and involve in contradiction and absurdity the word of God, and how they caricature the character of the Almighty. Can they not see other Scriptures than these they thus pervert?

I do not find any evidence in the Bible that God ever decreed absolutely that an individual should pursue a certain course of life. He has foreseen individuals would do it. We frequently foresee things will happen, that certain results will follow certain causes, but our foreseeing it has nothing to do with decreeing it.

We go further, we say many of the promises made to the Jewish people were only partially fulfilled. The reason is, the promise was made upon the condition implied or expressed, that they remained faithful to him. They failed to comply with the condition and in failing in this, they cut themselves off from the promise.

The covenanted promise to Abraham was, I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." Gen. 17: 7-9.

Now this promise has only been very partially fulfilled. He has not been their God, in the sense here promised, a great portion of the time.

They have not been possessors of the land of Canaan here promised them but a small portion of the time. He told Abraham that his seed should possess the gate of his enemies and he should be the head not the tail. That he would rejoice over them, to bless them, to multiply them, to make them a mighty nation. They have been wanderers and beggars for a home the greater portion of the last two thousand years, a despised, persecuted, offcast people, the very tail of all the nations of earth. What then, has God's promise failed? It has, if his promises be regarded as unconditional and absolute. He made promise to David concerning his posterity that were never fulfilled. He promised to establish his throne forever and his posterity should sit on that throne. See 2nd Sam. 7: 12. He also promises David that the children of Israel shall dwell in a place of their own and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness affect them any more as beforetime." 2nd Sam. 7: 10. Now these children of Israel have been moving continually, have no home, no country, no altar, no God. And David's children did fail from on his throne. Well what of all this? God's promises are always made on conditions implied or expressed. To Moses, Deut. 28, he shows the promises of blessing to Abraham, and his children were conditioned upon the children being faithful as was Abraham. "Ye shall be left few in number whereas ye were as the stars of Heaven for multitude, because thou wouldst not obey the voice of the Lord thy God. And it shall come to pass, that as the

Lord rejoiced over you to do you good and to multiply you: so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought, and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people from the one end of the earth to the other and there thou shalt serve other Gods," &c., &c.

Thus God's promises to Abraham were not fulfilled, but the reverse of them, because the implied conditions were not complied with. It was the same with the promises made to David. Although no condition is expressed, we learn from God's language to Solomon, 1 Kings 9: 4-6, it is necessarily implied. Is not this universal in all of God's promises and threatenings to nations? See Jeremiah 18: 7, "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and a kingdom, to pluck up, and pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do unto them.

And at what instant I shall speak concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit it."

Here are instances in which God foresaw evil courses, pronounced sentence upon the nations and yet says, at the very instant of inflicting the evil pronounced, if they turn from their evil, God will turn from his evil purposes and bless. If he proposes to bless a nation, and they turn from their good to evil, he will pluck up and destroy instead of plant and establish. He here clearly shows

they can turn even when he has pronounced the evil. Or else God deals with false pretences. This is a universal rule of his action. He announces it as explanatory of all his dealing with man. But we find practical illustrations of this principle in divers instances of both nations and individuals as presented in the Bible. The Jews themselves are notable instances of God's promising good and inflicting evil. Nineveh was a marked example of his promising evil and bestowing a blessing. The sentence Jonah was sent to proclaim, was, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown." Never was a decree of the Almighty more unconditionally made or proclaimed. Yet Nineveh was not destroyed. The reason is found in the rule by which God acts in such cases, as referred to above from Jeremiah. Nineveh repented, and God repented of his purposed evil, turned away his fierce wrath and they perished not.

Now Jonah was, like our brother, Calvinistically inclined and was exceedingly displeased that God should decree and perform not, and he became very angry, and he was so outraged that the Lord did not fulfill his unconditional decree, that he asked God to kill him. He was ashamed of a God whose decrees were not unconditional. Jonah is the only Calvinist I have ever found in the Bible. But God taught him a lesson that converted him from the error of his way.

The examples of individuals thus dealt with are numerous, Hezekiah doomed to die and having his life lengthened out fifteen years is an example. Did not God fore-know Nin-

evah would repent? That Jacob would rebel and Hezekiah would sorrow and pray? Did he decree they should repent and yet pronounce sentence as though they would not change?

There is nothing plainer if one will take God's own teachings, without prejudice or pre-conceived theory, than that God always, when he promises blessing or cursing, does so on the implied or expressed condition of continued and faithful obedience or of continued disobedience.

You may ask, does God not know, whether they will thus continue or whether they will change? His knowledge in the premises does not affect their ability to change in the least. But he usually addresses them on the presumption they will continue as they are when addressed.

It was in Jacob's power to turn and do evil if he chose, as his children did after him. The promise of good was no more made to him than to his family. His family turned and the promises greatly failed to them. Esau had it in his power to change for the better. Had he done so, the law, when "If that nation against which I have pronounced turn from their evil I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them," the evil God pronounced must have been turned from by God. Let God explain himself and all is plain. But when we undertake to make God's works conform to our theories, confusion worse confounded is the result.

Esau did not become the servant of Jacob in his own person or that of his family. When they met in after years Jacob was the fearful and

troubled one. Jacob's family so far as we can learn has more often been in a state of bondage and servitude than that of Esau. What then? Only this. Either the servitude was simply that he was to be subservient or secondary to his brother; or Jacob's family was so wicked, so failed to live as God required, that their supremacy greatly failed.

These are the facts. Our brother can never harmonize them with his theory. The failure of the promises to fleshly Israel was so marked and noted, that Paul explained, That they were not all Israel, which are of Israel. Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children. "But if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3: 29. Showing plainly that no fixed predestination based upon the promises of God, could save a single child of Abraham unless through conformity to the Divine will. In other words, it shows that all of God's promises and decrees, as you call them, were based on the condition always implied, that the subjects of the promise should remain faithful. And these promises or decrees failed with reference to every child of Abraham who did not comply with the will of God, and receive Christ when he came.

But more than this, to show that this predestination and these promises were based on character we refer you to the following examples. Moses married the Midianitish woman, and the offspring of this union were immediately inducted into the priesthood. Jethro was one of the wise counsellors of Moses. He suggested

the division of labor in judging the disputes of Israel, and from his suggestion it is thought the Sanhedrim, the supreme court of judicature in Israel, sprung.

Jesus Christ did not spring from pure Jewish blood. Ruth, the daughter of Moab, on account of her fidelity, was received into the Jewish family and mingled the blood of Moab with that of Abraham in the royal family of Israel, whence sprang the Savior, the promised seed. Then there was Obed-Edom, doubtless himself a member of the family of Esau or the descendant of some one who had intermarried into the family of Esau. (These names are all significant.) At his house the ark of God was left, when Uzzah was smitten for touching it. God blessed him and his family. They became the gate keepers of the ark and all the sacred vessels of the temple. He was also called the Gattite, indicating his foreign extraction. It is more than possible that some of this very blood of Esau mingled with that of Abraham in the Savior's veins. We might refer to other instances, but these must suffice. We draw the conclusion from these facts, that the Lord's rule given by Jeremiah applied in the promises made to Jacob, only on condition of his and his children's continued fidelity to God, were the promises to hold good. Whenever any portion of Abraham's family became persistently disobedient they lost their heritage under the promise. Ishmael was cut out of the main promise Esau was, all the disobedient and persistently unfaithful of the house of Jacob, embracing at one time mainly ten whole

tribes, fail to inherit the promises. Then at the coming of the Savior all who rejected him were reckoned not of the seed. For then and thenceforward, only those who are Christ's are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. This takes in the believing Gentile, cuts off the unbelieving Jew. While this principle was clearly at work in the family of Abraham and Jacob, we find that the faithful of Moab, of Midian, of Esau were admitted into the family of God, became his favored subjects, enjoyed all the privileges and became partakers with the children of Jacob in the promises. This shows beyond all doubt to my mind, that God's selection was based upon his knowledge of the general character of the two families, and that foreknowledge in no way, made his promises to them unconditional or hindered them from changing their courses and the blood descendants of the one inheriting the blessings promised to the blood descendants of the other, and the blood descendants of Jacob bearing the punishments threatened upon the family of Esau. This only is true, that a child of Esau, becoming faithful, was adopted into the family of Jacob, because he, like Abraham, was the father in the spirit, if not in the flesh, of the faithful. God chose Abraham because he obeyed his voice. All were chosen alike. This process of breaking off and grafting in has continued to such a degree that scarcely a child of Abraham after the flesh, is recognized by God as of the children of the promise. Moab's and Esau's and all the other blood's have, through faith, entered in, and became the children of the promise.

Paul's whole argument to the Romans and the Galatians which has been so sadly perverted, was given to convince them that promises made to Abraham and his posterity and the curses pronounced upon the other families of earth were not unconditional decrees, but were conditioned upon their obedience or disobedience to God our Father. It does seem to me if our brother will study these questions from a true standpoint he cannot fail to understand it thus. Especially so when there are only a few difficult passages of Scripture that bear this construction, while there are so many others that cannot possibly bear it, that teach the directly opposite. Does he not think it the part of wisdom or of honor to God, to interpret the more difficult passages in the light of those clear, plain, instead of placing them in direct antagonism to them? Then again, our brother talks much about the decrees of God. Has he ever thought that the word "decree" as referring to the decisions of the Almighty, is used very seldom in the Bible, never with reference to human character or human work, but once as referring to human destiny. That one was in reference to Nebuchadnezzar who had become so corrupt and uplifted with pride that God decreed he should be driven from his throne, to wander as a maniac for seven years. Even then had he humbled himself and repented as Nineveh did, God must, according to his rule, have turned from him the evil he proposed to bring on him. But does not our brother think that our ideas of God and his dealing with man will be fully as correct, if we use his own

approved terms of expressing them as by substituting terms of our own?

The works referred to as not controlling the choosing of Jacob were not Jacob's works, but the works of the Jewish law. The Jews were like my Calvinistic brother, insisting that God, having chosen or decreed salvation of Abraham's family through the law, must save them through the works of the law. Paul shows them that God elects on such ground as he sees fit, that he is debtor or under obligation to no man by previous covenant or unconditional decree to save him. But he chooses whom he will. He equally as clearly shows that he wills to choose those who through faith in Christ, serve and honor him, and that no one has any right to demur. He teaches here precisely the same lesson that was taught by Peter at the house of Cornelius when he exclaimed, "I perceive of a truth God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him."

The trouble with the Jews was, they thought they were elected to salvation through the works of the law, Paul was disabusing their minds on this subject.

That he does injustice to the lesson taught in the parable of the potter and the clay, he may learn from the first use of this parable in Jeremiah, 18: 3. The lesson that Jeremiah draws from it, is the exact opposite of that drawn by our Calvinistic friends. He learns from it, that when God proposes good to a people, and that people sins, he will turn from the good and bestow evil. When he pronounces evil if they

will turn from their evil doings, he will turn from the evil he purposed and bestow a blessing. That is the lesson Jeremiah draws for the benefit of the Jewish people; read the paragraph. How differently he interprets from my brother. Paul intended to teach the same thing. He does not affirm one thing concerning how the clay became marred or who marred it. He only says when it is marred, so as it is not fit to make a vessel to honor, the potter makes one to dishonor. Paul applies this to the Jews. They are the clay. It has become marred, that is, they have become so corrupted and sinful that they are unfitted for honorable service in the kingdom of God. They are not such clay as is fitted to make a vessel of honor, and being such, the potter, God, will use them to dishonor, notwithstanding elected to a position of honor. Paul does not say how they were corrupted, he does not say the potter marred the clay. He does not say God corrupted the Jews, made them sin, and that he was to blame for their unfitness for honorable position in the kingdom of God. Paul does not so blame the Almighty—so reproach his holy name. Our brother's theory does. It makes God corrupt and pollute, and defile the Jewish people whom he had once selected as his own beloved people, that they became unfit for service in his kingdom. But the Jewish people—the clay, selected by God, the potter, for an honorable and noble purpose, a vessel of honor, is marred. The Jews insist as they were selected to a vessel of honor, unconditional election demands they should be used as such. Paul tells

them nay; ye are marred clay, the potter has power and will use you only for a vessel to dishonor, a vessel of wrath fitted to destruction. Your election was based on the presumption of your continued fitness.

How was it marred? God did not do it. The Jewish people corrupted themselves. Now I know the comparison can be made as to dead clay corrupting itself. But the Jewish people were not compared to clay in its inanimate character, but simply used by them and not as fitted for that which it was chosen. God would use them for that end for which they were fitted, as the potter the clay. This is the only point of comparison.

We have written lengthily, but we wished to put this subject in its true light. We have never found an intimation in the Bible that God fore-ordained or decreed or fixed the character of a single nation or individual. He foresees the character, chooses, elects and foretells their work and destiny in accordance with that character. They, as thinking and willing beings, make or mar their own characters in the sight of God and he uses them for such purposes as their character fits them. So it stands not of the works of the Jewish law but of God's election.

D. L.

The Law of Sin and Death.

Dear Bro. Pessimus: Once more I attempt to say a few things on this subject. It seems that you are a little like the man that said the horse was sixteen feet high—you said once that the law of sin and death was the

Law of Moses and you say it yet—well, come and reason logically on the subject. To do this, we will state as a foundation or proposition, something on which we both agree. Will you say that the Law of sin and death is that Law that the apostle said he was made free from? And so say I, and so says the book. Query: When was he made free from that law? Surely not before he obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine. Rom. 6: 17, 18. When, then, did he do that? Not until long after the Law of Moses was taken out of the way, the Savior nailed it to his cross. Eph. 2: 14, 15, 16; Col. 2: 14. That the law of Moses ended and was fulfilled in the death of the Son of God, we need not multiply quotations to prove, and if fulfilled and taken out of the way, it was no more binding on Saul of Tarsus, or any one else, fifty days after the ending of the Law of Moses.

The Law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus went forth from Jerusalem for the first time. Did the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus make Paul free from the Law of sin and death before it existed? No dear Bro., this is too absurd.—Well, long after the going forth of the law of the Spirit and the abrogation of the law of Moses, Saul of Tarsus was a vile persecutor of the church of God. Was he at that time free from the law of sin and death? Now, dear Bro. these are facts too plain to controvert, and with these facts before me, it is strange that any thinking Bible reader could understand the apostle to mean that he was made free from the Law of Moses, when he said the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus had

made him free from the law of sin and death. You seem to sneer at my saying it was a simple and easy case, and say it has but little weight with thinking readers, and notwithstanding all you have said, I still say, the 8: 2 of Rom. is a plain, simple statement of the Apostle and easy to be understood by any common English Scholar that has read the Bible with any care.

To illustrate, suppose the Apostle had said "the Son of God," is there any rule in language by which we could understand him to mean the Son of Moses, or any one else save God? Nay, verily, and the Apostle does no more definitely say the Son of God than he does the law of sin and death. It seems that you have ignored and disregarded the definite article "the" and the preposition "of" as they were of no use only to occupy space. Why not say that the Apostle meant the law of the spirit of life, when he said, For what the law could not do, the *law of the Spirit* is no more definite than the *law of sin* you speak of. But this must be the result of thinking without reading, or reading without thinking.

First and last, you have said several very strange things; a few of which I will notice briefly. 1st. You say that it might be said that sin is indirectly the author of the law of Moses. Yes, I say it might be said—it was said that the Son of God cast out devils by Beelzebub; and I guess that saying was about as true as the saying that sin was the author of the law of Moses. You reason why sin may be said to be indirectly the author of the law of Moses, is that sin was the cause of the in-

roduction of it, (law). Dear Bro. bear with your humble Bro. while I cast your reasoning into the refiners fire—Sin the author of the Law of Moses by being the cause of its introduction! Well, Paul says, it (the Law) was added because of transgressions. But how sin could in any sense be the author of the Law of Moses, I could never see.

Again, you say the law of Moses was introduced to condemn sin in the flesh and add that Paul said it was too weak to do it. Dear Bro. where is that to be found? The Apostle in Rom. 8: 3, says this: for what the law (of Moses) could not do (in what particular, in condemning sin in the flesh? no, but what the law could not do in making him free from the law of sin and death) in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh condemned sin in the flesh. Now Dear Bro. there are some other things of minor importance that I will pass by, thinking that I have said all that is necessary for me to say, for if what I have said does not clear up the case, I have no inclination to say more. This article may seem hard in criticism. I have said it all for the truth's sake in love and hope you will discern between earnestness and candor, and ridicule. May the good Lord bless his children, building them up in a knowledge of the true faith and in good works.

Your Bro. in hope of eternal life,

N. B. GIBBONS.

Waxahatchie Texas.

The Fort Wort Debate. No. 4.

On the design of baptism, Bro. C. cannot be beaten. Price never attempted to meet the true issue, but manufactured a ghost of a thing and went to war with it. With Ditzler he went to the battle field and there found thousands perishing for the want of *w-a-r ter*. He made a great ado about Campbell's "Gospel in the water." Every text that positively declared baptism to be for remission or a condition of salvation had not a drop of water in it. Not a drop could be squeezed out of Acts 2: 38—to use his own classic phrase. The Pentecostians were commanded to repent and be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Bro. C. thought the baptism of the Holy Spirit was a promise, not a command. On the infant proposition, P. had 3,000 babies, besides adults, baptized; now there is not a drop of water in the whole chapter. What will not a man do to save a sinking cause! Shades of Clark, Neely and McNight, tremble in the presence of your illustrious son! Your commentaries are stale, commonplace things compared with this: 1 Peter, 3: 21—The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us, etc. "Figure," modified by "whereunto baptism," is the subject of "save." Now the question is, what is like unto baptism? Baptism of the Spirit, of course. It is this then that saves us. What think ye of Price? Whose son is he!

Of the many arguments made by Bro. C., which P. did not attempt to meet, was a very strong one, based on man's nature. God gets possession of every department of our nature by

a command adapted to that department. Man is not entirely converted until God has possession of the entire being, mind, heart and body. A mental act gives him our mind; a moral act, our heart or affections; a physical act, our body.

I wish to record here what I never knew or heard before. That a moderator should insist that his disputant call his opponent and brethren by an offensive name. The Rev. Mr. Hines, P. E., P. P., etc., Mr. Price's moderator, did this. Mr. P., in his first speech on the design of baptism, called us Campbellites, and our teaching Campbellism—and repeated it frequently during the speech. Bro. C. did not call him to order, but in his next speech asked him to drop the offensive epithet. Mr. P. agreed to do this, but Hines insisted in a speech of some length, that they could not and ought not to call us by the name we have selected. Be it said to his shame! I am glad that his Brother Price had christian courtesy enough not to regard the iniquitous protest of Hines—P. E. though he be.

One other article on the Spirit question, and I shall have done.

A. C.

 Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: Perhaps it will be interesting to the brethren who read the *ADVOCATE* to know what we are doing in this part of Texas. We have an organization of over sixty members at Enon, or better known as the "Sand-flat" church, in the Northern part of Houston County. Our aged brother, A. Kyle, preaches for us the second Lord's day in every month,

and I preach for the church as often as I can. The church bids fair to prosper. They meet twice a month at two different points, one at Enon, the other at Denson's School-house, so as to give all an opportunity of meeting with the church; for, otherwise, some of the sisters would not enjoy the pleasure of meeting with those whom they love.

I preached at Denson's school house last Saturday night, and at the end of my discourse Bro. Kyle arose and delivered an address that would have moved a heart of stone; and while singing, there were three came forward and made the noble confession. They were the daughters of our aged sister, Mary Denson. Bro. Kyle preached on Lord's day at Enon, at which time I and my sister Mollie united with that congregation. The Church at Enon has been built up in about two years, mostly by the labor of brother Kyle; he is laboring hard for that "form of doctrine which was delivered unto the saints," but he is getting old and if the brethren don't remunerate him liberally he cannot preach for them long, for he is too feeble to do much manual labor.

I preach monthly at a place known as the Jones' school-house, but the people are mostly Methodists and Presbyterians, yet I get a good audience. We would like to get some help to hold a protracted meeting at this place, for we think much good could be done, or if any traveling brother can stop with us, he will be cordially received. The cause of truth is prospering here, wherever the word is faithfully proclaimed,

"the harvest truly is plentiful, but the laborers are few."

Fraternally,

T. F. DRISKILL.

San Pedro, Houston Co., Texas, May 12, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: I write you this to let you know the good cause in Texas is still advancing. On the first Lord's-day in April I held a meeting in Wood County, and took one confession, went back again and commenced another meeting on Saturday evening before the first Lord's-day in May. We had the largest and most attentive audience I have ever seen at the place before. I took two more confessions and baptized three during the meeting, which closed on Monday morning at the water. The good cause here is gaining ground, the people are becoming more anxious to hear the gospel read and investigated than they ever have before, and may the Lord speed the day when all shall know and obey the truth.

Yours in the one hope,

JAMES A. DICKSON.

Miller Grove, Texas, May 6, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: I and Bro. Lee spent the time including the 1st and 2nd Lord's days in this month in Perry Co., on Buffalo Creek. At one point we had 16 additions, and at another 9, besides sowing the good seed of the kingdom at other places. We had the presence and co-operation of Bro. Land most of the time. He is a workman that needeth not to be ashamed—has done, and is still doing a good work in that section. There is a very large and inviting

field of labor west of us, but laborers are few. I would that I could devote a great portion of my time among them. I heard of Bro. Fanning's death while down there—it came like a shock. From my boyhood, Bro. Fanning has been my friend. While very young, I learned much of the Bible from him. He will be sadly missed. He was doing a noble work with his pen. But his labors are ended—Peace to him.

Write immediately.

As ever, Yours truly,

F. H. DAVIS.

I feel sore distressed to hear of the death of Bro. Fanning. The cause of our blessed Redeemer has lost in him, one of its most powerful advocates (in my humble judgment) that has lived since the days of the Apostles.

W. C. H.

Education, Church and State.

We have not failed during the past years to strive to impress upon the readers of the *ADVOCATE*, the idea that the church, to be what it should be, must educate the children, must impress on them, in every-day training, the religious demands. The church cannot delegate this work to the State or to other hands, without surrendering her strongest instrument of good to the world. If the church maintains her hold upon the hearts of the people, the church must teach and train from childhood in the precepts and practices of the religion of Christ. The Romanists have alone, among religious people, seemed to appreciate the importance of training

and impressing children from infancy. They have persistently refused to surrender this right to the State. We have and always will honor them for persistent adherence to principle in this matter, however wrongly they may apply the principle.

We have no hesitancy in declaring that teachers moulding in the school-room the habits of thought of the children, a much more effective power for good when properly directed by the Christian religion, than all the eloquence and learning of all the preachers in the land.

The interests of the State and the church are not one. They educate for different ends. The State educates for itself, and will and must make devotees to itself. In whose esteem material good is the first and highest aim. Materialistic infidelity is as certain to flow from State education as effect flows from cause.

We are glad to see the Methodist Bishops in their wisdom affirming the same truth. In their address to the Quadrennial Convention now in session in Louisville, they give the following utterance:

“We do not hesitate to avow that we regard the education of the young as one of the leading functions of the Church, and that she cannot abdicate in favor of State without infidelity to her trust and irreparable damage to the Society. The relations of the Children to the Church are all identified by the antagonisms of modern science, and outcasting of all religious element from all schools, a system fostered by State legislation. It is not ours to dispute jurisdiction with Cæsar; but, fully persuaded that the salt of

Religious truth can alone preserve education from abuse and mischief. Our results, we feel that the responsibilities of the Church grow with the progress of society and the demands of the age. In the same connection the address continues: We anticipate in the near future a complete system of universities, colleges, district schools, academies, sustained by our people, and manned by our own graduates, all thoroughly equipped; a rounded plan reaching from the lowest to the highest, safeguards of a Christian education to all the rising generation committed to our charge."

We have not seen more hopeful words on this subject for years, than these. We are glad to see the Methodists taking this position, not that we desire to see Methodists educate the children, Methodists will make Methodists of those they educate as Romanists will make Romanists of those they educate. But we would infinitely prefer to see the people made Methodists of by the Methodist church than to see them made infidels of by the State.

If Methodists will be true to this position the churches will educate instead of the State. The church that will be actuated by the Spirit of Christ in the matter is one that will and ought finally to succeed. Those ambitious of worldly position and influence will build up grand monied concerns for the rich and great, and will accommodate themselves to the wants of the high, the exalted and the learned. Those anxious to do good in the name of Christ, will build up in the neighborhoods of poor, simple schools, to educate the poor, conformed to their wants, adapted to their habits

and through these will educate the poor and direct them to God through Christ.

You may have all the Vanderbilts and all the Universities, old and new, in the country, if you will only give me the power, the molds, the thoughts and directs hearts and hands of the poorer laboring classes of the land, I will succeed most gloriously in the name of our Master with these.

Another lesson beside this should be learned, that is large, richly endowed institutions like the State, become rationalistic, that is infidel. Millions of money in Europe and America have been given schools to teach the Christian religion. That religion to-day stands in spite of the teachings of those institutions endowed to uphold it. The church is the pillar and support of the truth. The church must educate herself. I mean each church must keep its educational arrangements under itself, not place them alone and independent of it. I mean by the church, each congregation of disciples. Money placed in these endowed institutions would be better spent in providing instruction for the poor in the different communities.

Bearing on this subject we republish the following note from the *Apostolic Times* of a recent day on German Universities:

"Rationalism and Materialism are rapidly converting all Germany through the Universities, nearly all of the Faculties having secret or avowed sympathy with these systems. There are about twenty German Universities, and study therein being so cheap, they are largely attended, and

have thus a tremendous power to propagate the prevalent opinion. . . . The influence is heightened by the fact that skepticism is now growing fashionable, and German youth are made to believe that the Bible narrative is composed of myths which learned men regard as long exploded, and that they are fit only for the unlearned peasantry."

Now when we remember that these Universities were founded in the interest of the very Christianity which they are now seeking to destroy, and that from them go forth not educated youth in general, but the preachers of the German States, we see both the terrible present effects of their influence and the black iniquity of thus diverting the bequests and donations of the friends of religion who long since founded these institutions. We are also reminded that Rationalism and Materialism are rapidly increasing in our own country, that they naturally find their strongholds in institutions of learning, and that some of the most richly endowed institutions in America are under their influence. It is against this danger, among others, that our own institutions are to be guarded, and to guard successfully will tax our utmost as a people." M.

We are glad brother McGarvey has seen so much. He thinks now that some plan can be adopted to hold and use such institutions without such evils growing out of them. We have our doubts from the truth, that so soon as organizations outgrow the simple congregation of Christ, which they must do, they themselves have cut loose from the

only moorings of safety—the institutions of the Lord Jesus Christ, and they themselves become soil fitted for the growth of Materialistic or rationalistic infidelity. We think it a providential circumstance in order to their purity that Kentucky University has been wrenched from its hold upon the Christians of Ky. They had better let it go, than strive to recover it. I am not in these things depreciating education, but if I desired to educate a young man or woman to-day, thoroughly, to make true scholars, critical thinkers I am sure I would try a private school rather than any University, or College known to me. Here, too, the genuine Christian influence can be brought to bear. The mind and heart may be here moulded and trained for correct thinking and acting through being imbued with a true feeling of obligation to our Divine Father. A question more pressing than others now is, How can Christians train their children for lives of service to God and usefulness in the kingdom of Heaven? This question will find its salvation very greatly in schools for teaching children, sustained wherever there is a church of Christ; and in which the Christian religion by precept and example will be taught daily.

D. L.

A Trip to Barren Jo. Ky.

We had intended to give some account of a trip to Olivet congregation near Glasgow Ky., embracing the 2nd Lord's day in April. But since our return home we have scarcely been able to keep out of bed much of the

time and have neglected it. The brethren met there to concert action for more effectively reaching destitute neighborhoods in that section of country. We did not reach there in time to hear any of their suggestions. We met a number of teaching brethren. Our earnest and aged brother Smith, from Cave city, Bro. Barbee, who teaches a female school and the congregation in Glasgow, Bro. U. Wright, of Dry Fork: Bro. Berry, now living at that place, late from East Tenn., Bro. Duval, Bro. Morehouse, and others who labor more or less in word and doctrine in their respective communities, besides bro. A. Alsup Jr. formerly of Wilson Co. Tenn., and our veteran and ever active Bro. Huffman, of Trousdale Co. Tenn.

The brethren here were trying to teach the people without an organization that will overshadow and corrupt and pervert the churches of God. What their success in the future will be I know not. "Our brethren of the Plan" had attempted to work here. They attempted to sustain one Evangelist in more than a dozen counties but failed. A few congregations willing.

Bro. Alsup, by his own sacrifices, energy and the labors of his sister wife, had in a small section built up and put to worship ten or a dozen congregations of active disciple of Christ. They were here endeavoring to provide for more work of the same kind. We hope they will succeed. Bro. Huffman has greatly been instrumental in building up the cause at this and other points through this section of country. Bro. Alsup is a safe conscientious man, a laborious and faithful teacher. Bro. Berry

who has recently settled in that neighborhood seemed an earnest lover of the truth, and, we would judge, well calculated to do good. The brethren speak highly of him. The church in Glasgow, seems not to be growing much. It has the reputation of having a number of members who are not as orderly in their walk, as pure and devoted in their lives as Christians should be. The brethren speak highly of Dr. Barbee's teaching and labor with the church in correcting these things. They think he is doing a labor now that will bear fruit ere long.

Bro. Wright has occasionally written an excellent article for the GOSPEL ADVOCATE. He is what we would pronounce a sound man and has great reverence for the word and institutions of God, as he delivered them.

Our opportunities were not good for thorough observation but we would judge a good work is going on throughout this section of country. The people are simple and plain in their manners, and teachable.

D. L.

DAETH OF ELDER T. FANNING.

Died May 3rd, at our residence—Franklin College—my husband, Elder T. Fanning. Had he lived to the 10th of the month he would have been 64 years of age. His health had not been good for weeks, I might say months, but on Thursday, 30th of April, he was very violently attacked. On Lord's-day morning, he asked us to break the loaf in memory of the Savior's love. Our hearts were too full of sorrow afterwards to

engage in song. "Sing, sing!" was his request as he was fast growing cold in death. A hymn was sung but he was too feeble to engage in it, and soon he went away. Oh Father! we are weeping. We need thy help to say "Thy will be done." Need I tell the readers of his History, they have seen its last chapter! It is useless to say, that the active mind so earnestly engaged in the critical study of God's holy word, so anxious to know "what is truth" on this great theme or that, has ceased its questionings. There is no need to tell that the hands always so busy, were last Lord's day morning folded to rest upon the heart that had so long throbbled with earnest desire to do good to the church and the world. He was anxious to fulfill his mission—seemed to feel there was not much time left—that the night would soon come in which no man can work. This made him too great a toiler, and he sat in his study from 9, till 12 o'clock, and oftentimes till 2 in the morning. Had he not been blessed with a constitution of iron he could not have so long endured his multiplied labors. It is all over now, and he looks so calm in rest after his great suffering that it would have seemed cruel to have called him back to a world like this, if we could have done so.

Father! We need Thy help to bow in submission. We are very frail and cling to the things of earth with love, often greater than we give to Thee. Pity us in our feebleness and sorrow, and help us to come with humility to Thy feet. Though Thou slayest us, may we ever trust in Thy tender love.

We all have Faults.

He who boasts of being perfect, is perfect in folly. I have been a good deal up and down in the world, and I never did see either a perfect horse or a perfect man, and I never shall till two Sundays come together. You can not get white flour out of a coal sack, nor perfection out of human nature; he who looks for it had better look for sugar in the sea. The old saying is, "Lifeless, faultless." Of dead men we should say nothing but good, but as for the living, they are all tarred more or less with the black brush, and half an eye can see it. Every head has a soft place in it, and every heart has its black drop. Every rose has its prickles, and every day its night. Even the sun shows spots, and the skies are darkened with clouds. Nobody is so wise but he has folly enough to stock a stall at Vanity Fair. Where I could not see the fool's cap, I have nevertheless heard the bells jingle. As there is no sunshine without some shadows, so all human good is mixed up with more or less of evil; even poor-law guardians have their little failings, and parish beadies are not wholly of heavenly nature. The best wine has its lees. All men's faults are not written on their foreheads, and it's quite as well they are not, or hats would need wide brims; yet as sure as eggs are eggs, faults of some sort nestle in every man's bosom. There's no telling when a man's faults may show themselves, for hares pop out of a ditch just when you are not looking for them. A horse that is weak in the legs may not stumble for a mile or two, but it is in him, and

C. F.

the rider had better hold him up well. The tabby cat is not lapping milk just now, but leave the dairy door open, and we will see if she is not as bad a thief as the kitten. There's fire in the flint, cool as it looks: wait till the steel gets a knock at it, and you will see. Everybody can read that riddle, but it is not everybody that will remember to keep his gunpowder out of the way of the candle.—*John Ploughman.*

School Teacher.

Brethren L. & S: The present session of the Mar's Hill Academy closes on the 17th. of June.

We can furnish quite a number of good teachers, either male or female.

We cheerfully vouch for the purity and ability of every teacher whom we recommend. Any community desiring the services of a teacher will do well to consult us on the subject, at the earliest convenience. We can also furnish a number of Book-keepers, Clerks, etc.

Fraternally,

T. B. LARIMORE.

Mar's Hill Academy, near Florence, Ala.

"Feet Washing in Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian times.

Such is the title of a tract of 16 pages, by John T. Walsh, at Newberne, North Carolina. from whom it may be had for 25 cents single copy, 5 copies for one dollar.

Advertisements.

We ask the attention of the brethren and friends, to our Job printing

advertisement in this number, and hope they will remember us when they want anything of the kind done. We promise that work shall be done promptly and in good style.

E. G. S.

The readers will please notice the advertisement of "The College Pen," now running in our paper. These young men are trying to advance the cause of truth and we hope they may receive good patronage.

E. G. S.

Music.

Peter's Musical Monthly for June is on our table, brim full of New Music. Six songs, and four instrumental pieces, Songs, "Lennie Darling," "Throw your whiskey out," "The Mill's Shut Down," "When Charlie Plays the Drum," "Out in the Snow," and "God be Merciful." Instrumental pieces; "Rose Bower Schottish," "Idle Thoughts Polka," "Far From Thee," and "Whispering Waves."

This excellent musical journal is published by J. L. Peters, Broadway New York, from whom it can be had for \$3.00 a year, or 30 cts a number. We think it the best paper of the kind we have seen. We have received No. 6 of the "La Creme De La Creme," full of good music for advanced players, published by the same man, from whom it can be had for \$1.00 a year, or 50 cts a number.

Fellowship for Bro. Shaw.

We have received for Bro. Shaw from church at Union, Sumner Co., Tenn., . . . \$15.00
A Bro. at Joliet, Ill. . . . \$5.00

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

With What Judgment ye Judge, ye shall
be Judged.

I had caught my workman in several misdemeanors of a character that made him quite objectionable. I gave him special orders, and to make him understand better his interest in doing right, or,—to speak after the manner of men,—that he might have a feeling sense of the obligation he was under to observe my orders, I told him if I ever caught him again misusing my property, or abusing a trust reposed in him, I would at once dismiss him from service. I came, I saw the wrong again, and I discharged him. I left, and on my way home reflections crowded uninvited into my mind. With what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged." Well, I will have to go to judgment, the book says. Now suppose the great judge deals with me just as I deal with my employee; what will be my fate. How many plain commands has he given me? Do I keep them? Ah, that is the question. How many trusts has he given me to keep? Do I sacredly observe them? But this man persisted in doing wrong. And do not I and do not nearly all them who propose to study the lessons of the teacher of the above and keep them, fail, neglect, or refuse, day after day, to walk in the statutes and ordinances of the Lord? Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you. When I come to judg-

ment, will I have the King upon his throne to take up all the cases, in which I have misused and greatly abused the means God has given me, and hold me to a strict account for burying or squandering my talents and for unfaithful stewardship in many ways? Why there is my neighbor. God mad me his keeper and I have failed to handle him right. I have not kept the word of God before him, and further, I have not commended the religion of my Savior to his attention, by so living it as to extort from him an admiration for Jesus Christ and a submission to his will. Now he is on the road, to ruin bound, and I fold hands of indifference together, my cold, unfeeling lips are closed upon the subject of salvation and obedience and sealed, so far as I am concerned, to his eternal interest. This is a bad cause to have decided by a judge who will decide as I have judged and to whom I have, by my exacting spirit, given the example for judgment. My barn is full of corn, my granary stored with wheat, my larder with meats, my pantry with good things, which God has given, as his agent to dispense to those in need, that he might be glorified and I saved. Well, suppose I feed no poor and hungry and clothe no naked in need, but selfishly can see no wants but our own through a life time, will I not have taken the Lord's good things and appropriated them contrary to his will to one purpose when he would have them given in another way? A man can spend from ten to a hundred dollars for tobacco, quite an amount for beverages, pleasant drinks, strong drinks

more for cigars, and just any amount for the extravagant finery of the fashionable world and only a few stingily given dollars for the spread of the gospel. How will all this appear in the eyes of the judge of a man who has exacted the last dollar of his debtors with compound interest? We are the Lord's debtors. Suppose we could stand to-day, as we will in that great day, before Jehovah's awful throne and the same identical money we give for tobacco and the gospel be brought up as witnesses against us. How do you think it would make us feel? There are the two offerings, the one great and fat, to the flesh and the lusts thereof, the other a small one to God that made us. The one the first fruits without spot and blemish, the other stained by the judging spirit that gave it, besides tattered, torn and defaced. How do you think a jealous God looks at this? You jealous husband or wife, how would you regard such strange misdirected devotion as this on the part of your partner for life. God is a jealous God. The money in judgment is called upon to speak. The large pile gives its sad testimony. I went for tobacco, for my owner could not do without it, he could do without Christianity he had bad teeth, a bad stomach, certainly a bad taste, and it put him out of sorts not to have it, so I. his hard earnings, was given for that which did no other good than gratifying a vitiated and unnatural taste. The next pile larger still deposeth. I was given for whiskey and the like, the antidote for all the ills that are to come and the panacea or cure-all, for the ills which have come. The last, by no means

the least, went to adorn the body, because it is of so much more importance to bedeck the body for man to look at, than to adorn the soul with good works, that the eyes of Jehovah may take pleasure in it, then it is such exquisite pleasure to gratify pride. The little sum then taking no courage from its diminitiveness, and drawing no comfort from its importance, testifies as a witness for the State. My donor took little pleasure in doing good, the enjoyment of his soul was little, compared with the delights of the flesh. He could not make a denial of one of the foulest, filthiest things to see the gospel run and be glorified. He gave me freely, but it was through fear, not love. He was afraid of being called stingy. Had it been love, he would have given more to the thing he professed to love most. As he loved the things of the world most, he gave them more of his precious wealth. My size speaketh for my master and shows he loves the good of this life and the praise of men more than those found in the promises of the Bible and the praise of God. He runs after fleshly lusts and does not abstain from them. "That mercy I to others show, that mercy show to me" is the good sentiment from the poet. Who is willing to pray thus and have justice meted out to them by the rule? Homeless, healthless, penniless, so far as eternity is concerned, we roam, pilgrims over the wilderness of life. No one can give sound bodies from death and corruption, no one can give an inheritance that fadeth not away, no one can give a changeless and happy home, but God himself. Shall we

who look with indifference upon the wretched condition of our fellows, and pray, "That mercy I to others show, that mercy show to me"? We would not want that sort. Still we ought to expect it and enjoy it, since we took great pleasure in showing it, and made it our own choice. But the case being changed, changes the case. If you have anything, good Lord, to dispose of, give it to me, and if I have anything good, I will keep it for myself, so I will be doubly blessed. But remember all, that God does not so promise or propose. Abraham said to the rich man, remember that thou in this life-time receivedst thy good things and likewise Lazarus evil things, but now he is comforted and thou art tormented. Suppose that God had looked upon us when we were without God, and without hope, with the same kind of mercy, we look upon those around us without Christ and unsaved, what would be our condition? I tell you few men praying thus would ask for a blessing, for by their own merciless conduct towards others, they would rob themselves of favor. It is a truth beyond question that where God converts a man, he makes him the friend of every one great and small, high and low, rich and poor and clothed with bowels of mercies, humbleness of mind, kindness, forgiveness and love! Armed with the gospel of peace, the breast plate of righteousness, the helmet of salvation, the shield of faith, the sword of the Spirit, and having the bread of life, they are prepared, thoroughly prepared, to bless and be a blessing.

TO THE LITTLE FOLKS.

"Uncle Joe, what is the ministry?"

It is a term, by the use of which certain progressive members of the Christian Church conform to the language—and of course the idea—of Sectarian, self styled orthodox, religionist.

"What do they mean by it?"

They mean the preachers. Sometimes styled the clergy.

"Why do they call them the ministry?"

Well, it is done by poor inflated brethren, whose ideas have progressed so far beyond the simplicity of the Bible, and so far into the popular expediency, that they have imagined there is a class of clerical gentlemen whose special province it is to rule the affairs of the church.

"Are not the members of the church servants, or ministers?"

Perhaps so; but then it would not be sufficiently progressive nor politic to style all ministers. This would not harmonize with the orthodox idea of a peculiar class—an official pre-eminence.

"What, is the work of the ministry different from other church members?"

Oh, very different, indeed, according to fashionable estimation. In the first place, these are very essential qualifications. One who would be a minister must cease to think himself a common man. He must dress fashionably. If he has a gold headed walking cane, all the better. He must advertise himself conspicuously. When he preaches he must adapt his sermon to the most fastidious taste and refined elegance. He must not associate with the humble

and the poor; for the poor we have with us always.

"How are these ministers supported?"

They look about for rich churches, where the members admire nice things and love to have their ears tickled with pretty sayings; members who are fond of great display and little humility. Here the minister takes a "pastorate" and a big salary. Or perhaps preaches a dozen or two of his choice "taking" sermons, at so many dollars apiece.

"Do all of these ministers get pretty well paid?"

I think so, as a general rule; though there is some complaining among them in some quarters, and they speak of getting up a kind of "ministerial organization" to arouse the churches to more liberality.

"Do you think the churches are liberal enough in paying preachers?"

I think there is too much liberality bestowed upon many of this class of "able ministers," to the shameful neglect of humble, God-fearing, hard working preachers. I think members of some churches ought to be ashamed to receive the labors, repeatedly, of zealous, faithful, efficient preachers, and give them no remuneration; and yet, let one of these "able ministers" come along and measure, out to them a few of his novel and unique sermons, and the church will scrape up its dollars, and pay him more for a few days entertainment, than they have paid their faithful brother for years of devoted labor.

"Why are these who are so faithful in building up and nursing churches poorly paid?"

I don't know that I can tell. It

is clear that the churches do not do their duty in this respect. How to remedy this I don't know that I can say. These preachers, for one thing, are too diffident in telling churches their duty in this respect. The churches should be told very frankly that they must pay the faithful preachers who labor for them. That it is wrong to receive the honest labor of a brother, and give him no remuneration. Preachers must live as well as other men. Their families must have a living. Their children should be educated, as well as have decent and comfortable clothing. The preacher, in justice to his family, in justice to himself, in justice to Christianity and to God, must provide for his family. He cannot follow some secular employment a great part of his time, and make a full, successful preacher.

"What ought this faithful, useful class of preachers to do when the churches fail to support them? Quit preaching?"

No; not if it can possibly be avoided. When the churches encourage, by word, a brother to preach, they should certainly encourage, by material support; and when they fail to do this, the preacher should tell them very frankly that he must be supported. And if one telling will not do, he should repeat it till they hear him.

"Uncle Joe, it looks like, that while the "big" preachers are starving the churches and getting their money for doing so, the zealous workers and supporters of the churches are bringing themselves and their families to want—and get nothing from the churches for their labors."

Well, it does look a little that way, and our faithful, working preachers must lay aside some of their diffidence, and talk plainly to the churches of their duty.

“What is the best plan to raise money to pay preachers?”

A good plan is for every member of the church to run his hand into his own pocket and pay the preacher before he begins to be pinched with want. If one church cannot pay enough, let two, three, or a dozen, help pay him. Don't let the brethren or the churches be afraid they will co-operate too much. Neither let them fear that they will make an humble, faithful, God-fearing preacher too rich. The churches should not want something for nothing. They should receive no man's labor for nothing.

UNCLE JOE.

In the Serpent's Coil.

The Rev. Samuel W. Bush, upon retiring from the chaplaincy of the State Inebriate Asylum, gives a statement concerning the success of the institution which is far from encouraging. He surprises us by the information that few out of a hundred are permanently reformed. We had been led to suppose that cures from the terrible disease of drunkenness were more frequent, and relapses rare. The representations usually made concerning the work of asylums and reformatories for this class of frail, sinning men, have quickened many hopes concerning them. But Mr. Bush speaks with great definiteness of the institution whose operations he thus watched:

“This I know, that only three of the eighty-two patients under the first administration have continued in a course of total abstinence; and all these eighty-two belonged to the highest class of society, and were intelligent, educated men. Many of these are dead, and died in a manner not pleasant to contemplate. The rest—alas for them!” Prevention of intemperance, therefore, is the only hopeful work. If the habit, when formed, is so invincible, guard the young from the formation of the habit.—*Presbyterian.*

The transgression of sinners was not so great as the righteousness of Him who died for them; we have not committed as much sin as He wrought righteousness, who laid down His life for us, who laid it down when He pleased, and took it again when He pleased.—*Cyril.*

Peace does not dwell in outward things, but within the soul; we may preserve it in the midst of the bitterest pain, if our will remain firm and submissive. Peace in this life springs from acquiescence, not in an exemption from suffering.—*Fenelon.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Jacob and Esau--Election and Predestination	505
The Law of Sin and death.....	514
The Fort Worth Debate, No. 4.....	516
Church News.....	516
Education, Church and State.....	518
A Trip to Barren Co Ky.....	520
Death of Eld. T. Fanning.....	521
We all have Faults.....	522
School Teacher.....	523
Advertisements	523
Music.....	523
Fireside.	
With What judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged	524
To the Little Folks.....	526
In the serpents Coil.....	528

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 23

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JUNE 4, 1874.

Laying on Hands--Rejoinder to Bro.
Lipscomb.

Bro. L. pounces upon the expression, "Only those who received power directly from Christ can transmit it to others." If this were surrendered, it would not demolish the argument; for it was given to prove that Paul had the Holy Spirit before hands were imposed upon him by the church at Antioch, and Bro. L. admits that, "It is true that Paul had received the Holy Spirit." But lest I be counted a Campbellite, I will submit other evidence than that of Campbell, that the thought has its source in the Scriptures. Now, when the Apostles who were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Then laid they their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit. When Simon saw that through the laying on of the Apostles' hands, the Holy Spirit was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power. But Peter said unto

him, Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter. This account shows that it was reserved to the Apostles to confer these gifts. Another evidence is, that no account is given where others conferred these gifts. The case of Ananias has been cited. Ananias says he was sent "that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit." The historian adds concerning Saul, "He received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." Now in the several accounts of Saul's conversion, just as in the above, baptism is given as the second thing which Ananias did for Saul. Then, Ananias conferred what we sometimes style the "ordinary gift" of the Holy Spirit through baptism, in accordance with the law, "be baptized * * and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Ananias put his hands on Saul, not to confer the Spirit, but "that he might receive his sight." When Paul received an extraordinary measure of the Spirit I know not: maybe when he received his commission; or when he was in that trance at Jerusalem; or, as Bro. L. supposes, later in life. Hence, we think

Bro. L. wrong in saying, "Paul certainly received the Spirit as much through the instrumentality of Ananias as the Samaritans did through Peter and John." When Ananias was *through* with Saul, the same might have been said of him that was said of the Samaritans when Peter and John *came* to them: The Holy Spirit had not yet fallen on him; he was only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus and was only, therefore, realizing the conditional promise, "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Ananias conferred the Spirit by baptizing Saul, just as Philip did by baptizing the Samaritans; but Peter and John conferred an extraordinary measure of it by laying on their hands. There certainly is a great difference here.

Bro. L. wants to class Timothy's case with those who had hands imposed to impart spiritual gifts. Well, Paul imposed *his* hands for that purpose; but the eldership imposed theirs for a different purpose. If not, why did Paul say, "Neglect not the gift which is in thee, which was given thee according to prophecy, *with* the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" instead of *by* or *through* the laying on of their hands? And why take the honor and power to himself saying, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee *by* the putting on *my* hands?" Evidently the gift was conferred by Paul only, while the presbytery laid their hands on Timothy for another purpose.

It may be that the phrases, "full of faith and of the Holy Spirit" and "full of faith and power" applied to Stephen, do not mean the same thing.

But I think the conclusion that all the seven did as Stephen, goes on one leg. Stephen is pointed out both before and after his appointment. But all the power any or all of them had might have been received on Pentecost, for aught we know. The best way, however, to decide for what purpose hands were imposed in this case is to notice what the apostles purposed doing. They directed seven men to be chosen, whom they might "appoint over this business." How did they appoint them? Luke answers, "They laid their hands on them." The laying on hands, then, was for their appointment primarily, no matter what attendant power it conferred, if any. Bro. L.'s *argumentum ad hominem* misses the mark. I do not "believe the apostolic hands especially and only could impart this power or these gifts of the Spirit." Christ could impart them and did, on various occasions. This sentence is a counterfeit. Here is the original: "Only those who received power directly *from Christ can transmit it to others.*" But even this is not strong enough. Only the apostles transmitted these gifts. Christ imparted them, the apostles transmitted them.

On Saul's case, I have only to add, that the ceremony was for the separation or setting apart of Paul and Barnabas; for the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. First, we have the work to be done; then, we have the way it is done. Whether Paul had power before this to

work miracles is not known. I am inclined to think that this is the occasion (not the cause) that brought Paul's powers and position before the world. He was certainly an apostle of Christ before, destined to sit on a throne like the thrones of the twelve; but like Saul of old, he was too modest to assume the position till the Spirit pointed him out. Many points in Bro. L.'s theory, however, are valuable. He says: "He was Saul previously, now he is Paul." Not exactly so. After this, in the same chapter, he is called Saul twice. It is more probable that the changing of his name from Saul to Paul was occasioned by his contact with Sergius Paulus; because always after this he is called Paul, except in the passage that indicates the change, and others alluding to his conversion. Again Bro. L. says, "It is no longer Barnabas and Saul, but now Paul and Barnabas." The truth, but not the whole truth. In the 14th chapter, we have Barnabas first in two places; in the 15th chapter, in four places—all after the laying on of hands. "We think the theory stands sadly in need of substitution."

In those cases where imposition of hands was for imparting spiritual gifts, it is plainly stated: but in these three cases, no such statement is made; besides, in the first, it is for the appointment of the seven to a certain work, in the second, for the separation of Barnabas and Saul, to a certain work or "life-long office," and in the third, Paul's hands conferred the gift, so that the hands of the presbytery were laid on for some other object. What this object is, it is not my purpose now to decide.

Neither do I wish to be led off from the subject by discussing the Eldership. Let "ministry of God" mean the whole church of God, if you wish, yet matters stand as before. If the humblest disciple is sent to minister to the poor, he, like the seven, should be appointed by laying on of hands: if some are chosen to carry the Gospel to distant lands, they should be separated from the saints by the same sign; or if others are chosen to confirm the churches and set them in order, let them be ordained by the same ceremony.

C. M. W.

We will not try to follow our brother in all his article. It is not necessary to our purpose. And we think, on reading his article in print, he himself will not be fully satisfied with it. Our proposition was simply this. "We have grave doubts, if ever hands were formally imposed, save for imparting spiritual gifts." It is a question on which we are not fully satisfied. We once were as well satisfied as is our brother. He may grow to doubt his early conclusions, as we do, on many subjects. He assumed that, "Only those who received power directly from Christ can transmit it to others." We doubt this proposition much more than we do the other one. Yet it is one in which there is, at this period of the world, nothing practical. And as we grow older, we daily grow more indifferent to the discussion of merely theoretic questions.

He offers proof of it, 1st, Simon Magus saw that through the Apostles' hands, spiritual gifts were imparted, and he was told he had nei-

ther part nor lot in this matter. That is precisely of the force of the argument for salvation through faith alone. There are many Scriptures which prove that salvation is of faith, but the alone part they do not prove. This passage proves that the apostles imparted the Spirit through imposition of hands; it proves that Simon could not do it. We are perfectly willing to maintain that there were none at Samaria that could impart spiritual gifts save the apostles—because no one save the apostles possessed spiritual gifts there, until they had imparted them to others.

But all that does not have the most remote bearing on the question, as to whether others possessed this power after they had received gifts.

The next case cited is the case of Saul or Paul. Our brother affirms a universal negative. Only those who received power directly from Christ, can impart it to others." To prove this proposition, it is necessary to prove that every one who did impart spiritual gifts by imposition of hands received it directly from Christ, 2ndly, that none others could impart it. Now Paul imparted spiritual gifts. It certainly is incumbent upon him to show that Paul received the Holy Spirit directly from Christ. Has he done it? He says, "when Saul received the extraordinary gift of the Spirit I know not, maybe when he received his commission, or when he was in a trance, or as brother L. supposes, later in life." Now, we confess that is a poor showing for certain proof that Paul received it directly from Christ. He says, Ananias laid hands on him that he might receive his sight. But Ananias con-

nected his receiving the Holy Spirit and of his sight together, and we infer that the means that brought the one did the other also. He argues that Paul received only the ordinary gift of the Spirit through baptism. Now Bro. W. has Saul probably receiving the extraordinary measure of the Spirit, when he received his commission, that is, when Christ appeared to him on the way to Damascus, and then receiving the ordinary measure of the Spirit three days afterward, at his baptism. That is strange, is it not? that he should receive the greater measure of it first, and afterward need to receive the less? But he only says *maybe* he received it then, or maybe he received it when in a trance at Jerusalem, or later in life. Did he see Christ to receive it from him later in life? I did not say he possibly first received the gifts later in life. I know he received gifts early in life—his Christian life,—because he was called a prophet. Now let us try Bro. W.'s possibilities.

Paul was converted in the year 34. He wrote the second letter to the Corinthians in 60. When writing that letter he says his trance was fourteen years ago. This would make it in the year 46. The trance was twelve years after the conversion. But in the year 45 we find him numbered among the prophets and teachers. But the prophets and teachers of this age, were gifted persons. See Ephesians 4: 11. We presume none at that day were authorized teachers, unless endowed with a gift of the Spirit to enable them to teach aright; the Scriptures not then having been given. It is not possible that Saul should have gone into a

strange country to himself, away from inspired men, depending simply upon his memory—without communication with the apostles, to preach the Gospel to the heathen, build up congregations and develop living active, Christian bodies without a spiritual gift to guide him as a teacher. He commenced preaching immediately and confounded the Jews. He had but slight communication with the apostles and inspired men. It was a number of years before he saw an apostle. He went then to Jerusalem and abode with Peter fifteen days. He saw none other of the apostles save James the Lord's brother. He knew personally none of the churches of Judea, but confined his labors, from the beginning, to the heathen regions where Christ had not been preached." See Gal. 1: 15. Is it possible he did all this without spiritual guidance, without any instruction save the meager lesson in first principles, which he received at his baptism, and the few days he remained at Damascus after his conversion?

Later in life, for receiving the extraordinary measure of the Spirit would render the absurdity so much the greater. Paul, then, was not endowed with the greater measure before the less measure. He was endowed with the extraordinary gift of the Spirit from his baptism, was recognized as among those possessing gifts. Ananias connected the receiving of sight and of the Holy Spirit. He was sent for that purpose. We irresistibly conclude that the act that bestowed the one, did the other. Especially when the act used to restore the sight is the one universally used

to bestow the Holy Spirit. Now we do not say Paul did not receive still fuller measures of the Holy Spirit; we believe he did at Antioch, when the Holy Spirit commanded, "separate me Barnabas and Saul unto the work to which I have called them." The reason we gave still remains. From this time forward Paul is recognized as having the pre-eminence and as exhibiting spiritual powers he never did before. This change dates from the imposition of hands at Antioch.

Yet, our brother in the face of this, merely guesses that Paul received the spiritual gifts directly from Christ, some time or other, and on this guess affirms that none save those who received the Spirit direct from Christ could impart it to others. And expects us to receive it as conclusive proof. Paul laid hands on Timothy with others of the presbytery, and he received the Holy Spirit. Where our brother learned that the others imposed hands for a different purpose from that for which Paul imposed his, he does not tell us, but is quite positive in his statement and expects us to receive it as beyond doubt true, although Paul connects it as all done at one and the same time, and calls his and their hands jointly, "the hands of the presbytery," with the laying of which he received a spiritual gift. Our case is fully established, though, even admitting that Paul's hands alone were connected with the gift bestowed. For our brother fully acknowledges he does not know when or how Paul received the Spirit, and of course that he received it from Christ. We have shown clear evidence he did receive it through the imposition of Ananias'

hands, and very certainly a larger measure through the hands imposed at Antioch.

On this subject we have not a doubt. We wish we felt as sure on the other, to wit: That in Apostolic times hands were only formally imposed to bestow the Spirit. All we have felt authorized to say on this subject is, "we have grave doubts." Remember now in every case of imposition of hands mentioned in the New Testament, save Saul and Barnabas at Antioch, and the seven at Jerusalem, it is specifically said, that hands were imposed that the Holy Spirit might be received, or the reception of the Spirit is given as the result of the imposition. In these two cases this is not said to be the object, yet it is nowhere said that hands are imposed as the appointing means. The seven are selected, that the Apostles may appoint them to the work of caring for the Grecian poor, who were neglected in the daily ministrations of the church. Now the question is, was the imposition of hands a merely appointing form? or was it a medium of imparting the gift of the Spirit to qualify them to perform well the work to which they are appointed? Remember there was no written Scripture to guide them, and every one called to a special work was dependent upon verbal instruction and a frail human memory, or he must have a gift of the Spirit to guide him in the work. Hence, when they were appointed to so important a work, in the mother church that they might be qualified to do it well, when the disciples selected and the apostles appointed them, they then laid hands on them, that they might

have spiritual gifts to guide them. This applies to the case of Barnabas and Saul as well.

This idea acquires additional force from the fact that hands were in all other cases used for the bestowing of spiritual gifts, and in both these cases, spiritual powers are immediately manifested, as being present in a degree not hitherto manifested. The same results manifest themselves as when hands were imposed to bestow spiritual gifts. To our mind, this is sufficient to create grave doubts whether in both these cases hands were not imposed as means through which spiritual gifts were bestowed, to qualify them for the works to which they were appointed, instead of being a mere formality of appointment.

That Paul was appointed an apostle before, I do not doubt, that he had fully entered upon his apostolic work previous to this, and that he had power to manifest the full signs of an Apostle, we much doubt.

Other points we might notice, but this must suffice on this subject. If hands were imposed for other purposes, we agree with our brother that whenever a member of the church is appointed or goes to a new work, or even every time he starts anew from his congregation, it is proper to impose hands as a mark of approval, and pledge of fellowship with him in his labor. Paul and Barnabas were not first starting out to labor among the Gentiles when hands were imposed upon them. They had been at it for years. They were merely starting again, after a return to Antioch from labor. We think they more entirely were devoted to labor among

the Gentiles and were more fully qualified for the work by additional measures of spiritual gifts.

D. L.

BAPTISM.

CRAB ORCHARD, KY., May 16, '74.

Bro. L. & S.—Bro. Sewell says "just as certain as the word of God is true, just so certain is it, that he who would enjoy the promise of pardon from God, must be baptized." This seems to be true, from our standpoint. But the man of sin has gotten up great perplexity in the minds of the people of this world about baptism. The question comes in, in this, and previous ages, for a few hundred years back, "what is baptism?" Many hundreds of thousands are made to believe, that when a minister, priest, or whatever he may be called, dips the ends of his fingers in a basin or vessel of water, and drops from their ends, a few drops of the water upon the head or face of the person to be baptized, that he or she, or it is then *scripturally* baptized. They cannot read the new testament as God gave it, in the Greek language. What better can they do than to take the word of their minister or priest, or it may be their bishop, a mighty man among them. He tells them—(in these days), that the Greek word *baptizo* means to sprinkle water upon a person or thing, and quotes the passage—"I will sprinkle many nations," and "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean." But the said bishop never tells the uneducated multitude that the word translated sprinkled, in these passages, is not *baptizo*, the

word the Greeks used, and yet use as we use the word immerse. Nor does he tell them that it is the Greek word *baptizo*, the word they used, as we use the word sprinkle. Under these circumstances, will God still hold such persons in a state of condemnation, because they are not baptized in water, but have water sprinkled or poured upon their heads? All of them, no doubt, would be immersed, if their Greek scholar leaders would tell them the Greek word *baptizo* means to immerse, as did the people, among all nations, from the time the kingdom of God was set up, and the day of Pentecost, according to some, up to the fifteenth century. Would it not be just, if God, under such circumstances, should pardon all such deluded believers in Jesus Christ seeing they would obey him if they could know what to do? Suppose Jesus Christ had come and lived, and talked, and healed, and died, and been raised again, in order to our justification, in Kentucky, where we nearly all speak the English language; and had selected twelve men to "go into all the world, and present the gospel to every creature," and had said to them, "He that believes the gospel and is, or will be immersed, in the name of the Father and of the son and of the Holy Ghost, shall be saved" (in the sense of the remission of his past sins)—all thus complying with the terms would be sacred. But suppose preachers, ministers, priests, or bishops, many years afterwards, go into a foreign country, where the people know not the English language, and preach Christ to them, and tell them, "If you will believe in him, as the Re-

deemer of the world, and will be *immersed*—that is, have water *sprinkled upon your head*, or forehead, or face, from the ends of our fingers, after dipping them in a bowl or basin of water—you shall be saved," would they not be saved, although they are not immersed, according to the proclamation of the Savior, through his Apostles, on the ground that they would have been immersed, if they had understood what it is to be immersed? Just so it is in this country. The people, generally, know no more about Greek, than said foreigners would know about English. The people are utterly unable to avoid deception in such cases. Here, where we speak English, the most illiterate would think a man to be a simpleton, were he to tell them *immerse* means to *sprinkle* water upon a person.

All over the United States, in many localities, men are writing and preaching that there is no proof that people in the Apostolic age, were immersed when baptized, but that baptize means to sprinkle, and many thousands believe them, as they claim to be God's called, sent and qualified ministers. They never tell, *voluntarily*, that John Calvin, the head and front of Presbyterianism, said, "The men of old time put all the body under water." That Dr. Whitley, an Episcopalian, said, "Immersion being (was) religiously observed for 1,300 years, and approved by our church, and the change of it into sprinkling, without any allowance from the author of the institution. It were to be wished that this custom were in general use, etc." That Neander, a Lutheran, said, "There can be no doubt, whatever, that in the primitive times

the ceremony was performed by immersion." That John Wesley said, "to baptise by immersion was according to the custom of the first church." That in 1859 sprinkling was first established in Scotland;" and that this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established church." That "they (the members of the original church) maintain that *baptizo* can mean nothing but *immerse*; and that *baptism by sprinkling* is as great a solecism as *immersion by aspersion*." If there never had been but one language—the English—then God would have revealed his will to man in this language. This being the case, no one could deceive another as to the import of *immerse*. No one would, or could, make his neighbor believe it means to *sprinkle* water upon anything. Then, every one who would not, upon believing the gospel, be immersed, according to the commission, could not be saved. But, as God has given us his New Testament in Greek, all who do not understand Greek, can never know His will till Greek scholars give it to the people in their own tongue. Then, if a Greek scholar gives to the people, speaking English, the language of the commission thus: "Go you into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and has, or will have, clean water sprinkled upon him, shall be saved," how could the people help themselves? They are compelled to take the word of the translator. Would not God save them? Not because they had "clean water sprinkled upon them," but because they had in their hearts to do his will, if they

could have known it? There is a day to come, in the which a certain portion of Scripture will be applicable to "many." It reads: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day (when the kingdom is to be entered into) "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? And in thy name cast out devils? And then will I profess unto them I never knew you; depart from me, you that work iniquity." Read all from verse 21 to 29 of Matthew 7th. As far as I have quoted, seems to me, will be applied to those teachers of the people, who will have been guilty of teaching—"in the name of Jesus Christ"—what he never authorized them to teach, and to do in his name. Although John Calvin admits "the men of old time put all the body under water," yet he says, "the use is this, that the minister only sprinkle the body or the head. But we ought not to stand so much about a small difference of a ceremony, that we should, therefore divide the church, or trouble the same with brawls," etc. "Wherefore, the church did great liberty to herself, since the beginning, to change the rites somewhat, excepting the substance." The *leaders* of the people of the church did this. The church never did it. The church has not, nor did she ever have, the right to grant to herself the liberty to change any law of Jesus Christ, and then carry out that changed law in his name. But God will do right with us all in the end. Never "teach for doctrines the commandments of men."

Your Brother,
DELANCEY EGBERT.

The question as to what God will do with those who suffer themselves to be deceived in regard to the requirements of the word of God, and do something he has not commanded, and leave undone what he has commanded, has been often raised, but never settled. We have no rule by which to settle such a question. What God will do in such cases is with himself, and it is dangerous and vain for man to speculate on such questions. We know perfectly well, that they that do his commandments will have a right to the tree of life and will enter in through the gates into the city. We know, moreover, that those who are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, will receive indignation and wrath at the hands of God. We know that those who "obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." But about people who are "*honestly*" deceived about the word of God, and do something else, there is not much said. Most that is said, is very discouraging for such. We will give an example or two. In the 13th chapter of first Kings, we have an account of a prophet that came from Judah to Bethel by the word of the Lord. He performed some wonderful miracles while there. Causing the altar to be rent, and the ashes to be poured out. Also causing the King's hand to wither, and restoring

it again, uttering some prophecies that were afterwards fulfilled just as he uttered them. This man, after all this, allowed himself to be deceived by an old false prophet who lived there, and was induced to turn aside from what God had commanded, and do something else, thinking that would do. But the terrible result was, that this prophet, instead of being excused, as being *honestly* or *innocently* deceived, was destroyed by a Lion, and was buried in Bethel, and never reached the home or sepulchre of his fathers.

No doubt but that if you had seen this prophet when he turned aside from the word of God to do something else, he would have told you he thought he was doing right, that an old prophet had told him so. But his thinking it was right did not make it so; and thus he perished in his disobedience, without receiving any mercy whatever for his being deceived. Uzzah, in his sincerity to work for the Lord, put up his hands to hold the ark on the cart and doubtless thought he was doing right, was doing a good work. But God did not look at it in that light, and so he lost his life for his rashness. The Bible reveals no safety for man except in doing the will of God, as expressed in his word. To argue that all who are *honestly* deceived will be saved, is simply to apologize for disobedience to God, and to cause the people to go on in that disobedience, instead of examining the ground more closely upon which they stand, to find out their error, and abandon it. We do not think our brother intended to take such ground as this at all, yet it will likely make that impression upon some. If we want to win the people to the truth, we must make no compromise with error, nor in anywise apologize for it. The only safety for man is in doing exactly what has been commanded. We have no account in the word of God, of any one ever enjoying the blessings of heaven in any other way. If there is any one obligation that presses more heavily upon us, as a people, than any other, it is to call the attention of the people away from the traditions and commandments of men, to the pure word of God as it stands recorded in the Bible. And if there be one item in which the people would be less excusable than any other for turning aside from the positive command of God, that certainly is baptism, whether you look at it as to its design, or in reference to its action, or subject. As to the design of baptism, every one that knows anything of the new institution knows that God commands the people to be baptized; they would be his followers. It is nothing in the New Testament that is more positively commanded than baptism. And the masses of the people know this to be so. It is not a mere supposition or opinion, but they know this to be so. And to know that God has commanded a thing to be done is reason enough for doing it. The Pharisees and lawyers who rejected John's baptism, rejected the counsel of God against themselves, (see Luke 7.) Will those who reject the baptism commanded by Jesus Christ do less? Certainly not. And there is no room here for any apology for ignorance, or honest deception. The people all

know God commands them to be baptized; and this leaves them with out excuse in this matter. As to the action of baptism, it is universally admitted that *baptizo* means to immerse, to dip, to plunge. It is almost universally admitted that in Apostolic times the people were immersed, and that for thirteen hundred years afterward the same practice was continued among all religious people and nations. The religious world almost to a man, says that when a proper subject is immersed, the divine command is obeyed. These are the almost universal acknowledgements of the sprinkling world themselves. Where, then, in the face of all this, is there any room to apologize for a people who admit God's truth, and then go and do something else? God will do his own way in these matters, and we need not trouble our brains to find out whether he will in anywise depart from the strict letter of the law or not. Our work should be to teach the law in its plainness, and to teach induce the people to live up to it in all things. We know then they are safe. But if we undertake to apologize for those who do not obey the truth, because they may honestly think something else will do, we thereby cause many who know the truth, to risk something else besides the truth, and thus lull themselves to sleep in their delusions. Religion is too sacred a thing to experiment upon. And as to the subject for baptism, or the proper person to be baptized, all who know anything of the commission of the Saviour, or the preaching of the Apostles under that commission, know that believing penitents were commanded to be baptized, and that this class of persons everywhere were baptized, while not one single command was ever given for infants to be baptized. And even if we were to admit that infants might be baptized, yet, according to the New Testament, when they were old enough to believe and repent they would then have to be baptized, because this class of persons are commanded to be baptized. And we think infant baptism, which never was commanded of God, would not be much better than John's baptism was, after its day had passed. And we know that the twelve at Ephesus who had been baptized unto John's baptism by Apollos, after its mission was ended, had to be baptized again by Paul, in order to enter the kingdom of Christ. So upon this principle, those who are sprinkled in infancy, in ignorance of the gospel of Christ, will have to be baptized when they grow up, and understand, and believe the gospel. And hence, if I were to search for justification for people in ignorance of God's truth, this would be about the last I should take, since nearly all acknowledge the truth on these matters. If there is anything to be granted on the plea of ignorance or deception in these matters, the Lord will grant it. But that is his business and not ours. He will attend to that. Secret things belong to God, but things that are revealed belong to us and our children.

We do not wish in any way to countenance a disregard for the word of God, and his divine appointments. Let us do and teach them and all will be right.

E. G. S.

QUERIES.

Brother Lipscomb: There are over 50 brethren at this point and for the last eight or ten months we have been meeting every Lord's day when the weather would permit. A few weeks ago, some of the brethren proposed to change the time of meeting from ten o'clock in the morning to two in the evening. Some of the brethren believing that the evening was the proper time according to example given in Scripture; and there being preaching by some of the different sects within one hundred yards of our house of worship, every Lord's day except our regular monthly preaching day; it was left to the brethren to say if the change should be made. There was but one brother present who objected, and he said if it was the will of the brethren it was his also; there was a brother present at the time who has since refused to meet with us unless we will meet in the morning, but does not, as we think, give any good reason (his main objection is that we are showing lenity to the sects, I think.) Now Brother L., did we do wrong in making the change, and the brother do right in refusing to meet with us? If we meet in the evening, read the Scriptures, investigate the same, sing, pray, and break the loaf together as brethren, have we done our duty? Please answer through the Advocate if you think it proper, for we would be glad to hear from you on the subject.

W.

The word translated supper, means the chief meal of the day and is espe-

cially used to represent a feast, particularly on some remarkable occasion. This dignity and importance of the feast ought to be preserved. To preserve these, the chief and important time of the day devoted to worship ought to be sacred to its observance. The customs of this country make the forenoon of Lord's day the chief hour for worship. The members are more likely to attend then. It makes the impression on the public, that the members esteem it more highly. When it is postponed until afternoon that it may not get in the way of some other duty or pleasure, it is made a secondary matter of, it is an indication that we do not esteem it more highly than anything else for that day. Hence the members learning to esteem it lightly neglect to attend on trivial and unimportant grounds. The institution is not made the main feast of the day. Our observation has been that it soon declines in interest, and is neglected when assigned any other time.

But there is nothing in the Bible prescribing the time of day at which it should be observed, and if the brethren and sisters will agree on any time and show by their promptness and earnestness that they are making it subservient to nothing else, on the other hand they are making every thing else bend to this as the significant and important work of the day it would be acceptable to God. The great thing is to magnify the institution both in the time and manner of observing it, and in doing this to magnify the facts it sets forth.

A member who becomes offended at any changes the majority of his brethren may wish to make, which

involve no sacrifice of the truth of God, and refuses to meet with them shows a sad lack of appreciation of his duty to God, his privileges as a child of God. Shows a selfish disregard of the wishes of his brethren, a self important, dictatorial spirit sadly out of harmony with the spirit of Christ which must dwell in us or we are none of his.

A congregation should be very shy of changing established order and usages save for very important considerations and with the most perfect unanimity in its members. Change implies a lack of steadfastness that destroys confidence.

D. L.

Bros. L. & S. : Please explain the 29th verse of the 15th chapter of first Corinthians, and oblige

Your Brother in Christ,

E. T. GRIGG.

Stringtown, Mag, 11, 1874.

This is one of those passages the exact meaning of which is a little difficult to determine. It is a little difficult to tell with certainty what, or whom, the word dead refers to. The usual impression is, that this word dead refers in some sense to Christ. He died for our sins, was buried and raised again for our justification. In becoming Christians, we die to our sins, are buried with him in baptism, and arise again with him, to walk in newness of life. Now remember that in this entire passage Paul is arguing the resurrection from the dead. Some at Corinth had denied this. In thus being buried with Christ in baptism and rising again, their action declared that Christ was

buried and raised again. The meaning then of the passage, as we understand it, is, what is the use to be baptized in representation of Christ's burial and resurrection, if there be no resurrection—if he rose not. It would be a meaningless ceremony, upon that assumption. Why then be baptized for the dead, that is to represent Christ's burial and resurrection when he died, if indeed he did not rise. He intended to show these Corinthians that their action in baptism was meaningless if they did not believe in the resurrection and thereby present an argument in behalf of the resurrection. This when properly considered, is a very strong argument. Things do not originate without an adequate cause, or reason. The practice of being buried with Christ in baptism, was then in existence. It did not originate by chance. The facts that this practice represents must have existed, or such a practice, based upon such facts, could never have arisen. Therefore Christ must have been buried and raised again, or the idea of such facts, as represent by baptism, never would have been associated with that institution. This is the best we have on the subject.

E. G. S.

The two following queries were propounded to Bro. Fanning, and answered by him just before his death, too late, however, for the last number of the *Historian*. We publish them by request.—EDS.

“RELIGIONIST.”

Brother H., of Eldred, Pa., writes: “According to my understanding of English lexicons, the term, ‘*Religionist*’ invariably means

a 'Bigot.' If this is correct, I question the propriety of using the term, except to express the idea of a Bigot."

Answer.—Webster defines, "Religionist—one earnestly devoted or attached to a religion;" and then adds, "A bigoted, or affected practitioner of religion." Most certainly, the idea of bigotry, comes not from the word religion, or from any phase of the subject. It strikes us, as correct, and quite appropriate to call a man devoted to the religion of Jesus Christ, a religionist, of the pure stamp; and yet, one may, under the influence of superstition, or false religion, be a bigot. The Pharisee, who stood and prayed, "God, I thank thee, that I am not like other men," and boasted of his remarkable performances, would in common parlance be called, "a hollow-hearted religionist, or a mere bigot." But, we are not willing to be cheated out of an expressive designation, Religionist, because the word is abused.

Our Brother asks, "Are there circumstances, under which I may speak of an intelligent person, as an, *Instrument*?" "I think the word, *Agent*, preferable."

Answer.—Webster defines, "Instrumentation,—a series, or a combination of instruments; as *means*—agency." While, the word, "*Instrument*," literally gives the idea, of a tool or implement, in the religious world, it denotes an agent or agency, and we consider it proper to regard one as God's instrument, or agent for good.

Brother H. says again, "I know that, men as agents, use *instruments*, but how they can be agents and instruments at the same time, I cannot so well comprehend." If I am right, in reference to Re-

ligionists, and Instruments, it seems to me that some of our scribes write most incongruous, we should speak as the "Oracles God." (1 Pet. 4: 11

THE LORD'S SUPPER-HOUR.

SALADO, BELL CO., TEXAS, }
March 4, 1874. }

Bro. F.: While I am pleased, with your definition of the word "supper," I think, the form of my question was this, (to-wit:)

Is it wrong to attend to "the communion," in the forenoon?

I understand that it is legal to attend to said institution at any hour, on "the Lord's day,"—yet, unless we are *unavoidably* prevented, we should not defer it to the close of the day. "The communion" (together with its accompaniments) is "*the worship*" of "*the Lord's day*," and we should *not* give to God—the *refuse*. We know how it was under *the type*, when, His people offered the lame, halt, blind, etc. Please set me right as to the above.

As ever,
W. T. BUSH.

ANSWER.

While there are churches, that hesitate as to the breaking of bread at noon, or a little earlier or later, it seems to us, Brother Bush, is in the main correct, in making the Lord's supper the *important* service of the day, instead of giving any great prominence to the hour. Amongst the Jews, there were two important meals in the day.

Αρισταυ, Ariston, Was for breakfast, or dinner; but was most generally a slight refreshment, and yet on some occasions it denoted the most important meal of the day.

Δειπνον, *Deipnon*, Was the chief meal, but was translated, breakfast, dinner and supper. It was applied to feasts, of any kind. The Lord's supper, was of sufficient moment, amongst the early Christians, to call the disciples together on the first day of every week; and in our judgment, the purpose of assembling gives value to the service, much more than the time of the day. We are quite sure, at least, that, the word rendered *supper*, was not intended to designate, a meal at a late hour in the day, though it might have been attended to in the evening, or night, as well as in the morning, mid-day, or afternoon.

Memoirs of Jesus.

WAR.

Wars are of various kinds. They may be elemental, carnal, and spiritual.

War may be defined, in general terms, a conflict of powers; an opposition of forces; a "strife for the mastery."

When a wind or thunder storm is raging, we say: There is an effort of nature to restore her elements to their wonted equilibrium; and, figuratively speaking, we call this opposition of physical forces a "war of the elements."

So, in reference to the conflicts of nations,—the bloody strifes between worldly powers, and the bloodless contests of political parties, we speak of the opposing forces, and of victories, which last show the preponderance of one contending power over another.

In a spiritual point of view, the conflict of the Spiritual or moral powers of man with the carnal or fleshly propensities, and the resistance offered to the surrounding worldly influences, constitute a Christian warfare, requiring the use of Spiritual weapons, such as are spoken of by Paul, when he writes: "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but through God, are effective in the down pulling of fortifications, and the demolition of [human] imaginings, and every high thing that exalts itself in opposition to the knowledge of God." (2 Cor. 4, 5.)

In this warfare, Christians engage individually. But there is another species of Spiritual warfare, in which the church of Christ as a body is engaged; namely, the perpetual war,—the "irrepressible conflict."—between the truth of God and the errors of mankind. Truth and error may be regarded as eternally antagonistic. In a Spiritual sense, then, the church is to be considered a warlike kingdom, and every Christian a soldier. But it is not of Spiritual warfare that we are now to speak particularly.

The question which conscientious Christians are wont to ask, is not, "shall we engage in the contest against the world, the flesh, and Satan?" for concerning this war there can be no conflicting views among Christians. Our duty here is plain. But this is the momentous question: "Can a citizen of Christ's spiritual kingdom, consistently with his profession, and in harmony with the Spirit and teaching of Christ, under any circumstances, engage in carnal warfare, in mortal conflict with his fellowmen?"

Something has already been said in cc. lxxviii, and lxxx., respecting the Christian's relations to the civil governments of the world.

While it was there contended that the church and State should be separate and distinct; that the Church should not be subordinated to the State; it was nevertheless urged from the Scriptures, that Christians, individually, and to a limited extent, should be "subject to the existing [human] authorities." It was also contended that the Christian may vote, and to some extent participate in affairs of human governments; but that his vote does not necessarily involve him in all the inconsistencies of politicians or of governments. But the question, "should a Christian, in obedience to the authorities, engage in the conflicts of worldly powers?" was properly deferred to the present. Having arrived at that point in the Memoirs of Jesus, where the Founder of Christianity utters the following significant language; "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then my servants would fight, so that I might not be delivered up to the Jews; but now, my kingdom is not from hence;" it becomes necessary, and I feel in duty bound to make a diligent examination and earnest inquiry into the merits of the subjects of fighting or war.

It will be no very easy task for me to compress within the limits of one short chapter of these Memoirs all that ought to be written for the satisfaction of my scrupulous readers: for my own satisfaction, I might say for I have had conscientious scruples myself; and I feel like trying to

satisfy my own mind on the subject.

The special instructions of Jesus and his apostles have impressed very strongly on my mind those non-resistant principles, which do not admit the moral possibility of a Christian's fighting, in any manner, in self-defense or otherwise.

The example of the martyrs, in following the teaching of Jesus, "not to resist evil," shows a spirit of non-resistance which commands our admiration. Then the language of Jesus, above quoted, viewed in connection with the prediction of Isaiah that "they" the nations "should beat their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning hooks, and learn war no more," plainly indicate the peaceful nature of the reign of Christ, who is even called "the Prince of Peace." Also, Paul's declaration, that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal," is highly suggestive of anti war principles. Still, I have been, and am now, of conviction; am willing even to admit, that there seem to be some serious objections to the position of non-resistants, who are by many considered extremists.

With reference to the declaration of Jesus, that "his servants could not fight, because his kingdom was not a worldly kingdom," it may be confidently remarked, that the plain import of this declaration is, the subjects of the Kingdom of Heaven cannot fight with carnal weapons in defense of Christ or his kingdom. There cannot, therefore, be such a thing as a carnal Christian war, or religious war. There cannot be such a thing, as one Christian nation waging war against another Chris-

tian nation, or even against an un-Christian nation. A. Campbell, in his great "address on War," shows that "there is no such thing as a Christian nation on earth," and thus asks: "Can Ubrist's kingdom or church in one nation wage war against his kingdom or church in another nation?" To this question there can be but one answer,—"No." But I would ask: Is there not such a thing as a nation composed of Christians? Does not Peter, writing to Christians, say: "You are a holy nation, a peculiar people"? But if this "Holy nation" could assemble in one land, marshal its forces and equip for war, would it be right for it to wage war on the unbelieving nations of the world, and subdue them to the authority of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords? This question too, can only be answered in the negative; for Jesus' declaration forbids such a war.

The Jews, as a nation, were indeed permitted to war with the heathens. God himself, being "King of Israel," could rightfully, and did frequently, command his people to fight. But they had no right to wage war on their own responsibility.

But while it is a fact, that the Jews engaged in war, at the command of God their king; and while it is also true, that Christians, as a people or nation, have refused to fight with the sword, because their King, Jesus, forbade it; it is still a question, whether Christians, as citizens may or may not engage in a justifiable war between their own nation and another nation, who may wish to oppress or enslave them.

Or we may suppose a nation, composed largely of Christians, invaded by an army of rebellious subjects, as

well as by foreigners. In such a case, would it be right for Christian subjects to aid in the work of resisting by force of arms such disturbers of the public peace?

The following two additional queries, however arise, in reference to the preceding question: (1.) "Is a citizen of Christ's spiritual kingdom also a citizen of the earthly kingdom in which he resides?" (2.) "Is any human or carnal war really justifiable?"

I. It has been argued, on a former occasion, that, as one may be a member of a family, and of the church at the same time, so may a person, who is a citizen of the kingdom of heaven, be also a citizen and subject of some human government, at one and the same time.

II. In reference to the second query, it may be observed, that there are several classes of wars: (1) Aggressive or offensive wars; (2) Defensive wars; (3.) Wars for conquest or supremacy; (4.) Wars for equality, liberty, rights and privileges. As some may object to this classification of wars, I would remark, that it is difficult to classify things possessing opposite qualities. For a war may be both offensive and defensive. In fact, generally, all nations claim that the wars in which they engage are defensive. And defensive wars are generally supposed to be justifiable; while offensive wars, waged for conquest or supremacy, are, at least among civilized people, considered wrong and unjustifiable. Also, wars for rights, liberty, or equality, or against tyranny and oppression, when all other means or efforts have failed, are considered justifiable, on the

principles of patriotism. But in this case, an offensive war might seem to be justifiable; while a war in defense of tyranny would be denounced by patriot as unjustifiable! In a national point of view, then, some wars seem to be justifiable; not entirely, however; a war cannot be more than about half right; for only one of the parties can be in the right! But admitting that the cause of the nation in which a Christian lives is a righteous cause, the question still presses upon us: "Is his participation in such a war consistent with his profession?" If the Church cannot declare war, or become a party in the bloody conflicts of the world, can its members, individually engage, as citizens, in mortal strife with their fellowmen, whether their belligerent fellows be Christians or not?

Now, lest my anti-war sentiments should influence me to decide hastily that all war is wrong; or that it is positively wicked and inexcusable for a Christian, under any circumstances to engage in carnal warfare, I shall place before my mind, and the minds of my readers, the following points, in the form of question, (which form is well calculated to awaken thought and encourage investigation:)

(1.) Is the employment of physical force necessary to the maintenance of law and order? If so, may Christians aid the executors of law, by the exertion of physical force?

(2.) Is the employment of corporal punishment, in the government of the family or the school, and in the discipline of the prison, justifiable, in cases where all other means fail to accomplish the correction or reformation of offenders? In short, is it ever right to coerce obedience?

(3.) Is capital punishment in harmony with the law of Christ, or of God?

(4) Is dueling consistent with Christianity?

(5.) Admitting that national difficulties, both domestic and foreign, should be settled peaceably if possible; would it be right, when one nation, or the party in the wrong, refuses to agree to any rational or proper terms of peace, to employ such means as may be necessary to compel the proper acquiescence?

The first and second questions I unhesitatingly answer in the affirmative. Perhaps were I compelled, without further study, to say yes or no to the third and fifth, I should also answer them affirmatively. Not because I think that "might makes right," or that the weak should be subordinated to the strong; but because the power ought always to be exerted in behalf of what is right, and in the suppression of evil.

It will be impossible to discuss all these five questions, here: but it will aid us somewhat in the investigation of our subject, to keep them constantly before the mind. Respecting the fourth question, however, I wish to write more particularly.

If we consider duelling wrong, wicked, and criminal, (and this I think, is the sentiment of most enlightened Christians of the present day) we may, reasoning from analogy pronounce war, (which is simply a national duel, when mutually agreed upon and deliberately entered into,) an infinitely greater wrong, and utterly incompatible with Christianity and true civilization.

But it may still be urged, that a fight, whether between individuals or nations, in which one party attacks

another, without the other party's consent, is not a duel, and that fighting in self defense, or in defense of those unable to defend themselves, is justifiable, on the ground, that "self-preservation is the law of our nature," prompting us to repel injuries, and to protect ourselves and ours. But whatever might be said of the man who would not protect himself or his family; or of the government that would not by all means protect its citizens or subjects, one thing is certain: there is nothing in the teaching of Christ and the apostles to justify the Christian in fighting with carnal weapons. At this juncture, some earnest Christian may inquire: "How can I, who profess to be guided by the instructions of Christ, my Teacher, and to do whatever I do, in his name, or by his authority, engage in a business concerning which he has given me no instructions, directions, or commandments whatever; especially when I know, from a careful study of the Christian Scriptures, that the spirit and teaching of Christ are diametrically opposite to the spirit and principle of war; and when I know, also, from history, that in the first centuries of the Christian age, the followers of the Prince of Peace refused to fight in the wars of the heathen?" To this, the Christian (?) militarist may reply, that John the Immerser told the soldiers who came to him to be immersed, to do no violence to any one, and to "be contented with their wages;" that he did not tell them to abandon their military profession; that Cornelius, the Centurion, when converted to Christianity, was not required by the Apostle to quit his profession as a soldier; and that if

soldiering is such a wicked thing, surely the Savior and the Apostles would have been particular in forbidding Christians to engage in the business.

It does appear a little singular, that more was not written on the subject of war by the ministers of the Gospel of peace.

But, then, their teaching and example were opposed to the spirit and practices of war; were calculated to destroy the war-principle; and tended to promote the principles of "peace and good will among mankind,"

Their benevolent object could, at that time, be more effectually accomplished, in that quiet, unobtrusive way, than by directly denouncing war, which was regarded as absolutely necessary to the maintenance of governmental authority. This same opinion, that military power is essential to government, which cannot maintain order and peace in the State or protect the innocent and defenseless, without the aid of the strong arm of the soldier, is still prevalent; and the strongest objection to the anti-war teaching may be presented in the form of the following question: "How can a nation protect itself from foreign invasion, or its peaceable, law-abiding citizens from the deprivations of rebellious subjects, or of bands of robbers, if denied the power of the sword, or if all Christians refuse to aid the government in punishing its enemies?"

In answer to this objection I have only this to say, at present writing: I think the secular government must reserve to itself the right to resort to arms, whenever all other reasonable efforts to accomplish its objects fail;

and the Christian, it appears to me, should concede this right; but he himself should exert his influence in favor of peace, order, and brotherly love; If he contribute to the support of the Government, by the payment of tax, and by obedience to the laws, thus giving the secular authorities no trouble on his account, there will be little or no need of his services as soldier or public officer.

I have not urged the enormous expense of war, nor the terrible evils attending and following the march of armies, as an objection to this method of settling national difficulties; for though these considerations weigh heavily against the policy of war, yet if it be necessary, we should not care for the expenses, or the temporary evil consequences, if some greater good be promoted thereby. A patriotic people will cheerfully bear all the expenses and evils for the sake of liberty, security, and the blessings of peace, order, and national prosperity. But Christians must not do evil that good may come." If they cannot engage in the profession of arms, they are bound to "obey God, rather than man."

In conclusion, let me remark, that the conscientious Christian, (and every real Christian is conscientious,) will find it a difficult matter to decide on going voluntarily to war; for he will have to satisfy himself, first, in regard to several important particulars. He should not thoughtlessly and inconsiderately rush into something about which he has doubts and misgivings.

I. He must be certain, that the cause of the nation is just; for how

could a Christian fight in an unjust war? But it will be impossible for the bulk of simple-minded Christians to decide on the justice or injustice of the great majority of national wars.

II. He should convince himself that killing is not murder, at least in the second degree. The command, "Thou shalt not kill," may not apply to war; but there is danger of violating this precept, while engaged in the profession of a soldier. The feet of the Christian must not be "swift to shed blood;" yet there is danger of forgetting this, in the excitement and confusion of battle.

Altogether it appears to me, that the disciples of Jesus find many more reasons for refusing to fight than can be urged in favor of fighting. The more he hesitates, reflects, studies, and tries to satisfy himself that it is his duty to fight with carnal weapons, the less will he be impressed with a sense of duty to do so.

W. PINKERTON.

Waynesfield, O., May 17. 1874.

Strange Things.

"Funny as it may sound, Brooks and Baxter are members of and pew-holders in the same Methodist church in Little Rock. It would be interesting to hear them relate their respective experiences in class meeting after "this cruel war is over."—*Banner*.

The same thing happens in every war and almost every day in our politico religious churches, only it is not carried to the same extent.

Brooks and Baxter have only car-

ried their politics a degree further than others of the political Christians. But every man who voted for Baxter or Brooks and truly believes he was elected is in honor bound to stand by him in the position to which he has assigned him, or there is an end of all government.

But Baxter and Brooks church relations are not more remarkable than those of our worthy sheriff, E. Whitworth and Bill Kelley whom he hanged on Friday last. Our worthy sheriff is an active and faithful member of the Baptist church, is as true a specimen of the man who shirks no duty his position imposes as we know. He felt it a disagreeable duty to execute Kelly, but as Kelly requested he should personally perform it and the law imposed it as a duty he sought no proxy in the case but did the executioner's work himself.

Kelly, whether guilty of the crime or not, had undergone the change, which the Baptist church regards as the evidence of acceptance with God. He was taught, prayed for, examined by a session of a regular Baptist church, his experience of grace pronounced sound and valid, he was baptized, rejoiced in a bright experience, met death not only fearlessly but even joyfully, buoyed up by the hope of a happy immortality. We do not endorse his conversion as Scriptural, but Baptists do. Yet he was executed by a worthy member of the Baptist church.

This may seem all right to the masses of the people, but I confess the idea of a Christian man being instrumental in taking the life of his own Christian brother at the bidding of any power is most revolting. We

do not speak of it to blame Sheriff Whitworth in the matter. He only did his duty as an officer of the government. But the habit of Christians holding office under human government, and thus being required to do things so shocking to Christian sensibilities is blameworthy.

There was a time when those the Baptists claim as their ancestors bare neither the sword of vengeance or that of the civil powers and when their members were not permitted to hold office or take part in the civil or military administration of the government. We apprehend they were fully as pure, holy and spiritual then as now.

We understand, too, there was at least one member of a church of Christ acting as volunteer guard on the occasion, with loaded musket ready to take the life of some fellow-creature in some possible contingency that might arise.

Such scenes as these are liable to occur at any time under present customs.

Brother Walling says, "Government once punished good men—now it punishes bad men." Neither of these propositions is true. It never persecuted good men simply because they were good, unless that goodness led them into opposition to the interests of the government. It does not punish men to day because they are bad. Just as bad men according to the Christian standard as live, are honored of all human governments. They still punish those who refuse submission to their bidding good or bad.

All the elements of persecution for conscience' sake and the right of the

government to control the religion of the people are as fully embodied in the fine of twenty five dollars imposed upon Bro. Ramsey for refusing to serve as a juror—as was in the most violent persecutions ever directed against Christians. The Roman government, with Nero at the head, punished Christians not because they were Christians simply, but because they refused obedience and service to the government, in its demands for civil and military service, and obedience to other laws of the empire. The persecution commenced with punishing single individuals, and extended to the masses because they as a body refused these services and encouraged their members to refuse. This is true of the regular persecutions by the government as distinguished from the uprising of the mob, inflamed by passion.

The punishments inflicted by human governments, are fines, forfeitures, imprisonment, disfranchisements, banishment, attainure and death.

These all stand as different degrees of punishment for refusing to obey the laws, when they conflict with a man's convictions of duty to his maker. That act of fining Bro. Ramsey contains all the elements of persecution. It was persecution in its mildest form inflicted by the government. Judge Hickerson was not personally blameworthy. He is a sternly upright man; we are glad to bear this testimony in his behalf. We have no doubt he is a warm personal friend of Bro. Ramsey, and an admirer of his character. His office did it. Had he been a member of the church of Christ, he would still

have been bound to inflict the fine, or go still further, and imprison him. And for what? For refusing to obey the human government in violation of his convictions of duty to God. And in this he was following the example of the whole body of Christians of the first three centuries! What a thought; a Christian brother fining, imprisoning, hanging his brother Christian, and that for obeying the law of God.

We have not intended to call in question the propriety of civil government, punishing offenders against its laws. Especially those guilty of offences so vile as that charged against Kelly. But to show the glaring absurdity to which the idea of Christians becoming the executioners of civil law leads.

We see too the law does not confine its punishment to such hideous crimes and criminals. But Bro. Ramsey, who bro. Walling says is a good man, is punished by the law for being true to his religious convictions, when those convictions harmed no man. Christian governors, judges, sheriffs, magistrates, bailiffs, jailors become the instruments of this persecution. They punish him more promptly, give him fewer safeguards for protection against the oppression of a bad man that might be in power, than they do Kelly or other of the vilest criminals.

Now human government has changed just this much. It has modified, under the influence of public sentiment, its laws against the profession of the Christian religion on condition that Christians give up its practice and serve the government in matters in which the primitive

Christians refused service. On this condition the Roman government would have tolerated it. A compromise has been effected, in which all the surrender was on the part of Christians.

The government does anything else than punish bad men because they are bad. It is just as ready to punish good men who refuse to obey its laws as bad men who violate them.

D. L.

OBITUARY.

The following obituary was written by Sister Fanning for the Historian, but too late for publication.

Died at her residence, near Galatin, Mrs. ROSA D. ALLEN, widow of Col. R. Allen. She suffered long and patiently—was ready when the Pale Messenger called to conduct her over the river, where there is no bridge. She said, "she was not afraid. Long ago, she submitted to the Savior, and looked to him as her best friend in life or death." We yield her to him with the hope that she may be among those who will hail his coming with joy and thankfulness. May her children study to be humble and devoted in life, that they may be joyful in death, and may be worthy to attain that world, where there is no more suffering, no more sorrowing hearts, but peace and rest satisfy all earth's weary ones, and the idea of future sin or sorrow is not felt or feared.

C. F.

The Sins of Youth.

Young men do not remember as they might, how the early firmness, the early resistance to temptation,

give its coloring to future life. They do not mean to pollute their souls without hope of recovery. There is a kind of lurking feeling, even if they do not confess it to themselves, that one day they shall be able to put off these pleasant vices, and address themselves to a nobler because a more self denying life. And I do not question that there have been cases where the better thoughts have at length prevailed, where the Spirit of God has taken possession of the heart, and the spirit of evil has been cast out. I do not deny that there have been instances where a life of early profligacy has been succeeded by a life of devotion to Christ where even the recollection of time wasted and talent abused, may have given a tenfold zeal and earnestness to the faith of the man who has been set free from his chains, and brought back into the liberty of Christ. But even where it has been so, if you could read the inner history of such men, if you could see them on their knees, bitterly upbraiding themselves before God for their youthful sins, if you could witness their hours of anguish, if you could hear them confessing how often and often and often the old temptations come back, with ten fold force because the tempter knows how often he has triumphed in the past, how often the very recollection of past sin is itself a fresh suggestion to sin—if you could see and hear all this, you would not dare, any of you, to make light of sin, or trifle with the grace of God. And even while we acknowledge the restoration of the prodigal to his father, we can not but tremble when we remember how often it has been otherwise—*Rev. J. S. Prewone, D. D.*

GRATITUDE TO GOD.

I SOMETIMES feel as I could blot
 All traces of mankind from earth—
 As if 'twere wrong to blast them not,
 They so degrade, so shame their birth.
 To think that earth should be so fair,
 So beautiful and bright a thing,
 That nature should come forth and wear
 Such glorious apparelling;
 That sky, sea, air, should live and glow
 With light, and love, and holiness,
 And yet men never feel or know
 How much a God can love and bless,
 How deep their debt of thankfulness.

I've seen the sun go down and light
 Like floods of gold poured on the sky—
 When every tree and flower was bright,
 And every pulse was beating high,
 And the full soul was gushing love,
 And longing for its home above—
 And then, when men would soar, if ever,
 To the high homes of thought and soul—
 When life's degrading ties should sever,
 And the free spirit spurn control—
 Then have I seen, oh, how my cheek
 Is burning with the shame I feel,
 That truth is in the words I speak,
 I've seen my fellow creatures steal
 Away to their unhallowed mirth;
 As if the revelries of earth
 Were all that they could feel or share,
 And glorious Heaven were scarcely worth
 Their passing notice, or their care.

I've said I was a worshipper
 At woman's shrine, Yet even there
 I found unworthiness of thought,
 And when I deemed, I just had caught
 The radiance of that holy light
 Which makes earth beautiful and bright—
 When eyes of fire their flashes sent,
 And rosy lips looked eloquent—
 Oh, I have turn'd and wept to find
 Beneath it all a trifling mind.

I was in one of those high halls,
 Where genius breathed in sculptured stone,
 Where shaded light in softness falls
 On pencil'd beauty. They were gone
 Whose hearts of fire and hands of skill
 Had wrought such power—but they spoke
 To me in every feature still,
 And fresh lips breath'd and dark eyes woke
 And crimson cheeks flashed glowingly
 To life and motion. I had knelt
 And wept with Mary at the tree
 Where Jesus suffered—I had felt
 The warm blood rushing to my brow
 At the stern buffet of the Jew,—
 And seen the blood of glory bow,
 And bleed for sins he never knew,
 And I had wept. I thought that all

Must feel like me—and when there came
 A stranger, bright and beautiful,
 With step of grace and eye of flame;
 And lone and look most sweetly bent
 To make her presence eloquent,
 Oh then I look'd for tears. We stood
 Before the scene of Cavalry,
 I saw the piercing spear—the blood—
 The gall—the writhe of agony—
 I saw His quivering lips in prayer,
 "Father, forgive them,"—all was there,
 I turned in bitterness of soul,
 And spoke of Jesus. I had thought
 Her feelings would refuse control:
 For woman's heart, I knew, was fraught
 With gushing sympathies. She gaz'd
 A moment on it carelessly,
 And coldly curl'd her lip, and praised
 The high priest's garment! Could it be
 That look was meant, dear Lord, for thee!

Oh, what is woman—what her smile—
 Her lip of love—her eyes of light—
 What is she, if her lips revile
 The lowly Jesus? Love may write
 His name upon her marble brow,
 And linger in her curls of jet—
 The light spring flower may scarcely bow
 Beneath her step, and yet—and yet—
 Without that meeker grace she'll be
 A lighter thing than vanity.

N. P. W.

A Connecticut deacon in the olden
 times was sorely troubled about the
 scientific assertion that the sun was
 a stationary body, and did not move
 around the earth. "For," said he,
 to his minister, "didn't Joshua com-
 mand the sun to stand still?" "Very
 well," responded the dominie, "show
 me, if you can, the passage of Scrip-
 ture where it says that Joshua ever
 commanded the sun to move again."

Words, like water, may float an
 idea into a mind, or if in too great
 abundance, may wash the idea com-
 pletely out of it.—Anon.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Laying on of hands.....	529
Baptism.....	535
Queries.....	540
Memoirs of Jesus.....	543
Strange Things.....	543
Obituary.....	548
The sins of youth.....	551
Gratitude to God.....	552

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 24

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JUNE 11, 1874.

Sketch of a Discourse delivered at Locust Grove Meeting House, in Warren Co, Ky., Lords day Morning May 10, 1874. Founded on a few verses in 9 of Heb.

“And for this cause, he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a Testament is there must of necessity be the death of the testator. For a Testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.”

The word Testament in this passage is used in the sense of *Will*, or *Covenant*. We have here the *new* Testament, and the *first* Testament spoken of. Both these cannot refer to the same institution. The one is *first*, the other is second or last. The one is *new*, the other is old. These two Covenants or Testaments spoken of in this passage are evidently the Jewish and Christian. Besides these we may also mention the patriarchal age

or dispensation, thus making three distinct dispensations or covenants revealed in the Bible. Since there are three distinct Covenants or institutions revealed in the Bible between God and men, we must be able to determine which dispensation we live under, in order that we may know what is required at our hands in order to become the children of God. For as these dispensations differ one from another, so also the laws of each are distinct from the other. And as there are different laws revealed in the Bible, we shall never know what laws or directions to submit to, unless we can tell with certainty what dispensation, and what laws we live under. Paul putting this matter under the form of a Testament or Will, makes it very plain, and easy to be understood.

Men often act upon this principle, in disposing of their earthly possessions. A man for instance who has a family of children and property to divide among them, and desirous of dividing his property himself while he lives, sits down and writes a will exactly adapted to his family at the time. And if he never makes another

er, this of course becomes his last will and testament. But it may turn out that some change may take place in his family; one may die, or forfeit his inheritance, so as to make another will necessary on the part of the father. So he writes another will just suited to his family at this time. And now, whatever items of the first will are retained in the second, are now of force, not because they were in the first, but because they are in the second. And such items as were in the first, and not in the second, are now no more the will of this man, than if they had never been written at all. And if this second will becomes the last will and testament of that man, not one of his children can obtain a dollar of his possessions according to the first will. They will have to take his property according to this last will or not at all. For whenever a will passes into the hands of executors, it changes no more. But it may occur that after a man writes out a second will, that such changes will take place in his family, as will make it necessary to write out a third will. This being done, supercedes the first and second ones. And such parts both of the first and second as are retained in the third, are now of force, simply because they are a part and parcel of this last will and Testament, and not because they were in the first or second or both, but because these items have actually been placed in the third. And if this man dies when he has written out his third and last will and it passes into the hands of the executors, no one of his children can come and obtain his property according to the first or second will. They are then compell-

ed to come to the third. No matter how much they might prefer the first or second, they cannot get a dollar through them. The executors are bound to adhere rigidly to the very letter of the third and last will, and if they do not, they are wholly unworthy the trust placed in them.

Now this is but a fair illustration of what God has done toward his creatures, the human race. In the early ages of man's history, God established what we usually denominate the Patriarchal institution. This was all sufficient for the family of God on earth at the time it was given, and this remained in force some twenty-five hundred years. But by this time, the people of the world had so far wandered from God and his divine arrangements, as to make it necessary to make another will, testament or Covenant, which he did in the days of Moses, with the Jewish people. This second will or Covenant differed in many important particulars from the first. In the first, each man could offer his own sacrifice direct to God, and, thereby obtain the favor of God. But in the second or Mosaical covenant, only one tribe, that of Levy dared to approach God's holy altar, and even of that tribe, only one family, that of Aaron had any right to minister about holy things. No one else dared to approach the altar with blood. Those under the Jewish covenant that would sacrifice to the Lord their God, had to bring the offering to the proper place, and slay it, and let the priest take the blood and offer it before the Lord, and thereby make an atonement for him. He dared not offer the blood himself.

Again, in the Patriarchal dispensation, there was no special place designated, at which their sacrifices and offerings had to be made. Wherever the old Patriarchs were in their journeyings, they could erect their altars, and make their offerings, and God would accept them as well in one place as another. But when the Tabernacle was erected by Moses in the wilderness, God made it necessary for the Jews to bring all their offering, to that tabernacle, where he promised to accept and bless them. But he told them plainly that if they erected altars elsewhere, and offered up sacrifices thereon, he would cut them off from among their people. No Jew could now go and serve God as Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had done, no matter how much he might prefer that order of things. Such an attempt would have brought utter ruin, as was sometimes the case. They were compelled to worship God according to the law of Moses, whether they preferred it or not. All who know anything of the Bible know that these things are true. Other differences in these two institutions might be mentioned, but these are sufficient for our present purpose. The first or Patriarchal dispensation lasted from Adam to Mose, some twenty-five hundred years. The second, or Jewish dispensation or covenant lasted from Moses to the death of the Savior, about fifteen hundred years; making in both, four thousand years of the world's history.

We now come to what is called by Paul in the passage at the head of this article, "The New Testament." This is the last covenant ever made between God and men. It is there-

fore the one under which we live. This being true, makes it necessary that we should know just when this covenant was fully established in the earth, and when its laws for the first time went forth. For if we cannot tell when this New Covenant was established, and when its laws were first given to the world, we never can tell what the Lord requires at our hands in order to be saved. And unfortunately for the people of this world, most denominations of modern times, fail to make the proper distinctions between dispensations and laws, and try to make it appear that all people, in all ages, are saved in precisely the same way, who are saved at all. To get rid of this conglomerate confusion, we will be a little particular to ascertain just when the church or kingdom of God was established, and what are its laws of initiation or pardon. For it occurs to me that nothing is more absurd than to talk about sinners being saved the same way now, that they were in the Jewish and Patriarchal dispensations. It is claimed by some that the kingdom of Christ was set up in the days of Abraham. But Jeremiah tells us more than a thousand years after Abraham's time, that God was going to "make a new Covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah." That this new Covenant would not be according to the former one, &c. This former one to which he here refers, is the Jewish Covenant. But according to the claim of most of the denominations, the Mosaic and Abrahamic Covenants are both about the same thing, or at least that the Patriarchal dispensations is included in the Jewish. Otherwise,

they could not claim that all, in all ages, are saved the same way. Hence when God by Jeremiah says, that he will make a new Covenant, long after the Patriarchal has ceased, and the Jewish had been established and in operation for seven or eight hundred years, he means something entirely different from anything that then existed, or ever had existed on earth, or he could not have called it *new*, and said that it differed from former ones. And as the Old Testament closes with prophetic declarations regarding this coming kingdom and the Savior, and his forerunner, John, we have to come to the New Testament to find the development of the New Institution. This, we will now briefly do.

The first declarations we read in the New Testament in regard to the kingdom of God, represent it in the future. In Matthew 3rd, we read, "And in those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The phrase, "is at hand," is from the Greek verb *eggidzo*, which means to approach, to draw near. In this passage, the perfect tense in Greek is used, which might be rendered, *has approached, or has come near*. But it by no means signifies something already present or accomplished. This same Greek verb is used forty-two times in the Greek Testament, and in every instance signifies approach, draw near, &c., but not actually present.

In Mat. 21. 1, it is said of Jesus and his disciples, "When they *drew nigh* unto Jerusalem," Again in 24 verse same chapter, "When the time of the fruit drew near." In Acts 9. 3, it is

said of Paul, "As he journeyed, he *came near* Damascus," &c. Now when we say the time of fruit "*drew near*" we do not mean that the fruit was really ripe, but nearly so. When Paul *came near* Damascus, he was not really in it, but near by, and when he asked Jesus what he should do, he told him *to go into* the city, and it should be told him what he must do. All these expressions, *drew nigh, drew near, and came near*, are from the same word as the phrase "is at hand," in 3 of Mat. So when John uttered this sentence, he meant that the time was near by when the kingdom was to be established on earth. This style of proclamation was continued by Christ himself. He is represented as saying "the kingdom of God is at hand." When he sent out the twelve under their first commission he said to them, when ye go into a house or city and they will not receive you, shake the dust from your feet as a testimony against them, and say, "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." Luke 10, 11. The phrase *is come nigh* is from the same verb that is rendered *is at hand*. So long as this style is used, it is certain the kingdom was not at that time established. This style was used up to the death of Christ. Hence the kingdom was not established up to that time. In Matt. 16: Jesus said, on this rock I will build my church," &c. When he says I *will* build, he does not mean that he *has already built* his church. And this language was used after John's mission was ended, and he beheaded, and after the apostles had been at work for some time under their first commission, in

which he told them to testify to the people. the kingdom of God is *come nigh* unto you. So it is certain that his church or kingdom had not then been established. But some one will be ready to say, that in Matt. 11, 12. Jesus says, "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force," and then ask how could the kingdom suffer violence if it did not exist at that time? To this it may be replied, the kingdom was present in its preparatory state. John was sent to prepare a people for the Lord. Those who embraced the preaching of John were in a state of preparation for the kingdom. And so in this sense the kingdom was present, and suffered violence. But it was not fully developed, nor its laws given when Jesus said I will build it. He then spoke of its establishment in its fulness. With this construction the two passages agree, and show the kingdom still in the future. But these passages cannot be made to agree if the passage in 11 Matt. means that the kingdom was then complete. But when Jesus was crucified, Joseph was waiting for the kingdom, as we read in Luke 23 51. So if the kingdom was then established, Joseph did not know it, good a man as he was, but was still waiting for it. In the first chapter of Acts, the disciples asked the Savior, saying, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, it is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you,

and you shall be witnesses unto me both Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part, of the earth." So if the kingdom was established when Jesus ascended to heaven, his own disciples that had been with him all the while, and had heard all his instructions, and who were to be his ambassadors to the whole world, did not know it. They still ask that it may be established. It would certainly have been very strange, if the kingdom had already been established, and the apostles members of it, and that still they did not know it. We cannot believe it. But the answer of Jesus to them shows clearly that it was not then set up. He tells them "it is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." So the time had not come for them to know when the kingdom would be set up. But he tells them they shall receive power when the Holy Spirit was come upon them. The Spirit did not come till the day of Pentecost; hence the apostles themselves did not understand when the kingdom of Christ was to be established till that day. But when the Spirit came upon them on the day of Pentecost; that Spirit that was to guide them into all truth, they then understood the matter, and at once began the proclamation of that gospel that was to go into all the world, and to every creature. The same gospel then preached, is the gospel to be preached now. There has been no change in this respect. So if the kingdom of heaven, the Church of God was not set up then, it has not been set up yet. There was a kind of preaching done that

day that never was done before. So we date the full establishment of the kingdom of Christ on the day of Pentecost, in the city of Jerusalem. So in the closing part of the Second of Acts, we find the church spoken of as actually present, and the Lord daily adding the saved to it. From this time forward, the church or kingdom of God is spoken of as a present reality. In 8 of Acts the Church is spoken of as present, and suffering persecution. And so all the rest of the way through the New Testament, the church or kingdom is spoken of as actually present.

As the new Institution is spoken of under the figure of a *will*, we will now notice the items of that will, and the execution of the same by the apostles. Jesus had now provided a plan of salvation for the world, and in his commission to the apostles, he expresses the conditions upon which the people of the world may obtain an inheritance in these glorious blessings. In other words, he expresses the law of pardon, through which men may be pardoned and enter into the kingdom of God. The items in the will are, first, preach the gospel to every creature. Mark xvi. Secondly, faith comes in; "he that believeth," that is, believeth the gospel. Thirdly, repentance was to be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Fourthly, baptism is required of all who would be saved. These, including the confession of the name of Christ, (see example of the Eunuch), constitute the conditions or law of pardon. And the apostles executed this will to the very letter. On the day of Pentecost Peter first preached the Gospel, as

the will required; preached the death, burial, resurrection and ascension of Jesus to heaven. This according to Paul in 15th of 1 Cor., constitutes the gospel. Secondly, the people believed as the will required. We know they believed, by their crying out, and asking what to do. Their hearts are now humbled, and turned to God. Hence, thirdly, Peter by the Holy Spirit says, "repent." This shows that repentance comes just after faith. So the *will*, and the execution exactly agree. Fourthly, Peter also said, "and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ." Perfect agreement still in the will, and the execution. And in the fifth place, in the will, Jesus promised salvation to those who would believe and be baptized; that is, pardon, remission of sins. So also in the execution, when Peter commanded them to repent and be baptized, he also added fifthly, "for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." So that on this occasion the law of pardon under the New Covenant was fully presented, and three thousand that very day were baptized, and thus entered into the kingdom of God. From this time forward, so far as the Bible records, not a single human being was saved in any other way. The apostles went everywhere and preached the word. The people on their part heard, believed, repented, were baptized, and thus saved. But we know that to this system of things, to this law of pardon, many objections are urged, and many knotty questions are asked: such as "Do you deny that such men as Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and

such like men were saved? If they were saved at all, it was without baptism, for not one of them was ever baptized. And if they could be saved without baptism, why cannot we?" These questions are easily answered, when we observe the distinction between dispensations and laws. Baptism is peculiar to the New dispensation. It did not belong to either of the old ones. And as baptism did not belong to either the Patriarchal or Jewish dispensation, no man in those dispensations was commanded to be baptized. And as they were not commanded to be baptized, they did not dare to establish it upon peril of rejection from God. It is as dangerous to do too much, as too little. But every Patriarch who lived and died in the service of God, will live in heaven, and that too, without baptism. So also we may say of the Jews. All who lived and died in the service of God according to the law, from the time that law was established to the coming of John the Baptist, will be saved in heaven without any baptism; for it was unknown to them. But the difference between the Patriarchs and Jews, and the people who live under the new dispensation is, that these Patriarchs and Jews were not commanded to be baptized, while those who live since the New Covenant was established, are so commanded. The former disobeyed no command in not being baptized; but the latter do disobey a most positive command if they refuse to be baptized. We conclude moreover, that if the people in those ancient times had been commanded to be baptized, and had refused it, they would have been rejected from

God. Nadab and Abihu were commanded not to offer strange fire before the Lord. They did it and died. Had they been commanded to be baptized and refused, they would have fared no better. Moses and Aaron were commanded to speak to the rock. They smote it, and both died outside of the land of Canaan. In view of these things, who can say that it would have been any better with them, had they been commanded to be baptized, and had refused? God has always required obedience to his divine commands, no matter what they were. We are now, under the New institution, commanded to be baptized. If we reject it, it really amounts to a rejection of God. And if we reject him, he will reject us. So we find that the first people who rejected baptism, rejected God. The first baptism God ever required on this earth, was that which John the Baptist preached. Those who submitted to that, obeyed and honored God. Those who refused his baptism disobeyed and rejected God. This much the following passage fully demonstrates: "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." Luke vii: 29, 30.

So the very first ones that rejected baptism when it was established, rejected God's holy counsel against themselves. So if the Jews and Patriarchs had been commanded to be baptized and had refused, they would themselves have been destroyed. We may also learn from this that if we refuse the baptism commanded by

Jesus of Nazareth, we may expect less favor if possible, than those who refused John's baptism. No man can refuse baptism and not refuse a positive command of God. So then in the New institution baptism is one positive item in the law of pardon to the alien sinner. But in the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, baptism formed no part at all. In the New, the *Last will*, baptism was put in; while all the animal sacrifices and ceremonial cleansings of the old dispensations are left out of the last will. And now, no matter how much better any one may like the offering of sin offerings as of old, he cannot go back now and offer them, and thereby obtain pardon. The last will is ours. By this we are to be saved, if saved at all. And this last will and Testament requires baptism. Whoever therefore rejects baptism, rejects the last will and testament of God to man. And any one may just as easily go back and be saved by the law of Moses, as he can reject baptism, and still be saved by the New institution. And in either case, he would be saved independently of the will of God, as revealed in the New Testament. For if we reject one part of God's divine plan, we may just as well reject all.

But here comes another knotty question. "What will you do with the thief on the cross? he was saved without baptism, after baptism was established. And if he could be thus saved, why may not others also?"

In answer to this we state that, in the first place, no one knows whether the thief was baptized or not. When any man says he was not, it is a mere assumption on his part. No one

knows but that he had been baptized before he was arrested and placed on the cross. So the very foundation of this case lies in doubt and assumption. But suppose he never was, and that we grant that he was saved without it, can that case constitute an example for us? By no means. For Paul says, "a testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Jesus was still living, though on the cross, and if he saw proper to save him, he had the power to do so. But no one can now take his place and be saved like he was, granting that he was saved. Jesus has died now, and his last will has passed into the hands of his executors, his apostles, and all who would be saved must comply with this will, as presented by the apostles. After Jesus ascended to heaven, no human being was ever saved through a direct appeal to God, as is claimed that the thief was. Not one such case stands on record. But it may be asked, "did not Cornelius pray direct to God, and was not his prayer heard and answered, and was he not saved like the thief, without baptism?"

Certainly not. When he prayed, an angel was sent to him; but this angel did not save him, nor tell him what he should do to be saved. He only told him to send for Peter, telling him where to find him, stating that when Peter should come, he would "tell him words whereby he and all his house should be saved." Then Cornelius had to wait four days, for the coming of Peter, knowing no more all this time how to be saved than he did before the angel came to him. But Peter was one of the

executors of the Savior's will, to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given: that whatsoever he should bind or loose on earth, should be bound or loosed in heaven. He was the right man in the right place, with the proper authority. The door of faith is now to be opened to the Gentiles, and Peter is the very man to do it, for he has the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

He preached the very same gospel to Cornelius and his house, that he preached on the day of Pentecost, in Jerusalem. And Cornelius, good a man as he was, now had to be baptized, like the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, before he could have the promise of being saved. So when the Holy Spirit came miraculously upon them, demonstrating that God would accept the Gentiles as well as the Jews, "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." So in telling words whereby Cornelius and his house should be saved, he told him to be baptized, and he was baptized. So that Cornelius was in no sense saved like the people claim the thief was. And if we now claim that after the death of Jesus people are still to be saved like it is claimed the thief was, then we are forced to the conclusion that it is easier for a thief to be saved, than an honest man: for Cornelius had to be baptized after he prayed, before he had the promise of pardon. But the very thought of such a thing is ridiculous. But there is also the case of Saul of Tarsus. He prayed directly to Jesus, in person. But was he pardoned direct? Nay verily. He had to go into the city, and there remain three days, till Ananias came,

and told him what to do. And what did he tell him? He said to him, "and now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." The only thing that remained for him to do then, was to be baptized; hence this is all that was told him. So here is another clear case of a man praying directly to the Lord, but received no pardon, or promise of any, till he was baptized. Nor can there be a single case produced after the death of Christ, where any man or woman was pardoned through prayer, without baptism. So then we conclude that all who live under this New institution, can claim no promise of pardon till they submit to this much contested institution of baptism, which is as positive a command as belongs to the Bible. We now think the matter stands clear, as to why it is now necessary for those who would be the servants of the Lord to be baptized, whereas those of former dispensations did not. If the preachers everywhere would thus give the distinctions between different dispensations, and the laws pertaining to each, and thus enable the people to see which dispensation they live under now, and what the laws of this dispensation are, as contrasted with the laws of other dispensations, all could readily and easily understand what to do in order to be saved.

But so long as there is a general mixing and jumbling up of different dispensations and laws, there will continue to be difficulties and confusion, and differences and misunderstandings on the whole subject of life and salvation through Jesus

Christ. Thus distinguishing between different dispensations and laws, and looking alone to the New Testament and its laws, we have no difficulty on the infant question. No infant, or irresponsible being was ever commanded to be baptized. Jesus said of such, "suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Such as they now are, not such as they may become when sprinkled, but they are now in an innocent relationship in the presence of God, having done no wrong, guilty of no sin. They have no sins to be pardoned, and as baptism is connected with the remission of sins, it cannot apply to infants. None are commanded to be baptized except such as can be taught the Gospel, and are capable of believing it, and repenting of their sins. Infants cannot do any of these things, and are therefore not subjects of baptism. They can all be saved without it. So with idiots and all irresponsible beings. Baptism therefore belongs to those who have come to years of knowledge, who can understand the gospel, and can obey its divine requisitions. To these, there is no promise of pardon, if they refuse to be baptized. Baptism is a part of our obedience to the Gospel of Christ, and Paul says if we do not obey that, we "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." 2 Thes. 1. 9. This is the sermon that was to be replied to and set aside on the fifth Lords day of May.

The effort was made, as was announced. We will give some account of this effort very soon.

E. G. S.

(From the Christian Union.)

John Leland's Ordination.

[Our readers have all heard of Elder John Leland, the eccentric Baptist preacher, who sent the "big cheese" to Jefferson, and did a great many other startling things. The *Baptist Weekly* gives this account of his ordination.]

It is reported that Leland was at first ordained a minister by the choice of the church, without the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery. He continued for some years afterwards to preach and to baptize on the authority of his simple appointment, much to the disturbance of the peace of the association to which he belonged. In fact, on account of his departure from the usages of the churches in Virginia, he was not for a while in good fellowship with any. Whether right or wrong, he openly professed to believe that the imposition of hands by the Apostles, in ancient times, was only to confer miraculous gifts, and that, consequently, such a ceremony in the church now was in itself worthless, because wholly unauthorized. His brethren urged him most earnestly for the sake of peace to submit to ordination by the hands of the ministry; and finally, to gratify them, he consented that they might call a Presbytery for that purpose. Knowing all the questions which they would ask on his examination, and resolved in his own mind on the answers he would give, he felt confident that they would not ordain him.

The Council, consisting of three staunch Calvinists, was called. The day appointed for the ordination arrived, and with it came a multitude

of people to witness the ceremony. The work was divided amongst the several Presbyters. One was to ask the usual questions concerning his faith and call; another was to offer up an ordination prayer; and another was to deliver the charge to the pastor and the church. Leland took his seat long before they appeared, and resting his arms on his knees and burying his face in his hands, awaited their movements. The Presbyter appointed to conduct the examination at length began:

"Brother Leland, it becomes my duty, according to previous arrangement, to ask you a few questions upon the subject of your faith, and in reference to your call to the ministry."

"Well, brother," said Leland, slowly raising his head, "I will tell you all I know," and down went his head into his hands again.

Moderator. "Brother Leland, do you not believe that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world?"

Leland (looking up). "I know not, brother, what God was doing before he began to make this world."

Moderator. "Brother Leland, do you not believe that God had a people from before the foundation of the world?"

Leland. "If he had, brother, they were not our kind of folks. Our people were made out of dust, you know, and before the foundation of the world there was no dust to make them out of."

"You believe, brother Leland, that all men are totally depraved?"

Leland. "No, brother; if they were, they could not wax worse and

worse, as some of them do. The devil was no worse than totally depraved."

"Well, there are other questions that will embrace all these in substance. I will ask whether you do not believe that sinners are justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them?"

Leland. "Yes, brother, provided they will do right themselves; but I know of no righteousness that will justify a man that won't do right himself."

"Brother Leland, I will ask you one more question. Do you believe that all the saints will persevere through grace to glory, and get home to heaven at last?"

Leland. "I can tell you more about that, my brother, when I get there myself. Some seem to make a very bad start of it here."

The Presbyter, seeing that the audience was greatly amused, proposed to his colleagues that they should retire for a few moments and consult together. After returning, they remarked to the congregation that brother Leland had not answered the questions as satisfactorily as they could wish, but they all knew that he had many eccentricities for which they should make every allowance; that they had concluded accordingly to ask him a few questions touching his call to the ministry.

Moderator. "Brother Leland, you believe that God has called you to preach the Gospel?"

Leland. "I never heard him, brother."

"We do not suppose, brother Leland, that you ever heard an audible voice, but you know what we mean."

Leland. "But wouldn't it be a queer call, brother, if there were no voice and nothing said?"

Moderator (evidently confused). "Well, well, brother Leland, you believe, at least, that it is your duty to preach the Gospel to every creature?"

Leland. "Ah! no, my brother, I do not believe it to be my duty to preach to the Dutch, for instance, for I can't do it. When the Lord sent the apostles to preach to every nation, he taught them to talk to all sorts of people; but he has never taught me to talk Dutch yet."

"But, brother Leland, you feel a great desire for the salvation of sinners, do you not?"

Leland. "Sometimes I think I do, and then again I don't care if the devil gets the whole of them."

Upon this the Council retired again, and reported as before, much to the surprise of Leland, who was constrained to submit to ordination. After they had ordained him in due form, he said:

"Well, brethren, when Peter put his hands on people, and took them off, they had more sense than they had before: but you have all had your hands on my head, and, before God, I am as big a fool now as I was before you put them on."

To Brethren Pessimus and Poe.

Dear Brethren: You must allow an informal reply to your articles, as I have not time to make out a separate and lengthy reply to each; nor do I think the matter involved of sufficient importance to occupy much space in the Advocate. I am enjoying my Saturday's furlough with wife

and little ones, and have just seen your articles in the 15th and 20th Nos. of Advocate—am at work 36 miles from home just now.

Bro. Pessimus, you ask why I like the word baptize. My reason followed in the next clause: all baptism is immersion but all immersion is not baptism. To make my meaning clearer—there can be no baptism without immersion; there may be immersion without baptism. If one, of two radically synonymous words, more certainly and fully conveys the idea intended, that word should be preferred when that idea is to be expressed. Baptize and immerse are both derived from foreign words, the one from the Greek *baptizo*, the other from the Latin *immergo*. Any objection urged against baptize on this account will hold against immerse; and there is just as much certainty with regard to the meaning of the original *baptizo* as there is with respect to *immergo*. The latter is not in controversy because it is not a religious term; make it such, and it will undergo the same torturings that the other has. Its tongue will be split by inquisitorial hands, and, with triple speech it will mutter, sprinkle, pour, dip. *Immergo* embodied the same thought with a Roman that *baptizo* did with a Greek. If we are to use a word cast in foreign mould, let me use that coming from the very word the Savior spake in giving the command. The Savior said, "He that believeth and *baptistheis*, (is baptized) shall be saved. If the first expresses a definite action so does its derivative; it does not, my brother, "admit of controversy."

Baptize is a religious term, and

there always accompanies the thought of action expressed by it another thought respecting the nature of the action. Hence I say all immersion is not baptism in its appropriated or limited sense. The one is a vehicle of religious, the other of secular thought.

Now, Bro. Poe, I have only a few lines for you. I was simply indulging in a bit of irony. I am one of those "old foggy Christians," who is "jealous of his Master's honor; who thinks that what little good he can do should be done in the name of Christ, and to the honor and glory of the Father. Here I stand and have stood since I began to raise my voice in defense of the Truth. I have frequently said, that the Church of Christ is the grandest temperance organization on earth; that it embodies everything good and noble within the realm of human or divine thought; that there is not a good work on earth not contemplated in its provisions; that I can belong to no society but the Royal Priesthood.

For the compliment passed in saying that you supposed me to be committed soul and body to the Gospel of Christ, accept my warmest thanks. May you never have cause to think differently. I trust I am also committed soul and body to the temperance, patience, godliness, etc. of the Gospel. I am for temperance in the full and true sense of the term; and at another time shall have something to say further on this subject. I hope to see you at Waco, in July, and to shake hands over this little "chasm." Till then, adieu.

I hope Bro. Pessimus will drop his *nom de plume*; it is the worst

sort of perplexity not to be able to look a man's name in the face.

Brethren, farewell.

A. CLARK.

Fort Worth, Texas, May 23, 1874.

THE NAME.

"And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory, and thou shalt be called by a new name." Isaiah 62. "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen, for the Lord God shall slay thee and call his servants by another name." Isaiah 65 15. Never was there a prophetic declaration fulfilled more exact than was the above, when it is said "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." When the prophet used the above language, he evidently had under consideration the time when our blessed Redeemer was to make his advent into the world, and suffer, bleed, and die, breaking down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, when salvation was to be extended to the Gentiles.

By reading the 10th chapter of Acts, we find that according to the statement given here, that the Gentiles did (according to the Prophets' predictions,) see his righteousness, and in a very short time thereafter the name was given, and we hear them spoken of some other times afterwards in the New Testament by the name Christian,—but none such as are common now. We therefore believe that the name was given by the mouth of the Lord, just like the teaching was done, by the apostles. Now we believe that so long

as so great a difference exists as does in reference to our understanding of the Scriptures, we had better lay down our abstracts of principles, our confessions of Faith, our disciplines, and turn our attentions to the Bible, and study it in order that we may rightly divide the word of truth, and pray God for instruction in the same. For we fear that many, if not all of us have lost sight of or never understood many passages of the divine word.

There is no use for us to try to get together with all our different opinions and names. For it is impossible to prevail on a Baptist to be a Methodist; for says he, I cannot live under the discipline that they have, for it contains some things that I don't believe to be in accordance with the Scriptures, and they will accept as baptism, pouring or sprinkling. Ask the Methodist why he is not a Baptist, he will tell you he does not believe their abstract articles of faith tally exactly with the Scriptures, and they hold that immersion is the only baptism, and we think they are too strict on that. Ask the man that claims the name Christian and publicly denounces every other why he cannot be a Baptist or a Methodist, he will say that he does not so very well understand the laws they live under, that if they did not differ from the Bible (as they claim) that the Bible would do just as well, and all their laws would be alike, and all be like the Bible and that being the case the Bible would do, and we would have no need of those laws. And further. The great apostle to the Gentiles says, (all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profita-

ble for doctrine &c. &c., that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. 2 Tim. 3, 16-17, and therefore we need no legislation of man on this subject.

B. F. AUSTIN.

Scotts Hill Tenn.

The Fort Worth Debate. No. 5.

Price is the only man known to me that has affirmed in debate his teaching on the Spirit question, that the Holy Spirit operates independent of means in conversion. I believe, too, that Thompson did this in the late debate between him and Bro. Franklin.

I predict, P. will never do so again.

Mr. P.'s opening speech of one hour was a labored effort to prove that the Spirit operated on the sinners heart in conversion, and then did not like it because, Bro. C. endorsed nine tenths of his speech. Bro. C. informed him that he was not there to deny the operation of the Spirit, but to deny Mr. P.'s method of the Spirit's operation. It is remarkably strange that those who believe in abstract spiritual influence, think they have abundantly proved the doctrine where they have presented Scriptures attesting that the Spirit operates in conversion.

Price's speeches were all fixed up before he came to the debate, and those on this proposition were fixed up for the negave, so he did not work well in the lead and was continually trying to get Bro. Caskey to affirm something, Bro. C. informed him that he happened to have nothing to affirm but was denying just now.

P. said that the Samaritans were not converted till the Apostles came down and prayed for them; then the Spirit came and quickened them into new life. I am not mad, but speak truly and soberly. I know that I am hazarding my reputation for truthfulness when I put down that a sane man uttered such a thing, but I know whereof I affirm. What a stupendous humbug Philip was! baptized unconverted—unbelieving men and women. Poor Philip! I have long feared for your orthodoxy; you ought not to have left out the babies, would then have been sound in the faith.

I can't keep this question out of my mind: Do such men believe the Bible?

His last struggle for an argument was over the inherent depravity doctrine; that babies, idiots, heathen and such must be lost unless quickened into new life by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit. Bro. C. reminded him that, when on the baby propositions, he claimed baptism for them, on the ground of their purity; now they are morally corrupt, and can't be saved without a quickening by the Spirit. Bro. C. asked him to give one case of a heathen conversion without the Gospel, and he would surrender. Of course he did not attempt it.

Here is the last straw that the drowning Price caught; Mr. C. and his brethren don't pray for the Holy Spirit; therefore they don't believe in it—therefore my affirmation is proved,—I suppose is the logic of it.

The debate closed with apparent good feeling.

A. C.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: On Lord's day, May 17, Bro. T. W. Brents commenced a series of discourses at the Christian church in this place, continuing every night until the last Lord's-day night in May. Bro. Lipscomb preached one night, (and he preached a powerful sermon, too). Bro. Brents is truly an able and earnest defender of the faith—one that our brethren may well be proud of and need not fear to trust the cause in his hands at any and all times. I think that we have never had a series of sermons delivered in this place, setting forth the plan of salvation—more earnest, plain and practical in their character, than those of Bro. Brents. He makes every point so plain that even the "wayfarer need not err." I would earnestly recommend that the brethren everywhere make an effort to circulate his book, the "Gospel plan of Salvation" for I think without saying a word derogatory to the many able works of our brethren, there is not one that so fully meets the whole ground of controversy, and that so completely sets forth in plain terms the Gospel plan of salvation as does this book of Bro. B.'s, and to all young preachers it will be invaluable as a help. The brethren here were delighted with Bro. Brents' sermons—and feel sure that we have been greatly benefitted by them, we had the pleasure of adding to the church seven of our friends, who believed, repented, confessed the name of Jesus and were "baptized into Christ,—we thank the Lord for so much good that has been accomplished in the name of Jesus.

Several were added to the congregation who had formerly belonged to other congregations. We hope some time in the future to have Bro. B. with us again. I am truly,

Your Bro., in the one hope,
E. B. CAYCE.

Franklin June 5, 1874.

Dear Advocate: After the close of the present session I am going to Prince Edward's Island to preach the Gospel of our common Savior. They write me that they have seven churches on the Island, and only one preacher; though they meet on the Lord's day and sing, pray, read the word of God, exhort, and partake of the Lord's supper. They are not like many of our churches in the U. S.—meet only when the pastor comes, if that be only once a month.

Bro. B. B. Tyler says they are never too busy to read the word of God and to pray in their families. I ask the prayers of all the brethren, especially of those who know me. Pray that I may be humble, faithful, studious of God's word, an example to the believers in Christ,—that I may ever remember that though I plant and water in the Lord's vineyard, that it is God who gives the sunshine, and rain, and increase,—that though I work faithfully in the Redeemer's kingdom, that it is not I but the grace of God that works in me. Brethren, let us be true to God and to his church—reading his word daily—praying in the secret closet often—keeping up the family social prayer—attending the weekly prayer-meetings—and the Sunday-school and Lord's day meetings every holy Lord's day. God help us all to be

faithful is my prayer for Christ's sake.

G. W. WILLIAMS.

Bros. L. & S.: Our church here is in a good condition. Nearly all the members seem to be alive to the work that is before them. We are greatly in need of a preacher. Can't one of you come some time?

Your Bro. in Christ,

ED. M. CARNEY.

Mooreville, Ala., May 25, 1874.

We would be glad to aid these brethren, but other arrangements forbid at present.

Dear Brethren: On my arrival here I found a body of kind and sociable brethren and sisters, numbering about 60. I commenced preaching for them. We break the loaf weekly, have meeting Wednesday night, and as fine vocal music as we can expect to find in any community,—we think this a healthy location, and perhaps shall settle here.

Your Bro. in Christ,

N. DAVIS, M. D.

Salado, Bell Co. Tex May 26th 1874.

QUERIES.

Brethren L. & S: We have been investigating the 8th of Romans, and we find two minds spoken of, Carnal and spiritual, can both of these minds spoken of exist in a man at the same time. Please explain and oblige.

Your Brother,

JAMES A. PEARCY.

Paul said they both existed in him. When he would do good evil was present with him. The Spirit was

willing but the flesh was weak with the apostles in the garden of Gethsemane. We all feel a strong impulse of the flesh frequently present to make us to do wrong when we desire to do right. This impulse of the flesh is no doubt the carnal mind, the anxiety to do right, the Spiritual. They are in continual conflict in man's body. The character is dependent upon which triumphs and gains the mastery and so rules the life. We and others have so often recently said all we know on the 26th verse it is not needed we notice it further now.

Brethren L. & S.: You will please answer the following questions through the Advocate, at your earliest convenience.

1st. If a Brother should do any thing wrong knowing, and acknowledging before he does the deed, that it is contrary to the teaching of the word of the Lord, and does so regardless of the admonition of God, and his brethren, is it not a wilful sin? and will he receive pardon for his sin?

2. Should we stand or kneel in giving thanks at the Lord's table, all other people, so far as I know kneel in giving thanks. But what say you? Let me hear from you soon, and you will oblige.

Yours in hope of Heaven,

H. L. RODGERS.

Guntown Miss. May 25 1874.

It is exceedingly difficult to determine in practice what is the wilful sin for which there is no pardon. Men frequently get under influences that

so control them in their weakness that they do things which they would acknowledge as wrong—yet lack power to resist. We do not think it necessarily a wilful sin. If so I presume all are guilty of wilful sins. Peter doubtless knew it was wrong to deny the Savior. It is true he did not think he would do it till the time came. The Savior forewarned, yet he did despite the warning. David doubtless knew it was wrong to kill Uriah that he might take his wife. But his lust for the woman drowned for a time the sense of wrong he was guilty of doing. Yet he found forgiveness. His anguish and sorrow for the deed, called forth from him the strongest expressions of penitence the world has ever heard. But God accepted of his repentance.

It is an exceedingly dangerous thing to sin, knowing we sin, but whenever a man can repent of a sin, so free himself from it as to turn away from it with sorrow and disgust, we are altogether unwilling to place ourself between him and his maker and say he cannot repent, he has sinned a sin unto death. He cannot come to God. It is a responsibility entirely too fearful for us to assume. God must determine this.

D. L. •

The Repentance and Death of Judas.

Bros. L. & S.: I would be pleased to see an answer from you through the Advocate to the following:

It is said in Matthew xxvii: 3, that Judas repented. This seems to have been a thorough repentance from the fact that he returned the

money that he received of the Jews for betraying the Savior,—verse 4, he confessed his sin; verse 5, it is said he hanged himself.

1st. Now, according to the teaching of the New Testament, was his repentance acceptable to God?

2d. It is said in the 5th verse that Judas hanged himself. In the I: 18th of Acts it is said, “now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity: and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.” Do we understand Matthew and Luke to teach the same? there is some difference in the way they tell of the death of Judas. One says hanged, the other, falling and bursting. I have pretty well satisfied myself, but for the benefit of others I make this request.

Yours in Christ,

H. J. SPRY.

Lynnville, Tenn., March 2, 1874.

We think it clear that Judas' case is similar to Esau's. He had committed a deed that placed him beyond the power of forgiveness. Esau found no room for repentance though he sought it carefully with tears. He found no place for changing the mind of his father. Judas was said to have fallen from his position or apostleship, that, “he might go to his own place.” Acts 1-25. Had Heaven been his place, it would not have been needful for him to fall from his apostleship to go to it. He had deep remorse under the lashings of conscience a conviction that he had committed an unpardonable sin that made life a burden too heavy to bear, but true repentance never leads to

the desperation of self destruction. Had his repentance been acceptable to God, his place would have been with God. We do not think his remorse bore the characteristics of genuine repentance. He had passed beyond the point where true repentance was possible. We think there is no discrepancy between the statements of Matthew and Luke. We always understood that he hanged himself and falling from his hanging position, he burst asunder and his bowels gushed out.

Judas gave the money to the chief priests or laid it at their feet. We do not think, he, in person purchased the field. The money was the price of his betrayal of the Lord. He threw it at the feet of the priests. They took it and bought the field to bury strangers in. As he earned and furnished the money with which the field was bought, he is said to have bought it. Such expressions in similar circumstances are in common usage. The divine Father always uses a style common to man.

D. L.

The Third Heaven.

Brethren L. & S.: When Paul said, “I knew a man in Christ,” 2 Cor. xii: 2, was he speaking of himself, or some one else? Please answer through the Advocate and oblige many friends. Give a plain explanation, what is meant by the term third heaven, or paradise? also in the body and out of the body. Instruction is what we want and need.

Yours in Christ,

T. McDONNELL.

Anna, Ills., Mar. 31, 1874.

We are afraid our brother asks

instruction on a subject that will be difficult to give, and we think possible if given, but of little practical benefit.

The Jews divided the Heavens into three parts. 1st. The air or atmosphere where the clouds gather. 2nd. The firmament, in which the sun, moon and stars are fixed. 3rd. The upper Heaven, the abode of God and his angels." It was with reference to this division doubtless Paul spoke and simply means that he was caught up to the abode of God and his holy angels. We think he spoke of himself. He was not certain whether in the vision he was caught up in his fleshly body or whether the spirit was separated from the body and in this separated condition entered or saw Heaven. Paradise here refers to the same place as the third Heaven. It was evidently a vision of Paul.

D. L.

In a business note Bro. Banton of Texas says, "The cause is prospering in this place. We are about commencing the construction of a house of worship, which, when built will give us additional opportunities for doing good. I am preaching every Sunday, and as soon as court adjourns will commence holding meetings at such places as desire my services. I am under promise to begin at Palestine the 3rd Lord's day in June."

There is no genius in life like the genius of energy and activity. You will learn that all the traditions so current among young men that certain great characters have wrought their greatness by an inspiration, as

it were, grow out of a great mistake. And you will further find, when you come to measure yourself with men, that there are no rivals so formidable as those earnest, determined minds which reckon the value of every hour and which achieve eminence by persistent application.

STRIKING GOD'S CHILDREN.

Many years ago, when Joshua Morse was preaching the gospel in a private house in Stonington, Connecticut, without permission of law, as enacted by the 'standing order,' he was beset, knocked down and dragged out of the house. Afterwards he was fined and sentenced to be publicly whipped for preaching contrary to law. It is related that when he was brought to the place to be scourged, he said to the officer, "I suppose you must do your duty; but remember that when you strike me, you strike one of God's children." The officer was touched, burst into tears released him, and paying the fine himself, sent the good man home.

How many wrongs are done, which would not be, if men would remember that they are dealing with "God's children." Wronged, robbed, cheated, smitten and abused, their unresisting patience makes them the easy prey of unreasonable and wicked men; but in all their humiliation the Lord still loves, pities them and will at last "avenge his own elect that cry day and night unto him."

Striking God's children is serious business; how serious will never be known until the Judgment day, when the King shall say to them on his left hand, "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto Me."—Selected.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

Sunday-Schools.

"We have a union Sunday-School here" is quite a common story I hear. I have made some inquiry about these joint-stock concerns, and the information received leads me to conclude that in a great number of instances, it means nothing more or less than that some Sectarian is the Superintendent, and others of the same stripe are the prominent teachers. I am perfectly satisfied that the sects would not bear the Bible pure to be pressed in the school and were our brethren doing their duty, the end of the union would soon come. I had the unpleasant opportunity of seeing one of these harmonious schools. A pompous, and seemingly opinionated old Methodist gentleman was the Alpha and the Omega of its existence, growth and support so far as outside show was concerned. He prayed twice, and if one of our brethren said a word I did not hear it. What do you think of our school? was asked. I asked in return, what do you think of turning over your children, and those of your neighbors, to a man that does not believe the New Testament, to be taught by him? "Oh, but the Methodists believe the Bible." Do they believe that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven? Notwithstanding it is in the Bible and the discipline too, they deny it. Do they be-

lieve the like figure whereunto baptism doth now also save us? Do they believe Jesus sanctifies and cleanses his church with the washing of water by the word? I tell you if they believe it you do not. What do you think of having for a teacher of your children a man who holds to and with persistency advocates what you understand to be erroneous? would you send for a doctor, who, you know gives medicine, which does no good, is a source of great injury and leaves lasting bad effects upon your child? even admitting that he does administer some good remedies would you take the bad to get some good? You would not do it. Ah, then you, are more particular with the body than with the Spirit. God gives us children as a rich boon, and of all his good and perfect gifts, these should be most precious and tender in our sight. These will be what we make them and 'tis a reproach that fathers heap upon themselves, seemingly unwittingly when they complain that their children are not what they should be or what they would have them. Fathers are told to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. They should see then that these tenderlings learn of the Lord around the hearthstone in the mother's lap and on the fathers knees. A failure to do this is open, manifest neglect of the great duties of life. Sunday-School education should never take the place of home tuition. Unfortunately 'tis often the case however that parents, too indolent or indifferent, try to satisfy conscience by shipping their children off to be taught, and in their zeal to shun or shift their own duty they

are willing that they shall be taught by sectarians or by men of the world. Again there is a feeling of security, quite apparent among the brethren. They seem to think the battle has been fought, the victory won, and on their arms, at their ease, crowned with the laurels of success and off guard, they can lie not suspecting danger. Now the devil and Sectarianism wants nothing better than to tie the tongues of our brethren and if it can be done by pride or the desire for the worlds estimation 'tis all the better. Those who are thus easily entrapped and allured of such a winning bait are silly birds indeed, not wise like serpents. I have visited several churches lately, where I was hunched off to one side and informed that "we (that means sore backs and Sectarians) are on good terms, here and be particular what you say." I venture an assertion that wherever this is the case, that Sectarianism and error are winning the ground and truth is losing or on the stand still which is about the same thing. Flaunt error to the breeze, encourage it by your silence, and let truth trail in the dust! who that loves it will do it? "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" did some one say? Being God's freemen become not slaves to the flesh and humanisms. Watch did our Savior say? Be sober, be vigilant because your adversary, the devil as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour, whom resist steadfast in the faith. Whenever a church sheathes the sword, and cries out peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh. The enemies of Greece once offered to make peace with them if they would deliver up all their orators. Demosthenes related a fable to the point. "The wolves offered to make a treaty with the shepherds, promising to trouble the flocks no more if all the dogs were killed. Gladly did the silly minds accept the terms, but no sooner were these guardians of the flock out of the fold out of the way, than an undisturbed havoc was made of the sheep. Sectarians are willing for peace if you surrender your mouths and children. Are you willing to do it? I tell you, gentlemen may cry peace, peace, but if you talk the Bible pure there is no peace with creed makers and men lovers. How often do you find the children of well taught brethren going to Rome, Westminster Abbey, Philadelphia, New Hampshire for instruction, instead of Jerusalem. Ask what is the matter. See if the cause cannot be traced to the failure of the parent to teach the Bible and impress upon them the love of it. Paul marked out the boundaries between Judaism and Christianity, so that all generations to come might see the one standing far above the other. For all that Sectarianism is nothing more than a mixture of humanism, Judaism and Christianity. Why should not the division line between Christianity and Sectarianism be trimmed out now, the corner line, and the fore and aft trees be noted well? I have noticed some of the brethren would not call upon an unbaptized nothing to pray, and yet do ask the unbaptized sects to do so. Wherefore? Oh, but we love them and do not wish to wound their feelings."? which is best to give the sick you love sedatives all the while or unpleasant curatives? Did we not

wake up the world to a knowledge of their condition in ignorance far more rapidly while we kept truth fearlessly right before them than we have in the days of bowing, scraping and sentimental smiling? Then away with anodynes, let us have remedies. Sunday-Schools are very popular and are growing more common. They offer a fine field for the church to teach the young and the old the truth. Teach them then with all your might, but do not give your consent or influence to have abused by the promulgation of error. But an apologist says let them teach and we will get the chance of showing them the truth. Can you risk so much to gain so little? Can you take the chances of doing evil that good may come? If you want opportunity for telling the truth and thus leading men in the right way, hunt it, seek it, and in a legitimate way, and you will win many, yes many more than you will make use of. Do not pay so dearly for them when they present themselves so often and in so many ways. Teachers, if they discharge their duty, however obnoxious their teachings at first, win a place in the hearts of the taught, and thus make way to carry their repulsive tenets. Catholics can do this, then who may not. Giving Secularians the prominence is only inviting them to come occupy the tenets of the hearts of the young. Do you not see? Are you willing to do this? If you are not your children's guardian, who is? You look after their health and if they have property, you look after it with an eagle's eye. Will you jeopardize that which is of far more value than all

those other possessions,—the pearl of great price? You do it when you suffer them to be taught by men teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

“And if I go and prepare for you I will come again and receive you unto myself.” I will give thee such a home bringing as never bride shall have had before. The sapphire highway, glowing with the flush of the evening of time, shall be sprinkled with perfumed dews, and illuminated by incense-burning lamps, and the angel sentinels shining all along the line, will kindle with a rapture till then unknown, at the signal notes from the silver trumpets of our seraph harbinger; and, stooping to the polished pavement, to catch the first smooth, golden rolling of the wheels of our crystal chariot, will rise with a shout at the sound, and pass the tidings to the gates and walls of the responding City, and to the throne and heart of our smiling Father, that the morning star of heaven and the rose of the earth are hastening, in blended bloom and brightness, to perfect the court of infinite love, and proclaim to the universe the opening of the festival of everlasting joy.—*Ihos. H. Stockton.*

Pay Your Small Debts.

There are two causes which enter into and increase the severity of a financial panic. One is, that men will require payment where it cannot be made, the other is, that they will neglect to pay where they can. The one applies to large debts, the other small ones.

In times when money is felt to be such a valuable commodity, and everybody seeks it, an immense amount leaves the channels of trade and goes into men's pockets. Everybody clings to it, and pays it out grudgingly. There is hence a temptation to neglect small debts, and to hoard what business is dying for the want of. When each one neglects a small debt the aggregate becomes enormous.

Forbearance in pressing the payment of large demands is necessary, and ought to be shown, but it alone cannot give complete relief. The small streams, each of which seems insignificant, make up the mighty river; and the small sums which so many people owe, and which they can pay if they try, would, if paid promptly, put an amount of money in circulation that would be of incalculable benefit to the country. Pay, then, your small debts, even if it requires an effort to do so. Pay them at once, and owe no man anything but love. Do not be too anxious for the future; do right and trust in God. Instead of croaking about hard times, and putting off those whom you owe, pay down to the bottom dollar, and trust Providence for more. The only way to pump up what is in the bottom of the well, is to empty out what is in the top of the pump. And there is no pocket so ready for money as one that has been emptied in the payment of just demands. Remember that the obligation to make times easier rests upon every man in proportion to his ability, and that every one will share in a nearly proportionate degree, in the blessings of that prosperity he helps to bring about.—*Selected.*

TO THE LITTLE FOLKS. No. 10.

"Uncle Joe, what is the meaning of emphatic?"

Emphatic means forcible; strong. I know a little boy who is frequently very emphatic. When he is rather out of humor you cannot speak even kindly to him without provoking his emphasis. He says, "Shut your mouth," "I will knock you down," "I'll split your head open."

I know a matron who is a very emphatic woman. She says to her son, "If you don't make haste and go right straight and bring that wood in, I'll come there and stick this fork into you clear up to the handle." To her daughter she says, "You trifling hussy, if you don't make haste and set that table, I'll come there and I'll stamp on your toes till I mash them every one off." The emphasis with a vengeance.

I know a Pedobaptist preacher who sometimes makes himself very emphatic. When speaking of immersion he says, "Dipped in a puddle hole," "*Slunged* into a mud hole."

"Uncle Joe, I think he makes himself emphatically ridiculous."

I think every sensible person would agree with you. He not only makes himself ridiculous, but he wickedly ridicules the teaching and practice of the Savior and his apostles.

Some men make their language emphatic by using profane oaths. Some boys, desiring to imitate what they think is smart in men, are guilty of the same wicked practice. But instead of this appearing smart, it is emphatically disgusting.

I have seen some preachers who

emphasized their discourses by pounding on the pulpit with their fists, bruising their Bibles over the stand, and jarring the nerves of their hearers, by bawling at the top of their lungs. I knew one in debate once, who seemed to think he was drawing strong arguments from the stand by pounding upon it with his fist.

I have known some preachers to be emphatic in preaching long discourses to convince people that sprinkling is baptism; denouncing immersion as indecent, and unfit to be practiced by any who has any respect for decency. Yet they would go into the water and immerse some persons whom they had failed to convince, or persuade to be sprinkled. And I have noticed some of these same preachers who seemed to be in an emphatically bad humor, because they had to go into the water to immerse their subjects.

I knew one of these cat-footed preachers to station himself on a log in the water, and require the subjects to come down into the water to the log, when he, from his perch, would immerse them. In immersing one who had come to the side of the log, the preacher's foot slipped, and he fell head foremost into the water, and was most emphatically ducked. He looked most emphatically silly as he waded ashore—a good deal of starch being washed out of his clothes, if not out of his extreme fastidiousness.

Now, my little folks, I have made myself emphatically extravagant in the use of the word emphatic, in the foregoing illustrations and incidents. Emphatic language is words, phra-

ses or sentences, presented in a forcible style; frequently indicated by printing the emphatic words in italics, small capitals or capital letters; or by signifying such letters in writing by underscoring the words with one, two or three lines. I have known some writers to give the printer a good deal of trouble by being extravagant in underscoring their words. They were emphatic underscorers.

UNCLE JOE.

Prayer is the wealth of poverty, the refuge of affliction; the strength of weakness; the light of darkness. It is the cratory that gives power to the pulpit; it is the hand that strikes down Satan, and breaks the fetters of sin; it turns the scales of fate more than the edge of the sword, the craft of statesmen, or the weight of scepters; it has arrested the wing of time, turned aside the very scythe of death, and discharged heaven's frowning and darkest cloud in a shower of blessings.—*Guthrie.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Sketch of a Discourse.....	553
John Lelands Ordination.....	562
To Brethren Pessimus and Foe.....	564
The Name.....	565
The Fort Worth Debate.....	566
Church News.....	567
Queries.....	568
The Repentance and death of Judas....	569
The Third Heaven.....	570
Striking God's children.....	571
Fireside.	
Sunday-Schools.....	572
Pay your Small Debts.....	574
To the Little Folks.....	575

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 25.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JUNE 18, 1874.

Discussion at Locust Grove Ky.

In last week's number we gave the leading points of the sermon which so stirred up the pure mind of Mr. Lewis in behalf of his Methodism, as to prompt him to announce that he would have it replied to on the fifth Lord's day of May. On which occasion we promised to be present, and make a response to the reply, by permission, which was granted. Before entering upon the points of the discussion, it may be interesting to make a few general remarks. In the first place, the Methodists have held an almost undisputed sway over the neighborhood around Locust Grove, for the past forty years. They have had all that length of time in which to plant their system of religion in the hearts, lives, and affections of those people. And if they have confidence, either in their system of religion or in the firmness of the people in that community, we cannot see why they should have been so hasty and eager to rally their forces for war. The precipitation with which Mr. Lewis acted on this occasion, seems to me to give evidence

of a conscious weakness in his system, and that he feared to risk it to stand the test without a little more bolstering. And so he went and secured the services of one Timothy Frogge, a noted debater, a regular warrior from his youth: a man who had previously had near half a dozen regular debates with our brethren, for the occasion, to undo what we had done in one discourse. True we had preached more than once there, but only that one discourse was to be answered.

When Mr. Frogge arrived on the appointed morning, although he had come there purposely to reply to my discourse, as reported to him by Mr. Lewis, he said he thought we ought to settle upon some definite proposition for the occasion. We replied we thought that was settled already. That his brother had proposed to have my discourse replied to, stating that he could reproduce it, and we supposed of course he had the points from Bro. Lewis, and we thought that was proposition enough. So he consented to go into the work as it had been announced. Those who have read our discourse in last num-

ber can see whether he had anything definite before him or not. Mr. Frogge is a man of about medium height, rather corpulent, and heavy set. Apparently a man of fine constitution, and good health. A man of good intellect, but we are not prepared to say much as regards his education.

He is a pleasant talker, rather slow of speech, but generally distinct in his utterance. In debate he is rather loose and indefinite, wandering, often and far from the main point in discussion, and keeping his opponents from the main points, by quibbles and side issues. He indulges in sneers, and cuts at his opponent, that border very much upon the slang style. While his speeches with his actions sound well to an audience, we think they would make rather a poor appearance in print, if taken down as he delivers them. Yet in the estimation of his people, and of the people in general, he would be put down as a good debater.

There was an immense concourse of people present to hear the discussion, which began at ten o'clock and continued four hours, two in the forenoon, and two in the afternoon, in half hour speeches each. We cannot possibly give the speeches as they were delivered, nor can we give more than a mere sketch of the main points made in the discussion. But what we do give, we will try to give correctly.

Mr. Frogge led off by alluding to our discourse in reference to the three dispensations as revealed in the Bible, and the different requirements and laws of pardon, belonging to these dispensations respectively.

His first affirmation was, that there has been no change in dispensations, that God has never had but one law of pardon, from Eden on down to the present time. That all men in all ages, who have approached God and obtained pardon, have obtained it in precisely the same way. And when he had made this assertion, he brought scarcely a passage of Scripture to attempt to prove in any direct way that there has been no change of dispensations and laws, from Eden on down. He attempted to make his points in an indirect way by endeavoring to show that pardon in every age depended on faith, as the immediate condition. He spent some time in defining faith, claiming there are different degrees of Faith, quoting some of the sayings of our Savior about *little* faith, and *great* faith. That the first degree of faith, is a faith of assent, and that faith of assent precedes repentance. That the second degree of faith, which is a faith of *trust*, follows after repentance, that this faith of trust is the one that purifies and saves the soul, or brings pardon to man. And as a proof that there is first a little faith, a faith of assent that leads to repentance, and then a faith of trust that saves, he quoted Romans 1, 17. "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." This "from faith to faith," he referred to the development of faith of assent to the faith of trust, which saves the soul. This we considered rather a new exposition of that passage, and the reader can have it for what it is worth. He then read from Rom. 4, 3, & 23-4 con-

cerning the faith of Abraham. The third verse reads thus; "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." The other two run thus: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead."

From these passages Mr. Frogge argued that faith was the condition of acceptance with God in Abraham's case, and that the same principle is true now, and has been in all ages, and will be, to the close of time, that man can approach God now through faith as the condition of pardon. It was claimed positively by Mr. Frogge that baptism is no part of the law of pardon to the sinner, and never had been. That baptism would make a man's salvation depend on a third party. But that through *faith*, a man can approach God direct, for himself, and through that channel, obtain pardon, when no one else is near; stating that he was converted on dry ground, ten miles from the river, and more than a hundred feet above high water mark, and that therefore baptism had nothing whatever to do in bringing him to God. Next he quoted from Acts 15, 9. "And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith."

This passage was intended to prove that all the world, both Jews and Gentiles, are saved in precisely the same way, and that that way is by faith only, and that baptism has nothing to do with it, dwelling with emphasis upon the expression, "pu-

rifying their hearts by faith." At this juncture he read one passage to prove that the religion of Jesus does not constitute a new institution, but a rebuilding and remodeling of the old one. "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David, that is fallen and close up the breaches thereof; and I will build it as in days of old; that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this." Amos. 9, 11, 12. By this passage he sought to prove that when Christ came into the world, it was not to establish a new institution, but simply to rebuild an old one. This was almost the only passage he brought to sustain his assertion of no change in dispensations. The case of Cornelius was then brought up, to show that he obtained pardon before baptism. He regarded the fact that he received the Holy Spirit before baptism, as evidence that he received pardon also before baptism, and quoted Acts 10, 43, to prove that pardon came through faith, before baptism. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." He read a passage or two from A. Campbell, calling him my father, rather sneeringly, and also read a passage or two from the Christian System, but to very little effect. Next he read Paul's commission, by which he was sent to turn the people from darkness to light, that they might receive remission of sins, and then brought in connection with that, the declaration of Paul in 1 of 1 Cor. that the Lord did not send him to baptize but to

preach the gospel, and endeavored to argue from this that Paul did the whole work of turning people from darkness to light, and bringing them into the remission of sins, without baptism; quoting also from Gal. 4, 6. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father," to establish the same point of pardon before, and independent of baptism. He called upon me to say whether I believe that the water of baptism washes away sins, and read a passage from the Christian System to prove that Brother Campbell believed that water washes away sins.

Mr. Frogge argued that the baptism spoken of in sixth of Rom. is not water baptism at all, but baptism by the Spirit. Said he, it cannot be water baptism, for Paul says, "we are buried with him;" *are buried*, present tense, and if this means water baptism, then the Roman brethren and Paul were still buried in the water when he wrote his letter to them. Also quoting from 1 Cor. 12, 13, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." And he endeavored to do away with water baptism entirely, so far as this passage is concerned. While we do not say that these are all the arguments that Mr. Frogge attempted to make, we do say they are all the main and leading ones. There was a very great amount of repetition in his speeches, and many of the above arguments were repeated two or three times over so that we are satisfied that if his speeches had been taken down verbatim, the reader would get very few points not given in this brief sketch. One or two of his speeches were nearly

half made up with anecdotes, that did not even make good *filling*, with which to kill time. I hardly think the man was satisfied with his own work that day, for he appointed to preach two Lord's days at that place on baptism, proposing to have basket dinners and two discourses each day. So if it should turn out that Methodism is true, we have done some good in that community, after all, for we have caused a considerable amount of it to be preached there that would not have been otherwise. But we are very much inclined to think that some, at least, will be enabled to see the errors of Methodism, and will embrace instead thereof, the pure word of God.

But we will now give a brief of our reply to Mr. Frogge's arguments:

In reply to his assertion that there has been no change of dispensation, and that there has never been but one law of pardon, it was argued that if, after the time of Abraham and Moses, we could find anything said about a new kingdom or covenant, it would be proof positive of a change of dispensations, and consequently a change in the laws of pardon. To this effect, a passage in Dan. 2, 44 was read. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." This prophecy was uttered many hundred years after the days of Moses, and referred to a kingdom yet to be set up; a kingdom

still in the future when the prophecy was made. That it was to be something that had not existed up to that time. It was claimed as an almost universally admitted fact, that the kings, in the days of which God was to set up a kingdom, were understood to be the Roman kings. And that true to the prediction, Christ came into the world in the time of these Roman kings, and set up his kingdom in the earth, so that the assumption that there had never been any change in dispensations, was contrary to the word of God. Jeremiah 31, 31-32, was also read, as follows. "Behold the days come saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judea; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt;" &c. In this passage again, long after the days of Abraham and Moses, God declares that he will make a *new* covenant, that was not to be according to the Covenant through Moses. And it was to be *new*, and to *differ from* the other: this beyond all dispute, shows a change in dispensations. And a change in dispensations would necessitate a change in the laws of pardon. It was shown that in the Patriarchal age, each man could offer his own sacrifice, and make his own offering to God, and it was accepted. But that when the law of Moses was established, all sacrifices had to be offered through the priest. That none but the family of Aaron, in the tribe of Levi, could approach God's altar, and offer blood. That the law of pardon then was, that the one who

had sinned, must bring a certain kind of animal before the door of the Tabernacle and slay it, and the priest was then to take the blood and offer it before the Lord, and thus make an atonement for him, and said God, "it shall be forgiven him." But that since the death of Jesus, no one could obtain pardon that way. That therefore there has been a change in the law of pardon, and that Mr. Frogge was mistaken when he said there had been but one law of pardon from Eden down. It was also shown that while Jesus was engaged in his personal ministry, he said; "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Here the Savior says I *will* build my church, not *have built*, and that unless Mr. Frogge can prove that *will*, means *have*, he can never get rid of the idea of a New Covenant or institution. A number of passages were also quoted from Heb. and Gallatians on this subject, such as "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8, 6-7.

In this passage there are two covenants distinctly spoken of, the *first* one, and the *second* one; and the second one is *better* than the first. This shows clearly that there has been a change in covenants or dispensations. "And for this cause, he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament they

which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix : 15. Here again the distinction between Covenants is so clear as to leave no doubt, that more than one has existed. Quite a number of passages of the same import were presented, to show that the first covenant was done away, and a new one established, none of which were directly replied to at all by Mr. Frogge. We will not attempt to give all of them here. A few more must suffice.

"Then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Heb. x : 9-10.

Paul in 12 of Hebrews, when contrasting the law of Moses and the gospel of Christ, says: "And to Jesus, the mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." 24th verse. Here we have a *new* covenant, and blood that is superior to that of Abel.

"But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii : 23-26. This passage shows as clearly as can be, the doing away of one institution, and the establishing of a different one. To his assertion that baptism is no part of the law of pardon, and that it never had been,

we replied by showing from the commission, and from the preaching of the apostles, that in the new Institution—the church of God, baptism is a part of the law of pardon. Jesus said; "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This puts pardon beyond baptism, and shows that people are required to be baptized before they can reach the promise of pardon. To the believing Jews on the day of Pentecost, Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

This passage, beyond all doubt, places baptism as one item in the law of pardon, as certainly as repentance. To Saul of Tarsus Ananias said, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." No possible construction can take baptism from between Saul and the remission of his sins, when it was commanded him, and hence it was an item in the law of pardon to him. It was freely admitted that in the Patriarchal and Jewish ages, baptism was no part of the law of pardon, for it was not then established. God required no one of them to be baptized. Therefore all in those ages who lived up to the laws under which they lived, will live in heaven without baptism. But it was shown that so soon as baptism was established in the days of John, the very first ones who rejected it, "rejected the counsel of God against themselves," and it will even be more so with us, if we refuse the baptism commanded by Jesus Christ. And further, even my brother Frogge believes so strongly in

baptism, that he baptizes the little babies, for fear they can't get along without it. And according to the prayer in his discipline for the baptism of infants, they think it is for the remission of sins, even to the babies. To these passages, Mr. Frogge made no attempt at any direct reply, but attempted to offset them by passages that he thought taught differently; thus leaving the word of God to contradict itself. In reply to his passages from fourth of Romans, regarding the faith of Abraham, and his justification, a passage from 2nd of James was read, as an explanation: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Jas. ii: 21-24. This passage explains the whole matter, referring to the very circumstance mentioned in Rom. iv: 23, and showing that his faith was imputed to him by anticipation, and that the matter was not complete in his case till he had offered Isaac his son. That thus by works was his faith made perfect, and not till then. And moreover this passage shows that no one is justified by faith, without a full obedience to all that God has commanded. By works, that is, *obedience*, a man is justified, and *not* by faith only. Under the new institution baptism is commanded, and therefore no promise of par-

don till obedience is rendered to this command. In reply to his objection to baptism because it required the presence of a third party, it was shown that faith itself, about which he had much to say, stood in the same catalogue. That in the divine commission, Jesus said, go preach the gospel to every creature; he that *believeth*, that is, believeth the gospel when preached, and is baptized, shall be saved. The preaching had to be done first, and it was the thing preached, the gospel, that had to be believed. And this gospel could not be preached without a preacher. Hence the whole world was dependent upon the preachers, the apostles, for faith. Paul in tenth of Romans says, "so then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." The word has to be heard before there can be any faith. No hearing without a preacher; therefore faith as certainly depends upon a third party, as baptism, and he cannot get rid of it. We also told Mr. Frogge that when he claimed conversion by the direct work of the Holy Spirit, that even the Spirit becomes a third party between him and God. To this he replied by saying that the Holy Spirit is God himself, and therefore no third party. In reply to which we read Acts ii: 32-33, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." This passage shows that Jesus received the Spirit from God, and sent it upon the apostles, and that therefore the Spirit is

not God, but was received from him. We showed that in the case of Cornelius, several instrumentalities had to be used, and that finally, after four days, the preacher came and preached, and that then, and not till then, he had faith. None of these things were replied to, except by assertion. In reply to the passage in the fifteenth of Acts, where it says, "purifying their hearts by faith," we read a passage from Peter. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a true heart fervently. Being born again, * * by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." This passage shows that in order to the purification of the soul or heart, the truth, which is the word of God, must be obeyed. That when the gospel is preached, the sinner must believe it, must repent as commanded, and must be baptized as commanded, and then the promise of pardon. That this was just what these people did, to whom Peter was writing, as we find by reading the second of Acts. The people that there obeyed Peter's preaching, were afterwards scattered abroad by persecution, and Peter writes this letter to these dispersed ones, and this shows us exactly what was done, when it is said their souls were purified in obeying the truth. And the Gentiles were saved in the same way the Jews were, as Peter shows in the passage under consideration. Hence their hearts were not purified by faith only. Regarding the passage concerning the rebuilding of the tabernacle of David, that can easily be understood as re-

ferring to David's lineage or posterity. For a long time the throne of David was literally broken down, and no son of his sat upon his throne in Jerusalem. But when Christ came, he was of David's family or posterity according to the flesh; and in that sense, he did again build the tabernacle of David that was broken down. But in another sense, he built a new kingdom, a new covenant, established upon better promises. So with this view the Scriptures harmonize perfectly together. But with the other, they contradict each other. In reply to his claim that Cornelius was pardoned before baptism, we showed from Acts x: 43, the very passages he used, that remission of sins comes through the name of Christ. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Jesus himself says in 10th of John, "I am the door, by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." We therefore have to be in Christ, to gain the promise of pardon. This being true, we must settle the question as to how we get into Christ. This question Paul settles in 6th of Romans, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death." This passage shows that we are baptized into Christ. Paul in 3rd of Gal. teaches the same thing. Having entered into Christ then, as Paul says in first of Col. and Eph., "in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Cornelius was commanded to be baptized, and by baptism he entered into Christ, where

he obtained pardon through his name, so that Cornelius was pardoned like others, by believing, repenting and being baptized. It was shown also that his reception of the Holy Spirit was miraculous, like that on the day of Pentecost, and no such thing has ever occurred since. That Cornelius and his house were enabled to speak with tongues, and magnify God. And Mr. Frogge was asked if he received the Spirit in this miraculous way when he was converted ten miles from the river, and more than a hundred feet above high water mark. But he failed to inform us. We also showed that Peter was to tell Cornelius words whereby he and his house were to be saved, Acts xi: 14, and that if he was to be told *words* whereby he should be saved, then he was not saved by the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit. So that his salvation was precisely like that of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. Peter told them in words what to do; they did it, and were saved in the same way in both instances. And that the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit was to witness, both to Jews and Gentiles, that the Gentiles were called as well as the Jews, by the gospel of Christ. To his claim that Paul was not sent to baptize, it was shown that Paul himself gave the reason why he did not baptize, which was, "Lest any should say I had baptized in mine own name," verse 15, 1 of 1 Cor. The disciples at Corinth were divided among themselves, some for Paul, some for Apollos, some for Cephas, and some for Christ. He asks if they were baptized into the name of Paul? If they had been baptized into the name of Paul, then

they might claim to be his followers. But the force of the argument is, they were baptized into the name of Christ, and they must follow him as their leader and Savior. So that this whole passage is an argument in favor of the importance of baptism, instead of against it. Besides, it was shown from the eighteenth of Acts, that all these Corinthians, as well as others who received the gospel, were baptized. 'And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house, and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized.' So Mr. Frogge gets no comfort from this passage, when rightly applied, but the whole thing is against him. The passage he quoted from Gal. 4, 6, only proves that those who obey the gospel receive the Spirit, "Because ye are sons," (not to make them sons.) "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." In reply to his question if we believe the water washes away sins, we of course answered *no*. And as to the passage which he read from the Christian System, which, with a sneer, he called our confession of faith, to try to prove that Mr. Campbell taught that water washes away sins, we showed that he only read a part of the passage, and thereby did Mr. Campbell injustice. We then read some more of the passage where Mr. Campbell stated in regard to water washing away sins, that it is a "figurative expression." Thus showing that Bro. Campbell never believed nor taught that water literally washes away sins. As to our confession of faith, it was stated the word of God, and it only, is our guide

in all matters of faith and practice in the religion of Jesus.

Now, to the argument of Mr. Frogge, that the baptism spoken of in 6 of Rom. is not water baptism, but baptism by the Spirit, we will briefly reply.

In the first place, Paul teaches that there is a burial and a resurrection in this baptism, whatever it is. Every one knows that a resurrection means an entire raising up, and separation from the element in which the burial took place. When Jesus was buried in the tomb, he was raised out of it, and entirely separated from it forever.

So if this be Spiritual baptism in the sixth of Rom. then the people were buried in the Spirit, raised out of the Spirit, and thus forever separated from it. This argument proves just a little too much, by separating those baptized forever from the Spirit of God. But when we apply it to water baptism, all is right. They are buried in the water, then raised out of it, and have no more to do with the water.

And in the next place, we told Mr. Frogge, that if he had ever examined the original of that passage, he certainly knew that the Greek verb translated *are buried*, is in past tense which might be rendered in English *were buried*. In his next speech he denied its being in the past tense, and called on me for the proof. We opened the Greek Testament in our reply, and proposed to show him by the form of the verb, that it was in a past tense. He declined to look at it, stating he had one present among his books, but still denied its being in a past tense. We then held up the

book, and asked if there was a Methodist gentleman present who understood Greek. None could be found; and we then called upon one of our own brethren present who understood Greek, to look at it and state whether it was in past tense or not. To this, Mr. Frogge objected, saying that Bro. Bogers, (for he was the man we called upon,) was an interested party, and he should not decide it. All this too, after we had proposed to let a Methodist scholar settle it. We were willing to let a Methodist; or any other Greek scholar settle it, for we well knew that no Greek scholar would stullify himself so much as to say that verb is not in post tense. But when it came to one of my brethren making a statement on it, he said *no, he is an interested party*.

This to me, was a strange proceeding. How Mr. Frogge can reconcile this course with a sincere desire for truth, we cannot see. But so it was, and so the matter ended for that day. We still affirm that this Greek verb is past tense, Aorist, and we are still willing to leave it to scholars that may be selected by him and myself. We know we were correct in this matter, and have nothing to risk. McKnight translates, "have been buried." But we would prefer, "were buried," and this would leave no obscurity in the passage, and no room for cavelling. To his many anecdotes we made no reply, feeling assured that the good sense of that people would readily perceive that there was no argument in them, and that they were not very well timed, in the pulpit, on the Lord's day. Mr. Frogge's effort was mainly in raising side issues. all

the time, and keeping off from the main question in debate, which was that there are three dispensations revealed in the Bible, and that each dispensation has laws peculiar to itself; that we live under the third and last dispensation, which has a law of pardon differing from all that preceded it. This we held up before the people all the time, presenting passage after passage, showing it to be correct, and would not be kept away from the main issue. And so we are willing to leave it to the people who heard the sermon, and Mr. Frogge's reply, and to those who read, whether he set that sermon aside or not.

E. G. S.

From the Southern Christian Weekly.

West Tennessee Jo-operation Meeting.

We submit an outline of the proceedings of the Convention held at Jackson, Tennessee, commencing Friday, May 1st, and continuing until Thursday, May 7th. We feel constrained to say it was by far the best meeting of the kind ever held in the State. The investigations were thorough and satisfactory; the conclusions reached as near unanimous as I ever knew. There was no discord or wrangling, but entire harmony prevailed throughout. For the authority of the Bible there was a profound reverence exhibited; when it spoke all were silent; when it was silent a cautious liberty and sound discretion were used. All seemed watchful that no matter of expedience contravene the divine law either in letter or spirit. The Bible

and good, common sense ruled the meeting. "Louisville" and "Nashville Plans" were terms scarcely mentioned. Business was dispatched with rapidity, satisfaction and unanimity. Our space will not permit a detailed account of each day's proceedings. We must, therefore, be content with a succinct account of the whole.

E. R. Osborn, of Union City, was elected Chairman, and W. R. Hamby, of Jackson, Tenn., Secretary; the latter, however, served only one day, being called away by urgent business, and W. E. Hall was chosen to fill the vacancy. More than forty delegates were present. Among them were the following preachers, viz: B. W. Lauderdale, John N. Moss and George Reynolds, Colliersville, Tenn.; E. R. Osborn, Union City; David Walk, Memphis; James S. Aden and Richard Dunlap, Paris; J. P. Prince, Purdy; J. R. Biggs, Trenton; J. R. Farrow, — Moser, Alamo; A. R. Kendrick, Corinth, Miss., R. B. Trimble, Mayfield, Ky.; Elihu Scott, Clarksburg, Tenn.; B. F. Manire, Winona, Miss.; W. E. Hall, Jackson, Tenn.; Daniel Wadkins (colored) Nashville; Chas. Owen (colored), Huntingdon. Friday and Saturday were devoted to hearing reports from delegates on the condition of their respective churches. The following churches were heard from, viz: The church at Bellville, Alamo and Mason's Grove, Crockett county; brethren at Savannah, Hardin county; Paris and Blood River, Henry county; Union City, Palestine and Wilsonville, Obion county; Tresavant, Huntingdon and Roan's Creek,

Carroll county; Lemalsemac and Miller's Chapel, Dyer county; Murfreesboro', Rutherford county; Christian Chapel, Henderson county; Christian Chapel, Tipton county; Cloverport, Hardeman county; Memphis and Collierville, Shelby county; Mt. Carmel, Benton county; Henderson Station and Jackson, Madison; and quite a number of other churches were heard from who sent no delegates.

We republic the above from the *Christian Examiner* of Richmond, Va., as copied from the *Southern Christian Weekly*. We have not been furnished a report of the proceedings of the meeting at Jackson. We do not know who is the author of the above article. He speaks of the Louisville and the "Nashville Plan," clearly with the view of making the impression that the Christian brethren in or around Nashville have put forth a "plan" as has been done at Louisville. Now the man who has sense enough to write the foregoing article knows this to be untrue, and was guilty of making a false impression in regard to his brethren in the insinuation. The complaint has continually been made that we, while objecting to the Plans of the brethren, gave none of our own; which is true. We have repeatedly told how work was reported as being done in the Bible. We have not even attempted to systematize these operations into a "plan." We do not believe that it either should or could be done.

It is not one month since we saw a call from our Bro. Poe, in the *Review* upon Bro. Headington, one of the

editors of that paper, who vigorously opposes the Plans, to give a plan, with the statement that Bro. Fanning had always objected to other plans, had given none himself. This has been the universal complaint against us.

We have always plead guilty to the charge of opposing the plans put forth by others and giving none ourselves. Just as we have opposed all creeds given by man, yet are willing to formulate no creed ourselves. We believe God gave the items of faith just as seemed best in his wisdom in the Bible. We have believed that the workings of the church, how they should operate, was better given in the New Testament than can ever be given by man. We believe it a sinful and treasorable presumption on the part of man to formulate the truths of the Bible into a creed to be accepted by the church. It is an impugment of the wisdom of the Almighty. It seems to us equally a crime to formulate or systematize the operations of the churches as given in the New Testament into a plan. As though God's report is not sufficient for our example.

While we refuse to make a creed, the sectarian world respond you have a creed of your own. We all pronounce it a slander. We say we object to the "plan" of human mold, and to man's formulating God's direction and example, for work into a system for the church. Our brethren, without the courage to say we have made a plan, insinuate it. It is just as great a slander as the other, with less excuse for its utterance. The failure to directly affirm, while insinuating it, shows a sense of guilt

in making a false impression. We have made no plan, we expect to make none, nor do we expect to encourage or become partakers in the plans of others. We are satisfied that God was as wise in directing the work of the church as in guiding its faith. We believe it just as sinful to add to his order of work or to formulate it into a plan for the church as it is to make a creed directing the faith of the church in its work, its most important features. When we adopt a plan we will never oppose others for adopting a creed.

In this connection it may be proper to refer to an article that we had determined to let pass without comment. We refer to the proposition of our excellent and devoted Bro. Abell to call for a co-operation meeting, to start out State and District Evangelists. These theories and plans are pretty and plausible, these high-sounding titles and dignitaries are attractive. But brethren, does any one believe a true servant of God, will do any more work for humanity with these high sounding titles and going forth in the name of a State or a district co-operation than as an humble servant of the Most High in the name of the Son of God—acting in the name of Jesus, the Christ, our king and Savior?

Now brethren, if there is a brother in the State or out of it, with talent and heart for teaching the Savior, that is not engaged in the work for lack of ability, we certainly are willing to do all in our power to enable him to go to the poor and humble and sinful to teach them the way of salvation. If he is a member of a congregation able to assist him suffi-

ciently, we certainly will try to induce them to do it. We will not wrong them nor violate the relationships of God's family, by taking him out of his proper connection with it and assigning him a position unknown to the book of God. If his own congregation is not able to assist him sufficiently let others who know him, who are naturally connected with him and them by proximity or spiritual relationship arising from his labors among them, assist. It can be done and done effectually without creating a single function or forming a single function unknown to the Bible. This whole plan and order of creating functions and offices unknown to the Bible, placing one brother in a position of prominence with high-sounding titles and offices and salaries over and above his brethren, is utterly abhorrent to our faith in God, and respect for the purity and simplicity of the church and the divine equality of all true servants of the Most High, who do his work.

They are not needed to call forth the full activity, energy and devotion of the church of God but are continual hindrances to these. Why should one man be called a State Evangelist or a District Evangelist more than another? All are equally called to labor in the State, and all over the State, and out of the State, modified only by their ability and providential surroundings. These distinctions create bitterness, envy, strife. They discourage those not selected, they unduly puff up those selected to positions of honor or to the more honorable positions. These things do not crop out often publicly, but they exist as is well known to all who are

familiar with their workings. See an instance here, which we clip from the *Review*.

Bro. Lindsey was very denunciatory a year ago when he was in office, of all who opposed the Plan. Now he is out, some one else is in. Bro. Munnell gets more than he does, yet he did as much work as Bro. Munnell.

MISSIONARY.

"I desire to give notice to the State Board of the Illinois Christian Missionary Society and to the different district and county boards, that there is yet due me \$715 for my last year's work as State Evangelist. Will you please forward to me at Eureka, Ill.

My family are in need of means, and justice demands that it be paid. Bro. Munnell gets for his year's work \$2,400. I labored as faithfully as he, and have only received one-fourth that amount."

JOHN LINDSEY.

These co operations are the starting point of a departure from the simplicity of primitive times; this departure once made, we know not where it will stop. Take for example our Bro. Abell's own State of Virginia. His successor in office as State evangelist, demands that these meetings shall appoint committees to examine all the preachers and stop all from preaching, who do not come up to the educational and moral standard, this committee may adopt. Bro. Lucas, one of the editors of the *Examiner*, heartily endorses and enforces the suggestion, and adds that a "swarm of ignorant and immoral zealots" are now and have been swarming into the pulpits of the

Christian brotherhood that must be stopped. He demands that all who are preaching should be examined by this committee (who will have to be young College-educated men; nobody else is competent to the work.) Then Bro. Abell, Bro. Walthall, Bro. Coleman, Bro. Henry Duval and all the brethren who have built up the churches, must be examined by this committee of College-breds and be stopped telling lost sinners the way of salvation should they not come up to their educational standard. But will they stop with the preachers? It is just as important to have educated and moral Elders and Deacons as preachers. The church that would sanction the ignorant and immoral preacher, would an Elder or Deacon of the same character. Then how long would it be before this committee examined the Elders and Deacons, and prohibited or licensed them? And which functions of a church will be left? There never was one of these convocations for devising plans or schemes unknown to the Bible, that did not work mischief. We do not believe there ever will be one.

Then again, brethren, independent of evil tendency and unscriptural practice, the whole system is a failure in its practical work.

We once had a complete system here. We had our State evangelists, our district evangelists. The older brethren all recollect our beloved bros. J. J. Trott and Eichbaum. They were sent out by a meeting that we believe met in Murfreesboro (no worse for that, however.) They labored as faithfully and with as much ability as men will ever labor

in this world. They were positively starved out and everybody became tired and disgusted with the operations of the association. Bro. Trett was starved, disheartened, discouraged and driven by want to the Cherokee nation. Bro. Eichbaum had no family, tried for a time district evangelizing, and has hardly been heard of since as a preacher. I was for a number of years in my youth a member of one of these district associations and was present at the burial of the State meeting. We starved thoroughly and effectually—bro. Eichbaum, A. and A. P. Seits, Campbell and others, till some of them have had a continual nightmare of starvation ever since. Bro. Murfree was among the number, but had some possessions of his own that enabled him to live.

We speak of these because we know the facts, helped to do the work of starving them. It was just as bad in other sections. We heard Bro. Bantau say, the churches in Tennessee owed him we believe, three thousand dollars, it was over two we are certain, under these workings. Doubtless every other brother who has labored with them, could make a similar report. It is not different in other States; see the report of Bro. Lindsey above in the rich State of Illinois for the last year. It was counted the most successful year of the Plan. Illinois is one of the most populous States in the Union in membership of Christians, with her numbers and wealth. Go across the line into Kentucky, you will find the district evangelists have been unpaid, the preaching brethren poor and needy, labored under these Societies,

made debts and are left without aid. We know of one who lost his home by the failure.

In addition to these, we call attention to the report of our beloved bro. Abell himself as made last year, of the workings in Virginia. He is now an exile from his home, the land and people he loves above all others, starved out as a State evangelist.

In this State, where these plans have prevailed, the revered Coleman, Walthall and Abell, the fathers of the cause in Virginia, together with the younger brethren, Crenshaw, Holland and Challenger, have been driven from the home of their childhood and the labors of their manhood. Walthall and Holland have returned. No truer people under the sun live than the brethren of Old Virginia. When a system fails with them it is inherently faulty. But here is bro. Abell's account of the working of the system in Virginia.

To the Disciples of Virginia.

BELoved BRETHREN: There are some things I am confident you do not desire to exist.

1. That your State Evangelist should be dunned! dunned!! dunned!!! for just debts, and not have the means with which to pay them.

2. To raise his children in ignorance, because he has not the means with which to educate them.

3. To be compelled to leave his State, where and when his labors are very much needed, and take a trip to the West, to raise funds, to redeem pledges, which he cannot satisfy for the want of funds.

As a cure for these evils let me respectfully and affectionately sug-

gest instead of wrangling and contending about "plans" with an empty treasury, let us adopt the 'Lord's plan,' and contribute of our means, the first day of every week and thus have a replenished treasury instead of dead, unpaid pledges.

With much respect and affection
your evangelist,

G. W. ABELL.

We were certainly surprised after this from bro. Abell to see him proposing the same scheme that had proved so disastrous to him in Virginia, for adoption here. With all these things plainly before us it strikes us that a man who would accept positions dependent upon such unpractical organizations, is a candidate for the poorhouse, and if he will stick to it perseveringly, not give up, we will guarantee his election.

Our churches are not so earnest or active as they should be. Christians are not so pure in their lives, so earnest and faithful in their walk, not so zealous in doing good or teaching the way of the Lord as they should be. These human addenda will never improve them. Our brethren in the State are as faithful and intelligent as those who have "plans," they are as active as those who have their dignitaries and functions with honorable titles, and positions above their humbler but equally laborious brethren.

Our numbers increase as rapidly as any in the country. Brethren who are anxious to hear evil of us, report churches as dead, without they or their informers being able to point to a single one that died where we have no plan, and two dead ones

can be found where the plans prevail now, where one can be found in our State. We find where we have the least done for God and his cause, they complain most of the lack of some plan and try hardest to get up some plan.

The introduction of these plans, has given offense to good and true brethren wherever they have been introduced. They will here. Brethren can bring controversy and division and strife if they will, we shall regret the determination, we shall know we are free from blame. We only ask, do not try to press your human inventions and devices upon the churches of Christ. We are willing to work in harmony with all as all acknowledge is right.

We state again, if there is a brother in the State or out of it, whose talent and heart is in the work needing sustaining, and the congregations which know him think him suited to the work, we are willing to do all that we can to induce a proper sustaining of him by the churches of Christ in any true and proper work, but when it is proposed to create new functions and functionaries unknown to the Scriptures, we will have no part nor lot in the matter. We believe if one tenth the effort was made to get the churches to sustain the teachers of the word in a Scriptural manner, that is made to build up unscriptural organizations, there would be ten-fold more teaching done. It would be purer and the churches kept more faithfully to the word of God.

But, brethren, while these things are true, as expediencies we are almost ashamed for having offered to

men and women professing to be Christians such arguments. You and I profess to be servants of the living God. We have adopted a principle of fealty to God, which is expressed in the faith which says, God is served in his own institutions and works through his own appointments, unpolluted by human touch, unaffected by human amendment or change. They are the embodiment of God's wisdom, the medium of his exertion of power. The addition of these functions and organizations is a violation of this principle, is an abnegation of this faith. It is wrong. Whoever doubts the sufficiency of his institutions, questions his wisdom and power. It is a betrayal of distrust in God. We must have a pure church, without human additions and corruptions. I will have part or lot in no other. I cannot see the good institution thus violated, and hold my peace. I dislike controversy. My deep sorrow at the presentation of such propositions is a clear and satisfactory evidence to my own mind of this. Every drop of blood in my body, every principle of fealty to God in my soul forbids my remaining silent. I know I am right; I know even though I should stand alone, the principle will live. It honors God. The opposite dishonors him.

D. L.

Healing the Sick.

Brethren L. & S: James fifth chapter, 14-15 verses gives directions for the benefit of the sick. My object in writing is to stir up your pure minds by way

of remembrance to this passage of Scripture; it may be you can give some reason why it is neglected, and if so I wish you to do it in as plain a way as possible, for with my limited means of information it has the appearance of a command, and yet no body so far as I know is in the habit of practicing it, and yet we are professing to take God's word as our guide, and not shunning to declare the whole counsel of God. Now if there can be good reason given for setting this passage of Scripture aside as obsolete and paying no attention to it, how shall we in that case avoid the charge of disobedience. The apostle's language is very plain, no room left for explanation, the only difficulty about it is with regard to duration, was it designed for only a time and then go out of use, or was it to last to the end of time. It is evident the sick still need healing, and I believe the Lord is both as able and willing to heal now as he was then, but his blessing must be sought according to his direction. I would not have troubled you with this if I had not thought the importance of the subject demanded, and I know of no other chance to impress this subject on the minds of the people than to write, hoping to call out others, who can give all the instruction on this subject that is needed.

Your Brother,

JONATHAN NEWMAN.

Washington Co. Texas May 20, 1874.

We suppose the only reason for its neglect is the lack of faith in the means accomplishing the end. It has generally been conceded as belonging to the miraculous age. On what grounds except a lack of faith in the

efficacy of the means we have never been able to see. The Scripture seems to be of as general application as any in the letter of James. Nothing from the context shows to me it was limited in duration.

D. L.

QUERIES.

Bro's. L. & S.: A few disciples are living in this part of Alabama (Clay County) which you learned from the report of our elders, in the 41st number of the *ADVOCATE* last year. At the time of our organization, our neighbors seemed to rejoice with us, and to be willing for us to have church privileges, but so soon as a few of their best members united with us in pleading for a return to the primitive order of Christian worship, their hands were turned against us. Failing to make the people believe their misrepresentations concerning our teaching some of them, preachers, so-called, resorted to slander. Which course we did not expect from people who called themselves American citizens. God pity them, they know not that they persecute Jesus of Nazareth when they offend his little ones.

The brethren are alive, meeting every Lord's day and will never form any alliance with human religious institutions instituted for the sake of public favor.

A few accessions have been made to our congregation since our report last Fall. Reformation in this country is an uphill work.

There is, however, one good omen visible. There is great confusion in the Sectarian ranks. The people

are tired of the yoke they wear; Many of them however are not willing to exchange it for the easy yoke of Christ, cannot bear to be persecuted for the name of Christ.

They called our Savior an imposter, and they called his early followers the sect of the Nazarenes, and they call us the Sect of the Campbellites, and thus give God the lie, for he called his people Christians.

Through the influence of the truth a congregation has been recently organized on the foundation of the apostles and prophets about fifteen miles distant from us in Talladega County five miles from Munford. They at present number nineteen members, and a good prospect for many more. They all came from the Sectarian churches but two, who were added by relation; God bless them in their day of trial, is our most sincere prayer.

I am of the impression that a few small churches, at least may be built up in this and the adjoining counties, if the ancient Gospel can be proclaimed. We need more teachers and better ones. But we are determined by God's grace to be as strong instruments in his hands as we can which however is very little. May he strengthen our hands. We are all very poor in this world's goods, but I trust rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom.

We are not able to secure the service of an able minister from the fact that all live so far from us and we are not able to pay their expenses, and we have determined never to beg any one's service.

But if any Christian preacher would come among us and remain a

few days or weeks I feel certain that no people could receive him more cordially than we all would. We are materially distrustful of ourselves and feel that others could do our work better than we can and faster than we can. I mean the work of teaching in our community and in the adjacent neighborhoods, for we are not satisfied with a mock religion that imparts no saving influence to those near us, and may he who imparts his grace and strength to those who are weak, assist us in the performance of every good work is the prayer of us all.

We are often asked some questions which we cannot answer definitely, such as these; how many classes of religious people are there who prefer to be known as Christians and wear no Sectarian name.

How many who are now pleading for a return to the primitive order of Christian faith and practice in all things? in how many countries and in what Counties has the cause we plead made its way?

Has there existed in all ages, since the disciples were first called Christians, people who preferred to wear the only name by which we honor our Lord? Will you please answer these questions to the best of your knowledge in the GOSPEL ADVOCATE.

Will you please put me down now in time of peace as one who is opposed to all civil wars.

Your Brother,

J. M. JOINER.

Ashland Clay County Ala.

In answer to Bro. Joiner's queries, we respond that the movement with which we are acting has reached

with some degree of success, all nations who speak the English language. The United States, England, Ireland, Scotland, Australia and the adjacent islands. It is meeting with much success in Australia. There are people teaching the truth. But we find people teaching the same things and in many respects teaching the Bible more perfectly than we do, in Hungary, small bodies of the same people may be found in France, and several of the central and eastern countries of Europe. They have existed there for hundreds of years, possibly since the days of the apostles. See an account of the Nazirites page 1031 last volume of GOSPEL ADVOCATE.—

In answer to Bro. J.'s last question, we must refer him to articles in last vol. of ADVOCATE, headed, "The Church of Christ," pages 974, 1005, 1022. As to the members holding the position, we cannot tell. There are estimates of the members in association with us, in this country, varying from 500,000 to 700,000. It is possible the smaller number is nearer the truth. And of these many, are not with us in Spirit, less so than many Baptists or even Presbyterians and congregationalists. They are laboring to destroy instead of build up his true work. If there were but one single congregation living faithful to Christ, God's power would be theirs. If our brethren will continue faithful in their endeavors, God will bless them. He always uses the humble and weak instruments of this world, which have no confidence in their own strength or wisdom, but who trust in him, to exalt his name and extend his kingdom.

D. L.

 Last Half of Volume 16.

Next number, 26, begins the last half of the present year's volume. And we doubt not there are many who would gladly send us one dollar, and take the Advocate the balance of the year, if the matter were only presented to them. We therefore ask our readers to present this matter to their brethren and friends and see how many they can add to our present list of subscribers. We are satisfied that just a little attention on their part would greatly enlarge our subscription list, and thus largely extend our field of usefulness. The Advocate certainly ought to be read by many more than now read it, and might be with a little exertion.

We intend, by the help of God to made the Advocate more and more useful both in the edification of the churches, and in teaching aliens the way of truth and righteousness. We are exceedingly anxious to see the Advocate established upon a still firmer basis, and see its field of usefulness much enlarged. To do this we must have the number of subscribers increased. May we not hope then that the brethren everywhere will aid some in this work. Just a little aid from each one of our readers would amount to a very great lift to us, and to great extension of the Cause of truth.

EDRS.

He who can look up to his God with the most believing confidence is sure to look most gently on his fellow men; while he who shudders to lift his eye to heaven often casts the haughtiest glances on the things of earth

 The Point of Change.

Where a man is going toward wrong heartily, and he is converted there must be a time when he stops, for nobody ever changes his course from wrong to right by accident. There must be a time when he moves or attempts to move, in the direction, no matter whether he can tell what that time is or not, and no matter whether there was any great convulsion in his experience or not. There is in the case of every man who reforms his life, a point of time at which he ceases to go in one direction, and begins to go in the other direction. There is the principle of immediateism involved in every man's conversion; and those who are walking in the ways of sin should be abundantly plied to stop at once, and at once to begin to walk in the other direction, as the first step toward entering upon a better life—and for this reason: that what are called "resolutions" are not choices; they are simply stepstones to choices. That is a resolution where a man accomplishes. That is a choice where a man accepts an end, and employs all the instruments within his reach for the accomplishment of it. One is without instrumentality, and the other is with instrumentality. Therefore resolutions wither, while choices hold steadfastly. And you are, by all the means in your power, to bring men, not merely to vague resolutions, not merely to wishfulness not merely to wish that they were Christians. There never was a man in the world, I suppose, who was brought up with ordinary morality, that did not wish that he was a

Christian. There never was a beggar in the world probably, that did not wish that he was rich enough to make it needless for him to beg. There never was a lazy man that did not wish that he was industrious. There never was a drunkard who did not wish that he was temperate. There never was a man who had lost his reputation that did not wish that he was reputable. There never was a man of any sort who did not wish for something better. But wishing is invalid. Choosing is the thing.—*Beecher.*

Church News.

Bro. Lipscomb: I held a meeting with the brethren at Shady Grove, Wood County, embracing the third Lord's day in this month which resulted in four additions to the army of the faithful.

Your bro. in Christ,

J. C. MATTHEWS.

Donelton, Hunt Co., Texas, May 29, 1874.

We had two additions to the church at this place yesterday, by confession and immersion.

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville Texas May 4th 1874.

We have had Brother Barnes here with us preaching for us. Two came forward, one from the world, and one from the Baptists. A goodly number acknowledge the faith at Glade Water. Bro. Barnes is doing a good work throughout the country, he does his work well where he goes.

Yours ever in Christ.

W. McPRIDGEON.

West Mountain Texas May 24th.

Something for the Girls.

I should like to say a word to all the girls between fifteen and twenty-five. Do you belong to a Bible class? If not, why not? Do you say you are too old? Nay you are mistaken. It is of even more consequence now than when you were children that you should study the Bible. Then you expected to have many years before you during which you might attend school, and learn more and more of Jesus and the way of salvation. But now the time is short. A few more years will find you perhaps married, or, at least, prevented by some circumstances from attending school. This, then, is the only time that is left to you. Would you not be wise to make the best of it?

There is another reason why you should attend a Bible class. Children do not always listen to what is said. Sunday School teachers know that much of their labor is apparently thrown away. You know it too. You have perhaps been a scholar for many years; are you satisfied with your attainments? Have you been a sincere and conscientious learner? And can you say to-day that you are sure of heaven, through the merits of Christ your Savior? If not, you ought not to leave school yet. Now you are able to understand all that is said to you; and surely now you feel the need of a friend to instruct and counsel you. I entreat you not to leave the Sunday School until you have become Christians.

If you have already left, go back again to the Bible class, and seek to accept the Savior there. For, until

you have given your hearts to him you are not ready to face either the joys or sorrows of womanhood. Neither are you safe for those years which are coming to you. New temptations will meet you now. Life will open before you. Many voices will bewilder you with their sweetness. Often you will find it difficult to discern the right from the wrong. You need a guide who shall be tender and strong, and able to keep you in the right way. Will you not come to the place where you can meet with just the guide you want?

When we are ill at ease with ourselves, and unhappy in the home of our own heart, everything takes a complexion from our spirit, mere increase to delight, friends are no longer friends, nature loses her beauty, our employments their interest; life itself may at last become intolerable and death be sought as a refuge near and immediate from what is already hell. But where peace reigns, sunshine spreads all around. While Judas went, with his silver pieces, to hang himself, He who was being led to the cross exclaimed, "My peace I leave with you!"—*Norman Macleod.*

MISPLACED CARE.

"Two things a master commits to his servant's care," said one "the child and the child's clothes." It will be a poor excuse for the servant to say at his master's return: "Sir, here are all the child's clothes, neat, and clean but the child is lost!" Much so with the account that many will give to God of their souls and bodies at the

great day: "Lord, here is my body; and I am very grateful for it. I neglected nothing that belonged to its content and welfare: but for my soul, that is lost and cast away forever. I took little care and thought about it."—*Flavel*

BEGINNING CHRISTIANS.—A man who has, according to his conception of right and wrong, chosen sides, and said, "By the help of God I am going to do right, and by the help of God I mean to look to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to judge by his example and commandments of what is right and wrong for me"—such a man, I hold, has begun a Christian life. He is a beginning Christian. That which is abundant for the seed-time in the spring would be considered very poor for the harvest-time in the autumn; and that which is enough to begin this end of Christian life with would be far from satisfactory at the other end of Christian life. It is a great deal better that a man should begin, as Christ puts it, with a grain of mustard-seed, and go on growing through his life; rising and rising, as one ascends on an inclined plane, than that he should suddenly burst into Christian life with an affluence of experience, and with choral joy, and go sliding down the other way through the rest of his life.—*Beecher.*

IMPERFECTIONS.

Avoid minutely examining what other people do, or what will become of them; but look them with an eye good, simple, sweet, affectionate. Do not require in them more

perfection than in yourself; and do not be astonished at the diversity of imperfections; for imperfection is not greater merely because it is unusual. Behave like the bees—suck the honey from all the flowers and herbs.—*St. Francis de Sales.*

CARE FOR DAUGHTERS.

Would parents show themselves really good to daughters? Then they should be generous to them in a truer sense than that of heaping trinkets on their necks. Train them for independence first, and then labor to give it to them. Let them as soon as ever they are grown, have some money, or means of making money, to be their own, and teach them how to deal with it, without needing every moment to help them. Calculate what you will give them or will bequeath to them, not, as is usually done, on the chance of their making a rich marriage, but on the probability of their remaining single, and according to the living to which you have accustomed them. Suppress their luxuries now, if need be, but do not leave them with scarcely bare necessities hereafter, in striking contrast to their present home. Above all, help them to help themselves. Fit them to be able to rely on their own means, rather than to be forever pinching and economizing till their minds are narrowed and their hearts are sick. Give all the culture you can to every power which they may possess. If they should marry, after all, they will be truly the happier and better for your care. If they should remain among the millions of

the unmarried, they will bless you in your grave, and say of you, what can not be said of many a doating parent by his surviving child "My father cared that I should be happy after his death as well as while I was his pet and his toy."—*Exchange.*

Had it been an evil thing to suffer wrong, God would not have enjoined it upon us. Know ye not that He is the king of glory, and therefore He commands us to suffer wrong, and doth all to withdraw us from worldly things and to convince us what is glory, and what shame; what loss, and what gain—*Chrysost m.*

THE DIFFERENCE.

BY JOHN S. C. ABBOTT.

Two travelers are on a bleak plain. The night is dark with fierce wind and flooding rain. They are both drenched to the skin. Toiling through the gloom and the mire, they breast the gale, numbed with cold and almost ready to perish with fatigue. The storm beats alike upon them both. Both alike experience its fury.

But one of these benighted travelers sees in the distance the light of his home. It tells him that the hearth-fire is burning brightly, that the tea-table with the warm repast is spread, that slippers are on the rug, and that fresh garments are hung before the fire to be exchanged for his dripping clothes. And more than all the rest, it assures him that wife and child, with love beaming, are waiting to greet him.

As the light of his much-loved home beams through the storm upon his eye, thus revealing to him the bliss to which in one short hour he will be introduced, he wraps his cloak around him and tramps bravely on, through sleet and gloom, and wind and rain, singing merrily, for his heart is joyous,

"There is no paradise like home, sweet home"

But the other benighted wanderer, on the same plain, exposed to the same storm and cold, is a houseless, homeless vagrant. There is no fireside for him—no table spread with luxuries to appease the hunger which is gnawing at his vitals—there is no wife with her smiles, no child with its greetings, waiting to welcome him. The gloom of the tempestuous night is rendered more dark and chill by the gloom which settles down upon his soul.

He must seek shelter in some shed or barn, or throw himself upon the frozen ground, beneath some dripping shrub, and there in vain seek sleep, while the wailing of the storm mock his misery.

So it is in the toilsome, tempest swept journey of life. The Christian and the worldling, on the journey, are alike overtaken by darkness and the storm. They both encounter its unmitigated fury. It beats upon the head of one as pitilessly as upon that of the other. Alike they are chilled, drenched, and exhausted.

The spirit of unbelief says, "What is religion good for, then? It does not rescue one from life's troubles."

But the Christian sees in the distance the illuminated windows of his Father's house. He knows the greeting which awaits him there—the

bliss, perfect and eternal, which he shall soon attain. This gives strength to his fainting heart. Bravely he can bear whatever the toil or peril of the pilgrimage.

But for the worldling in the hour of trial, what is there? Nothing! When the shadowy peace the world gives, the peace of youth, health, prosperity, is taken away, there is nothing left. There is naught but weeping, wailing and the blackness of despair.

Never fail to do daily that good which lies next to your hand. Trust God to weave your little thread into the great web, though the pattern shows it not yet. The grand harvest of the ages shall come to its reaping, and the day shall broaden itself to a thousand years, and the thousand years shall show themselves as a perfect and finished day.—*McDonald.*

To arrive at perfection, a man should have very faithful friends or inveterate enemies; because he must be made sensible of his good or ill conduct, either by the censures of the one or the admonitions of the other.—*Dingenes.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Discussion at Locust Grove, Ky.....	577
West Tenn. Co-operation Meeting.....	587
Healing the Sick.....	593
Queries.....	594
Last Half of Volume 16.....	596
The Point of change.....	596
Church News.....	597
Something for the Girls.....	697
The Difference.....	599

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 26.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JUNE 25, 1874.

LOVE TO GOD.

“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” John xiv: 23.

It is always pleasant enough to do that which we love to do. It is always pleasant also, to work for one we love, and to do such things as are well pleasing in his sight. This is true in reference to our fellow men, and it is true in reference to God. If we love God supremely, it will always afford us pleasure to do those things which we know to be pleasing in his sight. Therefore, if we wish to make the work of Christianity pleasant, we must cultivate constantly in our hearts supreme love to God. With many, the work of Christianity seems to be a burden rather than a pleasure. They go about it, as they would go about an unpleasant task, and thus the pleasure that ought to be realized in doing the will of God is mainly lost. Ask the wife who loves her husband, if it is a burden to her to do those things that she

knows her husband wishes, and that she knows will be well pleasing to him, and she will tell you no, indeed: it is one of the highest pleasures of my life, to please my husband. Jesus Christ is represented as the bridegroom, the great husband or head of the church. The church is represented as the bride, the Lamb's wife. In this case, therefore, the bride, the church, composing all Christians, should love the Savior so well as to make it the highest pleasure of their lives, to do his bidding; to do the things they know to be well pleasing to him. And if they do not learn to do these things from a principle of love, it will always be an onerous task, if they do them at all. The religion of Jesus is based upon such a principle, that if we enter properly into its spirit, the doing of its requirements affords the highest and purest pleasures to be enjoyed in this life. No other course of life is to be at all compared with it in point of producing happiness, consolation, and pure satisfaction of conscience.

The foundation of the religion of Jesus was laid in love. Love reigned

and ruled in the counsels of the eternal Father, when he so loved the world as to give his own Son, to come into a world of sin, to suffer and die to provide a scheme of redemption through which poor mortals might live. God himself is love, and it is impossible to serve him as we should and not love him with a devotional and tender love. God requires our warmest and purest love. We are commanded to love God with all our heart, soul, mind and strength. When we meet on the Lord's day to break bread, our services will be cold and formal, and meaningless, unless our hearts are full of love for our dear Savior, who died that we might live. We should therefore make it a part of every day's work, to cultivate in our hearts a pure and devotional love to God, and to Jesus our dear Savior. And to aid us in cultivating this love for God and the Lamb, we ought to read and meditate much upon what they have done for us. Look at Jesus in the garden, meditating upon, and agonizing over the approaching death of the cross. Hear him pray for the removal of the bitter cup; yet see how meekly he says, "not my will, but thine be done." Can any one look at this and not love him? View him in his submissive course before Pilate, when the Jews were clamorous for his death. See him as he bleeds, and groans, and agonizes, and dies, for poor helpless sinners. View him as he rises from the dead, and brings life and immortality to light through the gospel, and then ascends to heaven to prepare a place for those that love him. A Christian that can ponder over these things and not have the deepest

emotions of love stirred within him, too full for expression, would certainly be a very cold-hearted Christian, and one that need not be expected to do the will of God. Let the child of God spend much of his time pondering these lovely characteristics of the Son of God, and he will find it an easy matter to love and serve and honor the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world.

But not only must we learn to love God and his Son, but we must learn to love that course of life that they have ordained for us to walk in. No one can be a true servant of God, and at the same time cultivate a love for any course of life that God has forbidden. The man who loves strong drink, must crucify that appetite, and bring it under complete control of love to God and his ways, or he may just as well lay aside all thoughts of heaven and a blissful immortality in the presence of God. No man can love the ways of drunkenness, and the ways of God at the same time. And no man will turn from a course of drunkenness unless he loves the ways of God more.

But the ways of God in these things are of such a character that everybody knows it will bring more happiness, even in this life, than the ways of drunkenness. The man who loves the gratification of his fleshly propensities in any respect more than he loves the cause of self-denial that God has required, may as well make his calculation to miss heaven, unless he at once change his course. Paul says, "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die. But if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Rom. 8. And

when we come to weigh the short-lived pleasures of this life against the eternal joys of heaven, the former will make a very poor compensation for the loss of the latter. The young and gay Christians, who cultivate more love for dancing and frolicking than they do for that life of humility and piety which the religion of Jesus inculgates, may just as well make their arrangements to bid farewell to God and heaven forever, if they persist in such a course. We have known in our lifetime, as we think, many pious Christians, both old and young, but not one of them ever cultivated a love for dancing, or any such vain and worldly amusements. The two things cannot possibly agree together. "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lusts thereof; but he that doeth the will of God, abideth for ever." 1 John ii; 15-17. And we all have the choice before us: to love the world, and follow its pleasures, and be lost, or love God and his ways, and follow them, and be saved. But it is not in our power to do both at the same time. We are required to deny "ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world."

Now, every one that will think for a moment, knows that the course of life required in this passage, will bring more happiness, even in this life, than any other. The part of wisdom then is, to learn how to love this course of life better than any

other, and then it will be but a pleasure to pursue it. But if we cultivate more love for the opposite course, then we will pursue that. Now, as certainly as we love the Savior sincerely, we will strive to love his ways; for we know his ways are the ways of wisdom and truth. And it is not worth our while to claim that we love the Lord, and not love his ways. The Lord, and the course of life that he has enjoined, are so intimately connected that we cannot love the one and not love the other. In all ages, men who have truly loved God, have also loved his ways. Enoch so loved the ways of God, that he walked in them three hundred years, and was not suffered to die and go to the tomb as others, but was translated, that he should not see death. Noah was a lover of God, and his divine ways or commands, and was saved from the flood, together with all his family. While the rest of the people loved their own ways and followed them, and were all destroyed. Lot loved God, and his divine requirements, and followed them, and was saved from the terrible doom that befell the cities of the Plain. But all the other inhabitants of these cities loved their own ways, and followed them, and a terrible death was their end. Caleb and Joshua among the Jews, loved God, and they loved his divine requisitions, and kept them, while the other Jews loved their own ways, and pursued them. The consequence was, that Caleb and Joshua entered into the promised land, and enjoyed its rich blessings, while the rest, who preferred their own ways, perished outside.

Abraham loved God and his re-

quirements more than he loved himself, or his family. He went next to last act of sacrificing his son, to obey the command of God. Thus proving that he loved God better than his own life or that of his son, and has left us a lasting example of faith and love to go by. David said, "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted by the river of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." 1 Psa. 1, 1-3. Whenever a man's delight is in the law of the Lord, he will always take pleasure in keeping that law. There is, then, every reason why we should learn to love God and his holy laws. Our present and everlasting happiness depend upon it. We never can prove that we love God except by doing his will. God himself will accept of no other deed of proof. All our claims that we love God will amount to nothing unless we do his will. No matter how much a believing penitent may claim to love God, he falsifies that claim of love when he refuses to confess the name of Jesus and be baptized. Jesus will reject him at last, if he persist in this rebellious course. The Christian man who loves God but refuses to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, but falsifies his own claim. John lets us know very plainly that if we have this world's goods, and see a

brother or sister in need, and shut up our bowels of compassion against him, the love of God does not dwell in us. We may deceive our fellow-men in these things, but we cannot deceive our heavenly Father. Whatsoever we sow, we may be assured that that is what we will reap.

If we sow to the flesh, we shall of the flesh reap corruption. If we sow to the Spirit, we shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.—*Paul*. We are told by Peter, that Christ left us an example, that we should follow his steps. His entire life was an example for us. He proved his love toward us, by freely yielding up his life, that we might live. So we should prove our love to him, by giving our entire lives to his service. There can be no doubt about men loving God; who serve him faithfully. Their whole life is one constant demonstration, that they do love him. No one can doubt for a moment that Paul loved God, nor is any other evidence needed of that fact, than his whole life from the day he obeyed the gospel till the day of his death. And how bright was his prospect, and how strong his assurance of eternal bliss when he came to die. And the ground upon which he based his assurance is worthy of note. He did not place it upon feeling, or impulse, or emotion of soul; but he calmly said, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith."

In modern times, when religious people are called upon for their assurance of immortality, they refer you to some happy feeling or emotion, when they think they obtained the favor of God, and to the day of their death, this constitutes the main

basis of their hope. But Paul places his in the fact that he had done the Lord's will. From this, through the mercy of God, he looked for an everlasting crown of glory. And this exactly accords with the word of God elsewhere. In the last chapter of Revelation it is said; "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." In this sort of course there is perfect safety. Our love, then, must not be mere passion, or impulse, but it must be of a pure devotional character that will lead us to do the will of God, and then all will be right with us.

E. G. S.

The Lineage of Christ.

We remarked in an article on Esau and Jacob, that it was probable some of the blood of Esau commingled with the blood of Israel and Moab in the veins of the Savior. On a closer examination we think there is more than a probability of this. Salmon the Son of Nashon, a prince of the family of Judah, took Rahab the harlot to wife, after the destruction of Jericho, and by her was born Obed, Edom the father of Jesse and grandfather of David. Jericho was a city of Canaan. Canaan was originally inhabited by the children of Cain, son of Ham. But into this family Esau had married. From it he took several wives. He settled in Mount Seir. His family was a vigorous, prolific and aggressive stock that soon overran and controlled the family into which he married, and mainly became the rulers of Canaan adja-

cent to Edom or Idumeah. Jericho was an important trading point in this section near Edom and was in all probability inhabited largely by the Edomites. Indeed, the superior vigor of the race, largely infused the blood into the nations of Canaan and became the dominating portion of these nations. Place this, together with the fact that he was called Obed-Edom, it shows plainly that his mother was an Edomite, a child of Esau. Although a harlot, she believed in God, was faithful to him, and become one of the honored progenitors of the Son of God.

Nashon was one of the chiefs of Israel. His son, Salmon, may have been one of the spies whom Rahab had concealed and saved, who on the capture of the city married her.

In giving an account of her deliverance, and the deliverance of her house in the destruction of Jericho, the writer adds, "She dwelleth in Israel even unto this day;" meaning her family. Of her offspring no doubt was the Obed-Edom at whose house the ark was left in the days of David, and whose family became keepers of the vessels of the sanctuary in later days. Tamar also, who bore Pharez by her father-in-law Judah was doubtless a Canaanitish woman, as Judah's own wife, Bath-Shuah, was.

These examples serve to show that, notwithstanding a blessing was pronounced upon the family of Jacob and a curse upon that of Esau, yet when Jacob's family rebelled against God, it was cut off and accursed—even to ten whole tribes at once. And that the children of Esau, of Moab, of Canaan and of course of Ham, all of whom had been accursed

had the power of believing and obeying the God of heaven, and that when one of them did obey God, he or she was accepted of God, and adopted into the family of Jacob, as a joint heir with his children in the promise made to Jacob.

More than this, Canaan the son of Ham, is supposed by many to have derived his name from his mother's family. Hence that she was a daughter of Cain, who slew Abel. The maternal patronymic frequently descended to the child, as Obed-Edom. If this reasonable inference be true, then beyond doubt, the blood of Cain also coursed in the veins of the Savior. He was the Savior of the whole human family, connected with all nations by blood, none so degraded, none so polluted, none so fallen in sin, no family so accursed, but that if they would repent they could bear a part in the fleshly body of the Son of God. No sinner so low, no nation so degraded, but that Christ loved and died for him, and they may find help and redemption in him.

Beyond doubt, there was no predestination or decree of the Almighty couched in any curse of his which prevented the most abject of sinners turning and finding grace and favor with him. All his promised blessings to Abraham and his seed, were conditioned on faithful obedience to him. When they failed, God was able of the very stones to raise up children to Abraham. He was able to receive those who would believe of other nations, that they, through faith, might become the children of Abraham.

It was always true, that in every nation, he that feareth God and doeth righteousness is accepted of him. No

unalterable decree of God ever yet kept a man or woman from God.

D. L.

Teaching and Baptizing, who has the Right?

Bro. Lipscomb: If a disciple wanders off some three or four hundred miles from the church where he holds his membership and steps in a country where there is no church of Christ, then feels it his duty to preach or work for the cause of Christ, and goes to preaching the gospel of Christ, has he any right to baptize any one? Now I joined the church in Alabama, and am out here, and have never been ordained to preach, but preached or tried to preach my first discourse last second Sunday. If any join and I baptize them, will it be valid? Or tell me what is required of a man before he has the right to preach, and if I may preach and baptize, how to organize a church, if you think I ought to preach.

Your brother in Christ,

G. C. R.

Liberty Hill, Bienville Parrish, La.

We certainly say, It is the duty of our brother to preach the gospel of God's beloved Son. The fact that he is away from a church, *i. e.* away from where the gospel is preached, makes the necessity all the greater. The disciples who were scattered abroad from Jerusalem went everywhere preaching the word. It is probable if they had remained at Jerusalem they never would have preached. The apostles were there,

and there was no occasion for it. They went out where there were none to preach the word, they felt the obligation on themselves to teach the people, rather than see them remain in ignorance of Christ the Savior. All except the apostles, men and women were scattered, all preached. They had no ordination, no election or authority to baptize but what every disciple has. However important it may be to have the sanction of a congregation to the work to which we devote ourselves, when there is a congregation present to take the oversight of our labors, when we are where there are no congregations, no disciples of Christ, but the whole community is in darkness and ignorance, and souls are going down to death for the lack of spiritual light, no Christian ought to hesitate as to his duty to teach them. But if a man teaches them and refuses to baptize them, what good does it do? I have never yet found a particle of authority in the Bible for saying one Christian is authorized to baptize, another is not. The church can give no authority, it has none; all the authority comes from Christ. We should think a Christian would be held to a terrible accountability at the last day, were he to refuse to baptize a man demanding it at his hands, when there was no one else to do it. It is a responsibility we would much fear to bear. It is beyond all doubt the duty of a Christian in such circumstances both to preach and baptize. He has the same authority to baptize, that he has to teach.

The only organization proper for a body of new converts, is to bring them together as a body of worship-

pers on the Lord's day, every Lord's day to worship after the apostolic model—to engage in studying the apostles' teaching or doctrine, in the fellowship, breaking of bread and prayers. When they come together be careful to give each something to do; let every one bear some part in the worship. Develope their talent and taste, do not do all the praying and singing and exhorting and reading. See what each can do. When they are practiced and taught so as to be able to edify them selves in worship, and competent to manage the affairs of the church, either formally or without formality, let it be understood that certain of those most faithful and true, and of the most sound, prudent and discriminating judgment take the oversight. They should also be careful not to do all the worship and work themselves. The object is to get every member at work. The getting every member to work, and to engage in the worship in his proper place, is the only organizing we know as required in the Bible. A brother's being to himself, without the watch-care of a congregation, the advice of old and prudent counsellors in Christ, ought to suggest to him the necessity of unusual caution and circumspection in his walk, and prudence in teaching only the true word of God, unmixed with human speculations. He ought as much as possible to avoid extreme positions, or that which is new and sensational, in his teaching. He ought to labor for the Lord.

"MINISTERIAL SUPPLY."

There is a reason, not usually considered, for the present state of things, which is very powerful in its influence. It is the attempt on all sides and in all ways to substitute charity for self help in obtaining a college education—a change which particularly affects the ministry, and which is seriously injuring the usefulness of our colleges. There is no need of an attempt to prove that the Alumni of a New England college, who now do honor to their Alma Mater, are those who were poor boys and "worked their way" to an education—still less is it necessary to show that it was from the ranks of such that the ministry was recruited. The facts of the case are notorious. Let any college graduate of ten years standing look back and consider how it was with his own college mates. Let him take up a Triennial and look over the italicized names that are near his own, and he will be very vividly reminded of the rough clothes and cheap board of their owners. They lived cheap, they lived hard, they economized, they taught school, they worked their own way along. Now the best of that class are not in college. Why? The long winter vacations are done away. Opportunities for earning money are not given as they were. Students are not encouraged to seek them. They are told that there is no time for outside work—that a right attention to the prescribed course will absorb all a young man's strength and time. It is doubtless all very true—and always was true; and yet it was the hard workers, the school-teachers, who took the honors in life since.

But is not this class provided for? Do not the colleges advertise that no young man need stay away because of poverty? Yes; and the advertisements are true. But what they offer is charity; and it takes poverty of manhood as well as poverty of purse to induce a young American to accept help when he can help himself. If he cannot help himself to an education he will let the education go, and take in its place something to which he can help himself.

The recent act of the students at the Boston Methodist Theological School—their request that the educational funds received might be reckoned as loans and not as gifts, was a representative act. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth spoke, and it spoke the sentiment of the better class of young men in the country.

This may be all very foolish on the part of the young men. It may be a false idea of honor and independence. We will not discuss the question now. The fact remains that, foolish or wise, such a sentiment rules the best class of our young men. Of two well known theological schools of the same denomination, one offers a chance for self-help, the other "all the help you wish and a hundred dollars." The first is overcrowded with students, the second has not one-third as many. No good school in the land that offers opportunities by which a young man can pay his own way by the work of his head or hands but is thronged, while our colleges stand holding forth their scholarships and beneficiary funds,—in vain? No. They are taken up; the money is used, but the brave,

strong young men who in years past filled their halls are not there now. They have turned aside to other pursuits.

It is said that a theological student has no right to such feelings as work such results. That one studying for the ministry can draw upon the churches' funds as freely as the missionary, etc., etc., etc. We will not now dispute this logic. The difficulty is not thus met. A farmer boy is not called out of the hay-field into the ministry, often. Very few young men fit for college with the ministry in view. When one does, it is an even chance that "God called somebody else when he answered"—and it is to be hoped that when he learns his true powers and proper work, he will pursue that for which he is fitted. But woe to him in that day if he is bound by obligation to some educational society upon whose funds he has been living. Not that it is presumed that the society will be hard upon him, but the situation is fearfully hard.

The necessary prerequisite of an increase in the ministry is a large band of educated young men of character and strength. Educational societies, scholarships, "funds for indigent students," will not furnish such a class of men. We will find it again when our colleges are so arranged that a boy can earn an education.—*Christian Union.*

QUERIE'.

Messrs. L. & S: Please explain through GOSPEL ADVOCATE the 11th

verse of the third chapter of Matthew.
A SINCERE INQUIRER.
Bell Buckle, Tenn., June 4 1874.

"He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." &c.

John was here speaking to a mixed multitude, and the meaning is that some of them would be baptized in the Holy Spirit, as on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius, while others would remain wicked, and be baptized in the fire of eternal ruin.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S: You have left out one thing requisite, (baptism) in your summary of the articles of salvation, in last sentence of first column on page 412, Vol. 16th and No. 18 of G. A.

Though you have expressed it plainly in your comment. And why not in your summary? Please answer through G. A.

Yours in the faith,

J. S. GILL.

Bethel Springs, Tenn, May 23rd.
1874.

Baptism in the above sentence was left out through mistake of the Typos.

E. G. S.

Friends L. & S: I saw in the ADVOCATE for May the 14th Questions and answers. You state as your opinion that if a Christian should partake of the Lord's supper with a pure desire to remember the Savior's death: though it be with Pedo baptists, it will be acceptable, and although he may be the only sincere

individual that may participate in a Christian's Sacramental meeting, (all others present being hypocrites) it would be acceptable as though they were all true Christians.

Now I ask, why if the sacrament administered by men so much in error as the Pedobaptists, or by hypocrites would be acceptable? would it not be more acceptable if the bread and wine were blessed and partaken of by that true Christian alone, avoiding the necessity of eating with either class of the wicked and the infidel? Please answer through the columns of the *ADVOCATE* and oblige

Yours truly,

JAS. W. BRYAN.

Elkhart Anderson Co, Texas May 23, 1874.

Some of our brethren seem to be wonderfully troubled about the taking of the Lord's Supper, and about the light in which they should consider and treat the denominations. We would say to any brother who looks upon these things as Brother Bryan does, no, never take it with Pedoes. If you think the bread and wine presented by them would not be to you the Lord's Supper, a memorial of the death, the broken body and shed blood of Jesus, by no means in the world partake with them. If it be impossible for you to meet with any of your own brethren, so as to partake with them, then take it at home with your own self, alone, if none of your family are members. If they are, then take it with them.

And if you have any means of discerning who are hypocrites, always keep a sharp lookout, when assembled with your own brethren lest

you may chance to eat with them. What we said regarding eating with hypocrites, was in case we did not know they were hypocrites. So then if you think the presence of a hypocrite would in any way vitiate the Lord's Supper to you, be sure always to use your Scriptural microscope carefully before you partake, and if you can find there are any hypocrites there, then better withdraw, and take it alone, lest you be contaminated, and your memory of the Savior frustrated. We think brethren sometimes become over critical. Paul said, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat." If a man will examine himself, and be sure that he is all right himself, he need not trouble himself as to whether there are unknown hypocrites in the assembly or not. The more attention we give to keeping ourselves right in the sight of God and men, the less we will be likely to trouble ourselves about the imperfections of others. We here mention also that we have received another attempted criticism from Brother William Ring, on our admission that there are Christians among the Baptists. But as there are no new points in it, that were not met in our last reply to him, we are not inclined to publish it. If it is any consolation to brother Ring to think that there is not a Christian in all the Baptist ranks, we are perfectly willing he should enjoy it, to his hearts content. But we would remind him that God acknowledges that some of his people are in Babylon, and calls upon them to "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18: 4.

It is said that all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and it is a question of grave importance, as to who is entirely free from all the effects of that wine yet. It is well, at least, not to become too critical, and cut off all the world at one broad sweep. That we, as a people, are correct in taking the Bible alone for our guide, does not admit of a doubt. That our teaching is correct on the subject of conversion, we have not a doubt. Whether our practice is what it ought to be or not, as Christians, is a very different question. Let us then strive to live Christianity before the world in all its fulness, and by thus pleading in our lives, together with our tongues and pens, we may then win the world to the whole truth.

E. G. S.

—
Please give me some information on the following passages of Scripture through the columns of the ADVOCATE. 1. Matt. 11. 11. 2. John 14, 12. 3. Heb. 1. 13, 14. 4. Rom. 8. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23.

We do not wish to weary your patience, but wish you to give us some information on the above Scriptures.

W. E. GARNER.

County Line Ga.

—
1. Matt. 11, 11, says; "verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Evidently John was not in the kingdom, for it was not then set up. John came not to set up the kingdom, but "to prepare a people made ready for

the Lord." And as John was not in the kingdom, any one who is in it, since it has been established, is greater *in the kingdom* than John, since he was not in it at all. We do not understand that the least one in the kingdom is a greater man than John, or a better or more useful servant of God than John, but simply that the least one in the kingdom is greater in the kingdom, than one who never was in it at all. No one can be great *in* a relationship that he never occupied. 2. "Verily, verily I say unto you he that believeth on me, the works that I do, shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my father." We suppose that in this passage the Savior had reference to the apostles. They received the power to perform the same kind of miracles that Christ himself performed. And besides that, it was their privilege to preach the gospel to all nations of the earth, to give the laws of the New Institution to the world; to forgive or retain the sins, not merely of a few individuals, but of myriads of our race, from the day of pentecost to the end of time. To bring millions of human beings out of darkness, into the glorious light of the kingdom of God. To turn millions from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among the saints. It is still their privilege to sit on thrones, to give to the world all the laws that pertain to the upbuilding and perpetuation of the kingdom of heaven, to the close of time.

In this connection the Savior promises the comforter, the Holy

Spirit, which was to guide the apostles into all truth, and we therefore conclude that the greater works to be done, had reference to the glorious work of establishing the Church of God in the earth, and the conversion of the world, and of preparing the people for a glorious immortality beyond the grave.

3. "But to which of the angels said he at any time, sit on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering Spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" The intimation here is, that angels minister for the heirs of salvation. In what sense they minister, we cannot tell. What they do, and how, we do not know. In the days of Abraham and Lot, the angels appeared unto them in the form of men, and delivered Lot and his two daughters from the terrible destruction that befell Sodom and Gomorrah. When they appeared to Abraham, they were called men. When they went into Sodom, to Lot, they are called angels. But at the same time they talked and acted as men, except in their miraculous power. They rescued Lot out of the hands of the wicked men that pressed upon him to the door, and smote them with blindness. And in the morning they laid hold upon Lot and his wife and hastened them out of the city, before the shower of destruction came upon them. Whether these angels were pure spirits from heaven, or men miraculously endowed, we will not undertake to say definitely, though we are inclined to think they were angels from heaven. Direct manifestations were frequent in those times.

Abraham Isaac and Jacob met with these angelic visitors frequently it seems. In Genesis 32, 1, it is said of Jacob, "And Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him. And when Jacob saw them, he said, this is God's host &c." What these angels did or said on this occasion we are not informed. At another time Jacob met an angel, and wrestled with him and prevailed. But information regarding these angels is rather meagre. Still the information is definite that they were angels, and that they appeared to men and ministered to them.

In Psalms 34, 7, we read; "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them." This passage shows definitely that in those times the angels did minister to the righteous, and care for them and deliver them. When Jesus had passed through his sore temptation, and had triumphed over the great enemy of God and men, the angels came and ministered to him. He at one time intimated that he could by praying to his Father obtain more than twelve legions of angels. Angels appeared at his tomb, the morning he rose from the dead, and rolled away the stone. They appeared as his escorts when he ascended to heaven.

When Lazarus died, it is said by the Savior, that he was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. Jesus said concerning his followers, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is heaven," Matt. 18, 10. Whether this is intended to teach

that each child of God is constantly watched over by angels or not, we will not definitely say, but it looks very much that way.

We have no idea that angels ever appear in a visible form now, as they did to Abraham, Lot, and Jacob or our savior. But that they do minister in some way for the well being of the children of God, though unseen by us, we have no doubt. The thought too, is a very consoling one. We have many sore trials in this world, many dark hours of grief and trouble. And the faith, that angels are ever ready to minister in our behalf when we are faithful to the Lord, is calculated to give us much consolation. The thought too, that angels are ever present around the death bed of the righteous to bear their spirits away to rest, is full of comfort and consolation. We therefore rejoice much in a belief in the ministry of angels in behalf of the humble child of God on earth.

4. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestations 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."

The word creature is used in these

verses in more senses than one. The word itself may mean *creation*, or it may be applied to the person, or thing created. In 19 verse, the word creature, means Christian, or child of God. The earnest expectation of the Christian waits for the manifestation of the sons of God; waits relief from mortality. In 20th verse, the word creature refers to the whole race of man. The creature, man, was made subject to vanity; that is, frailty, morality. The whole race of man was made subject to morality, to death. Not willingly, but when they partook the forbidden fruit, it was forced upon them whether they were willing or not. But the same God that made them subject to death has also given the hope of eternal life through Jesus Christ, to all that will obey him. So that more than was lost is found, through the Gospel of Christ. In 21st verse, the word *creature* refers to the humble child of God, who shall finish his life on earth in devotional service to God. All such will be brought from the grave, and with all the redeemed, shout the praises of God forever. In 22 verse, the word *creation*, refers to the whole race of man, as they all now groan, and travail in pain, under the mighty weight of mortality. The sufferings arising from mortality are immense. All groan and suffer until death takes them to the tomb. Even the saints themselves do not escape this. Hence in 23rd verse, we learn that the Christians though they receive the first fruits of the Spirit still groan and suffer under the pains, and diseases, and sufferings of mortality. The religion of Jesus is not intended to relieve us from the consequences of

mortality in this life. Hence the Christian will suffer pain, disease and death here; but thanks be to God, he has the hope of everlasting life beyond the tomb, where all sufferings will be ended.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S.: If it is not too burdensome, please give your views on 1st Tim. 1 chap. 20th verse, and 5th chap. 24th and 25th verses, through the Advocate.

Yours in hope,

N. B. ESTEP.

County Line, Ga.

1. "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." From this we understand that by the direction of Paul, the church of which these men were members, had withdrawn from them, as the church at Corinth was also directed in a similar case by Paul. They had done wickedly, and could no longer be tolerated as Christians, and had to be put away from among the saints, that the church might be relieved from the burden of their bad conduct, and that they might cease to blaspheme—might cease to do wickedly, and learn to do well, so that possibly by this punishment they might be reclaimed from their wicked ways and thereby saved. When Christians do wickedly, they virtually give themselves to Satan, by serving him. And in such cases, where they will not cease from such a course, the church ought to deliver them over to the dominion of Satan, the world, where they belong, until they repent,

and turn from the evil of their ways. And when they do manifest sincere repentance, they should again be restored to the fellowship of the congregation.

2. "Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some men they follow after.

Likewise also the good works of some are manifest beforehand, and they that are otherwise cannot be hid."

This passage is a little difficult. We suppose he means that the sins, or wrong doing of some of the members, will be of an open, plain character, so that the church can readily perceive these wrongs, and bring them to judgment, in the church, in this life.

While in the case of others, they so manage their sins, as to keep them hid from the church a long while, or even to the close of life. But although such may elude the vigilance of the church, they cannot elude the vigilance of God, and so their sins will follow after them to the judgment seat of Christ, and come up against them and hurl them down to ruin. No man can hide his sins from God. He may hide them from his fellow men, but not from the all-searching eye of Jehovah.

So also the good works of some are open and visible to all around them, while the works of others are known only to themselves and God. But no one need ever be afraid that a good work, done in the name of Christ, will ever be blest. God will know it. Many Christians no doubt are passing their lives away in apparent obscurity, who are all the time doing good in the name of the Master, and they will receive their reward at the judgment seat of Christ.

And those who do otherwise, cannot long be hid. If the Church does not find them out and bring them to judgment here, the Lord will soon overtake them.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S: Should a woman who has married her mother's husband, (though her mother be dead) be admitted into the church? Is this a parallel case to the one spoken of by Paul in 1 Cor. 5. 1.

Was the ordaining of Matthias in first chapter of Acts, done by the authority of God or not, if it was, were there not 13 apostles? Please answer through the ADVOCATE and oblige a Brother.

S. T. BRIGHT.

Nevada County, Ark., April, 26th. 1874.

We certainly say that cohabitation with a mother's husband, (for marriage in the sight of God it cannot be) is adultery of the most degrading character. No legal forms, if any law should be so devoid of all sentiment of decency as to sanction it, can make it anything else than degrading adultery. No continuance for length of time in the State, can destroy its debasing character. Certainly a church should not think of receiving a person who is a party to such beastly degradation without a deep and thorough repentance for the sin. He stood as her father. We have no doubt that the laws of God, as given to Israel, regulating the marriage relation is an expression of what God saw to be good for the world and such as meets his approval.

A better system of Hygiene for

the good of man, morally and physically, has never been seen than that given by God to the Jewish people. We do not think a better one ever will be known. Read Levit. 18. 6. to end.

We know of no reason to call in question the validity of the apostles in choosing Matthias, to take the place of Judas. Luke evidently considered it a part of the divine record. We accept his judgment in the matter without a doubt.

We knew of no reason why there should be only twelve apostles.

Apostle means, simply, one sent. The Savior chose twelve apostles, sent by him to the Jewish nation. We suppose to correspond to the twelve tribes of the Jews. Judas fell from his apostleship. Matthias was chosen in his stead.

They were by pre-eminence the apostles to the Jews, to bear witness to them concerning Christ, his work and teaching.

But when the Gentiles were called, he sent Paul to them as the apostle to the Gentiles. Barnabas was also called an apostle, Acts 14-14.

Others are apostles of the churches, in Greek—translated into English, Messengers 2 Cor. 8-23. The word in Greek is *apostolos*, sent, that is universally used to indicate the apostles of Christ.

D. L.

Honor to Whom Honor is Due.

Bro. Lipscomb: In No. 22. of GOSPEL ADVOCATE you speak of your trip to Barren Co. Ky. In that you say, "Bro. Alsop had in a small section built up and put to worship ten

or a dozen congregations of active disciples." While it has been my lot to perform near this amount of work in other sections where I have formerly labored, I have not done so in this section. I had the pleasure, during last year, of adding many to the cause of our blessed Master, throughout this country. On the fourth Lord's day in May, of this year, with the assistance and counsel of Bro. U. Wright, a congregation was set to work at Centerville Tenn. of perhaps about thirty members. We remained with them three days, and six were added by confession and baptism.

We have two more points in Barren Co., where we hope congregations will be set to work before the year closes, much of the material being already gathered at present. It has been chiefly through the labors of Brother U. Wright that the cause has gained a footing in this country.

Some seventeen years ago, he left the Baptist people, under many difficulties, took a stand on the Bible with the disciples of Christ when there were but very few who would contend for the Bible alone, unmixed with the traditions of men, and having no Evangelist in this region of country, at that time, he began immediately to talk and plead for the cause; for many years he stood alone and contended earnestly for the faith, sowing the good seed, and waiting patiently for the harvest to ripen. He has now the pleasure of seeing many of his neighbors and friends yield to the terms of the Prince of Life. I. H. Smith, his brother-in-law, has stood with him a tried and constant friend, whose sin-

cerity and undoubted integrity, has won for him the affection of this people.

Isaac T. Reneau, an old and tried veteran, of marked ability, has done much throughout this country. He, though the eldest, is still in the harness, laboring faithfully for the cause he has almost spent a life in supporting. When I look around me and see,

That a few more days or years at most,
And they will reach fair Canaan's coast,

the troublesome question arises, Who will take their places and toil as they have done? It certainly must be a proud period in their lives, to stand at their present point of observation and view the stormy sea through which they have passed, to look over their trials, when their race is well nigh run—having the blessed assurance, that the Lord, for whom they labored and toiled, will call them to a home of rest, peace and joy. Our veterans are fast passing away, their warnings are left on the pages of the many periodicals in the land. We would fain bid them stay a few more years and cheer us with their kind word of counsel.

We sincerely hope that enough may be gathered from the rising generation to honorably fill their places and oppose with boldness the "progressive" movements among us, in some portions of our great country. Who will contend earnestly for the truth and hate every false way?

Yours in hope of life,

A. ALSTUP, JR.

Dry Fork, Barren Co., Ky. June 9th., 1874.

Church News.

Brethren L. & S: As I have never seen anything in the Advocate from this part of our State, I thought I would drop you a few lines in order to inform you and your numerous readers, how the good cause is progressing here. When I came to this State, five years ago, I was a total stranger to the gospel. I had, it is true, heard a great deal of Methodism, Presbyterianism, Baptistism, and the like, but had never heard a gospel sermon; nor truth enough to save me from eternal ruin. Not only is this true, but when I arrived here, I found the people entirely ignorant, (with a few exceptions) of that knowledge that makes wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. There was not a gospel preacher in fifty miles of this place. Sectarianism held full sway. The glorious gospel of the Son of God was called by all the ugly names that sectarian malice and animosity could invent. Darkness, ignorance and superstition shrouded the minds of the people. I do not mean ignorance in a literary point of view, but ignorance of God's truth.

In January 1870, Bro. E. M. Northum, an able and successful preacher of the gospel, through the earnest solicitations of Bro. J. P. Rogers, came down here and commenced preaching with very good results. He continued to preach during the year, at this and other points, organized several congregations, and added about two hundred recruits to the army of the faithful. Since that time the cause has been

progressing slowly but steadily. At our last annual meeting, held in October, Bro. John H. Vandyck, formerly of Paris, Tennessee, and more recently of Louisville, Kentucky, was employed to evangelize in south Arkansas and north Louisiana. He has, since that time, been preaching with very good results. He is an able and efficient preacher, and will, I hope, accomplish a great deal of good during the year. The prospects for a great ingathering into the army of the faithful, are very good, in many parts of the country. Yet, in other parts of the country, there are hundreds whose minds are still shrouded in darkness through which the rays of the sunlight of heavenly truth have never penetrated. They turn away from the gospel as unworthy the attention of a people who are led by the unerring words of a specially called and sent and qualified ministry, who teach them to rely upon the emotional feelings of the heart as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. These false teachers and blind guides adopt the logic, "I have only to consult my feelings, all I feel to be right is right to me." And thus, they endeavor by special pleading, sophistry, and unwarrantable assertions, to keep the people away from the truth, and create darkness when the clear light of heavenly truth should shine in all its brilliancy and glory. And notwithstanding the Savior prayed so earnestly that his disciples and all who should be induced to believe on him through their words, should be one; and, notwithstanding the apostles admonished and exhorted their brethren to avoid all those who caused divisions and offen-

ces among them—to be perfectly joined together in the same mind, walk by the same rule and speak the same things, these men claiming to be specially called and sent of God to bear the glad tidings of life and salvation to a world lost and ruined in sin, are telling the people, that division is one of the grandest beauties of Christianity—God intends for Christians to remain divided, that they cannot all see alike; that the union of Christians would result in crime and bloodshed. My God, what unbelief! What infidelity!! Would not Paul say to one of these men, “Thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, how long wilt thou not cease to pervert the right way of the Lord?”

Nay more, are they not doing more to prevent the spread of truth, the diffusion of gospel knowledge, and the progress of the cause of Zion's king than all the infidels that have lived since the days of Celsus? I maintain that they are. Thousands on thousands of the seed of Abraham refuse to obey the gospel on account of these divisions. I might offer proof of this if I had time and space, but for lack of time and space to write, I must desist.

Not only is this true in reference to the Jews, but many of the best and most intelligent citizens of our State have, for the same cause, refused to obey the gospel. Talk to them about becoming Christians and they reply, we know not what church to join. It is impossible for all to be right while traveling in so many different directions. Make peace among yourselves, and then come to

Brethren, we occupy the most

exalted position of any religious body on earth. Let us therefore be circumspect. Let us hold fast the profession of faith. The eyes of the religious world are upon us. Every fault (of ours) is magnified a hundred fold. To you, dear brethren, who are engaged in editing and publishing the Advocate, I would say, go on in the good work in which you are engaged. You are doing a great work. Many of your productions will be read with interest when you are gone. Finally, brethren, pray for us, that we may be enabled to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints; that we may aid in rolling on the grand car of God's eternal truth, till it shall spread from east to west, and from north to south, till it shall cover the face of the earth as the waters do the channels of the great deep, till all be brought to know the Lord, whom to know, is life eternal.

Your young brother,

W. T. BREEDLOVE.

Woodlawn, Ark., May 4th, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: On Friday the 8th day of last month I bade adieu to the loved ones at home for a tour among the hills bordering the Cumberland river. After a tiresome ride of 65 miles I began a meeting on Lord's day at Lafayette, Macon county. The brethren here have built them a neat and substantial frame meeting-house. They meet regularly on the first day of the week and seem to be alive to the Master's cause. Our meeting continued from Sunday till Friday night with large and attentive congregations. Sixteen confessed their faith in Jesus Christ

as the Son of God and were buried with him in baptism. Two of the number were from the Baptist church. The brethren were encouraged and much prejudice removed from the minds of the people. Saturday the 16th I went to Gainsboro, Jackson County. Although Gainsboro is near or quite fifty years old, situated in the midst of a kind-hearted, generous community, there has never been a church house in the town. We have several good sisters and a few noble brethren striving to build up the cause in their midst. We did the best we could to set things in order and the brethren promised to go to work and keep the ordinances as delivered by the Apostles. Three were added during our meeting, one from the Methodists, one reclaimed and one by commendation. Friday night, May 22, through the courtesy of the Methodist church at Cookville I preached in their house to a large congregation. We have a few good brethren here. To these let me say, that the success of the cause of truth in your midst depends on yourselves; preach Christ by your daily walk. Actions rather than words must convince our neighbors that the religion of the Bible is the world's only hope.

Saturday 23, went to Sparta and preached three discourses. The church here is in good working order; and although considerable growth in grace and truth has been made within the last two or three years, there are some yet that need to realize that God demands a consecration of heart and life to his service. Reached home Monday and found all well, for which we devoutly thank the Giver

of all good. And now a word as to the good cause here. Five years ago this was an unpromising field for the good seed of the kingdom. Church house doors were closed against us, and preacher after preacher prepared himself for war against some hideous monster of the imagination called Campbellism. We went to the Court-house, where the people have heard for themselves, and as a result a goodly number have decided that to be a Christian is enough. Our congregation is in good working order. The brethren and sisters have not been too proud to meet weekly in the Court house to remember a Savior that was born in a stable. We have a good substantial house nearly completed. Men of the world have aided cheerfully and liberally.

Saturday before the 5th Lord's day I began a meeting five miles north of Lebanon, Wilson Co., in a house just finished the day before. Continued over two Lord's-days with fourteen baptisms, one a member of the Baptist Church; all but two or three of the others were raised under the influence of denominational teaching. Our veteran brother Huffman was with us two or three days and preached a very excellent discourse contrasting God's ways with the ways of man. A church of about 50 members was planted and the new house named Philadelphia. The brethren and sisters agreed to meet on the first day of the week to keep the ordinances. May they be as faithful as the church at Philadelphia in Asia.

J. M. KIDWELL.

Smithville, Tenn., June 10, 1874.

Dear Brethren : Although a stranger to you, permit me to trouble you with a few plain statements with reference to ourselves, and the cause which we love, in this City.

First, then, we are few in number, some 20 in all, and are poor. Some 18 months since, a Bro. and family, from Mo. came among us who is wealthy (Weston F. Birch) and we felt much encouraged, but now he and family are going further South to engage in the Iron business, so that in this respect our hope is gone. We have only five or six to pay anything save that it be a pittance each week as a weekly contribution. The most we can do under our present circumstances, would be to raise 300 Dollars beside paying Hall rent, where we meet.

We think this an important point for the Gospel to be preached, and shall it be kept out for the want of money?

We paid Dr. W. H. Hopson 125 dollars for a ten days meeting. His church promised to send him back to us again, as we understood it, at their own expense, but he has not come yet.

A Bro. H. B. Rice, who is now in Ill. at Rock Island, whose engagement with the church there will expire in Sept. has offered to come here, as his parents live in this country, but we could not sustain him in our present condition. Bro. R. was educated for a Prebyterian minister, and preached for that order for a time, but for some three years has been preaching for the Christian Church.

We feel that the right kind of a

man could build up a self-sustaining church here, in one year, and shall that fail for the want of a few dollars?

To all, let me say in conclusion. We intend to put our own shoulder to the wheel, to the utmost of our ability, and now call on you to assist us in this glorious work.

L. DELONG.

Chattanooga, Tenn. June 1874.

The Methodist on Intoxicating Liquors.

In the conference of the Methodist Episcopal church, (South) the minority report on temperance which provides, as an amendment to the general rules, that any person making, buying, selling or using as a beverage, intoxicating liquor, will be, upon conviction, debarred from membership in the church, was adopted by a vote of 335. The question caused a very animated and prolonged discussion. This action will be sent to the annual conference, and, if three fourths concur therewith, it will pass into a law.

There are some things in which the Methodist Church and the Church of Christ are alike, and some things in which they are widely different. They are alike in having written laws to control the conduct of their members. They differ with regard to the making power. Christ and the apostles make laws for one; conference for the other.

If the above mentioned action pass into a law, there will be another point of agreement in the laws of the two bodies. On the statute book of the Church of Christ there has been for over eighteen hundred years, act

"debaring from membership" just such characters as are contemplated in the late act of Conference.

There is, however, considerable difference as to the respective enactment of this law. It was passed for the Church of Christ early in its history; for the Methodist Church in its 146th year.

All friends of temperance will be glad to hear of the favorable reception of this act by the annual conference, as it will then become a law to the Methodist church, and we will have that large and influential body of people pledged to the cause of temperance. I trust many other societies will imitate their example. I have ever regarded the law of Christ on this subject, as well as others of vital importance, a model one, and would be glad to hear of its being adopted by all the religious and benevolent societies of the day.

It ought to be a matter of great congratulation to the members of the Church of Christ, that their law-maker had sufficient wisdom to make a perfect code of laws at first; and had not to wait for a "women's movement" to suggest a course of action.

A. C.

Personal.

Dear Brethren: Please grant me the privilege of saying a few words through your columns concerning our worthy and highly esteemed brother, Prof. W. Y. Taylor.

After devoting many years of his life to teaching school—and securing a position last year in Mars Hill

Academy which he has filled with ability and devotion, feeling, however, the importance and the great responsibility resting upon him, he has determined, if possible to abandon the school-room forever, and devote the remnant of his days in the proclamation of "the truth as it is in Jesus."

He does this without any promise of temporal remuneration, believing that the brethren will sustain him while he dispenses the "bread of life to a famishing world."

While it becomes necessary to procure the services of a teacher to fill his place, and while earnestness and goodness, and true devotion are indispensable prerequisites to obtaining a position in our school, we have no hope of securing a more agreeable, willing, ready, numble, earnest and devoted Christian co-laborer and we heartily commend him to the brotherhood everywhere as worthy in every respect.

T. B. LARIMORE.

Mars Hill Academy, Near Florence, Ala. June 9, 1874.

Fellowship.

We have rec'd. for bro. Shaw, from a brother at West Line Mo. \$5, from a sister at S. Harpeth Tenn. \$5, from a brother at Mifflin 2.20.

The Jollege Pen.

The June number of this Magazine is on our table, greatly enlarged and in handsome dress. The following is the table of contents for this number:

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Astronomy, Address to the Calhounclaynean, Temperance, Address to the Philetarean Literary Society, Formation of Character, Woman in Adversity, Christianity and Woman, Certamen Est Magnum.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY:

Sacking of Jerusalem, A Moon

light stroll among the ruins of Carthage, A Day at the Court of Isabella, Capture of Babylon.

MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENT:—

May-Day at Neophogen.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S DEPARTMENT:—

Fireside Angels, Education, The Mind,

EDITOR'S DEPARTMENT:—

A Pleasant surprise.

See the Advertisement on our advertising pages.

E. G. S.

Last Half of Vol. 16.

Next number, 26, begins the last half of the present year's volume. And we doubt not there are many who would gladly send us one dollar, and take the ADVOCATE the balance of the year, if the matter were only presented to them. We therefore ask our readers to present this matter to their brethren and friends and see how many they can add to our present list of subscribers. We are satisfied that just a little attention on their part would greatly enlarge our subscription list, and thus largely extend our field of usefulness. The ADVOCATE certainly ought to be read by more than now read it, and might be, with a little exertion.

We intend, by the help of God to make the ADVOCATE more and more useful, both in the edification of the churches, and in teaching aliens the way of truth and righteousness. We are exceedingly anxious to see the ADVOCATE established upon a still firmer basis, and see its field of usefulness much enlarged. To do this we must have the number of subscri-

bers increased. May we not hope then that the brethren everywhere will aid some in this work? Just a little aid from each one of our readers would amount to a very great lift to us, and to great extension of the Cause of truth.

ED'RS.

Cleanliness.

In 1872 several cases of typhoid fever occurred in families living in Leeds, England. These families were dotted about in different localities without any apparent regularity. On close examination the physician found that every family attacked was supplied with milk by the same man, but his family had uninterrupted health. They used none of the milk themselves. He obtained his milk from a farm house in the country. On visiting the farm it was ascertained that there were six persons in the family ill with typhoid fever, in a room adjoining the one in which the milk cans were kept, and that the woman who handled the milk also nursed the sick. During the summer of 1873 a dozen or more inmates of a boarding school were taken ill, showing typhoid symptoms. On examining into the milk supply, it was ascertained that the water used to wash the milk vessels came from a well into which was leaking a water-closet pipe.

Commendatory.

Brethren A. C. and A. B. Carnes are travelling somewhat extensively over the country, and desire to meet and worship with the brethren where they travel, and we hereby bespeak for them brotherly kindness and Christian regards, wherever they may go.

ED'RS.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

The Strange Glass.

Did you ever see a glass that always makes things seen through it, appear larger or smaller than they really are? So they are never seen to be what they are but changed, depending only upon how you look at them or through which end of this glass they are seen? The number of the human family that use it is not small by any means. Did you ever hear several individuals rehearsing their trials in life? Was not each eloquent in describing his own particular troubles, and did he not shake a significant head, with the very complacent remark, "oh, I know you never suffered like me." Looking at others' woes through one end of this glass, they appear smaller than they really are, whilst ours are magnified by the same glass into unreasonable proportions. 'Tis not an uncommon thing for small aches to grow to the size of distressing pains, losses of an indifferent character are groaned over and talked about as if a lifetime earnings were gone, all ability to make more departed forever, whilst the carelessness and unconcern with which we look at the real afflictions and ruinous misfortunes of others, show, at once, that we see them much smaller than they are. The ancients said every person carried two bags or wallets, the one in front with troubles and trials in it; the other behind, bears the complaints of others. These they could

not see readily and consequently gave themselves but little trouble about that which did not annoy their eyes, but these were always in sight and of course seeing them the bag carrier talked about them and made complaints about them. But the glass is used in many ways or to look at many things. Especial use is made of it in calculating interest and profit. Two men go to settle after some transactions. Each using one of these glasses sees his own interest in the affair great and his neighbors small, so they cannot agree upon what is right. When the matter is decided according to justice, both are astonished and dissatisfied, so in dealing with others and attending to business for them, their welfare is a small thing compared with one's own when using this glass, in swapping horses, selling goods or otherwise trading, men only glance through the end of the glass that looks after their neighbors wealth (interest I mean) whilst they take continuous strong looks at their own which is made very great for the sake of gain. Thus they can afford to swindle or see others cheat themselves as it is called by the aid of this wonderful instrument. This reaches all trades, professions and callings. Preachers are quite as nimble in turning and peeping when viewing flock and fleece as others. Extortion has its origin in the recess of these lenses. Whenever men attempt to look at others wants, through their own, they fail to see them, for so many and so great are home desires that rays carrying distress cannot penetrate them. 'Tis folly to try to see others through a body as one of these glasses make self-Christians (so-called) use this glass of selfishness, but 'tis done only

when they throw away the best one in the world called the perfect law of liberty. This makes man free from all such evil spirits as living and caring for self and no one else. Jesus Christ makes us free from the practice of it. But in order to enjoy this last, it devolves upon us to be servants of righteousness. We must make it our business of life to *serve* right; Christ sets us free from the commission of sin by placing us under himself as our guide, and 'tis only when we leave his protection and rule that we sin. This we often do, however. No one will ever sin if he lets Christ reign in his heart. You see then we are free from sin by coming into a kingdom, by keeping the laws of which we are kept from sin, and whose rule positively forbids it. The New Testament is intended to take away such glasses as we have spoken of, that the man of God may see by the pure light of heaven. Our Savior speaks of two kinds of lights. The single and the evil. His subjects should (do) have single eyes and receiving the light from the sun of righteousness, they are able to "seek another's wealth or advantage and not their own peculiarly," "not their own profit but that of many," and "look not every man to his own things but every man also on the things of others."

"When each can feel his brothers sigh,
And with him bear a part.
When sorrow flows from eye to eye,
Aud joy from heart to heart."

We use this glass in looking into the future. Especial use is made of it in looking at God's blessings. The end that makes them small is of very general use. I know a preacher who is ever spying out hard times. He predicts "bad crops this year," "oh

you have never seen things just as they are about to be."

With such a book as the Bible at command, and such a God as that to rules over this world it does seem to me that we have to set aside too much of truth and common sense to reach the place of evil prognosticating complaining, whining, sighing. I know two farmers, one looks at everything so as to make much less than it really is. He is gloomy accordingly. The other can see some good in everything. His wheat had the rust, "Oh I've seen it worse than it is now and we still made a good crop. If one thing is not so good he can see where another is better. As to hard times he can see many good things coming from that too. He does not know but that misfortunes are blessings in disguise, so they look small to him whilst God's good gifts are full sized, in his eyes. The one of these men approaches as the dark, gloomy, lowering cloud, the other like the rising sun scatters light joy and beauty all around.

What a world we would have if all its inhabitants were muttering volcanoes of society, ready at any time to pour out a furious blast of complaints and cast its gloomy effects upon all around. If all that God has given and promised, cannot take men out of the valley of trouble, despondency, and despair, and place them on the mountain of hope and joy then they have a hankering for sadness. Looking through this glass is a small letter, whilst I is very large. Your character and mine are viewed in the same way. Let our eyes be single.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Love to God.....	601
The Lineage of Christ.....	605
Teaching and Baptizing—who has the right	606
"Ministerial Supply".....	608
Queries.....	609
Honor to whom Honor is due.....	615
Church News.....	617
The Methodists on intoxicating Liquors.....	620
Personal.....	621
The College Pet.....	621
1rst half of Vol. 16.....	622
Cleanliness.....	622
Fireside.....	
The Strange Class.....	624

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 27.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JULY 2, 1874.

Laying on Hands—Once More.

Bro. L. has "grave doubts if ever hands were formally imposed, save for imparting spiritual gifts." He has grave doubts as to the truth of this proposition: "Only those who received power directly from Christ could transmit it to others." He thinks it is not practical; yet devotes much of his article to it, which shows that it is very useful in determining the truth on this subject. When we decide upon it, the way is open to an easy solution of the main proposition.

The first case examined is that of the Samaritans. Bro. L. admits "that there were none at Samaria that could impart spiritual gifts, save the apostles—because no one save the apostles possessed spiritual gifts there, until they had imparted it to others." This admission is fatal to his position. This admission is true—the reason assigned contradicts truth and Bro. Lipscomb too. Miracles and signs were done, before the apostles came, by Phillip, who, according to Bro. L., was "in direct

communication with the Spirit, under its inspiring guidance." Why did Philip impart Spiritual gifts? Why send to Jerusalem for the apostles? The answer must be that none but the apostles—not even Philip, one of the seven—could impart spiritual gifts to others.

Bro. L. has said enough on Paul's case to satisfy me, and most any one else, that Paul received the miraculous gift of the Spirit, either at his commission or very soon after. I took no position as to the time; but was inclined to the belief that he was commissioned and qualified at the same time. The question is whether he received it then directly from Christ, or afterward through the hands of Ananias—certainly he received it about this time, for he confounded the Jews at Damascus. In the first place, we do not think he received the Holy Spirit through the laying on of Ananias' hands; for Philip could not confer this power, it seems, and how, then could Ananias? Bro. L. is surprised when I say Ananias only conferred the ordinary gift through baptism. He certainly did do this, for he baptized Saul.

Now did he confer anything further? I doubt it—I seriously doubt it. Let Bro. L. prove it.

He also thinks it strange that I should have Paul receiving extraordinary and then the ordinary gift. But he falls into the same dilemma. He has Paul receiving the extraordinary gift at the hands of Ananias, and afterward he received the ordinary gift when Ananias baptized him. We only differ as to the length of time between the gifts, and not to the priority. We have stumbled upon the truth, Bro. L. Cornelius and his house received it in this order too; for they spoke with tongues before they were baptized. Surely the gift that fell upon them was not that gift which the world cannot receive.

But is it not probable that Paul received this gift directly as did Cornelius and his house? The other people were qualified as well as commissioned by Christ, and Paul says, "I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." Moreover, concerning the gospel, he says, "I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." "When it pleased God ** to reveal his son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." It was by this revelation of Christ that he was endowed with apostolic power. Then Timothy received the gift from Paul, who received his power from Christ. So far, then, "every one who did impart Spiritual gifts by imposition of hands received it directly from Christ." We conclude "that none others could impart because none others did im-

part it. If Bro. L. will show us one clear case, we will give it up. He cannot show that any one but the apostles ever did transmit these gifts. The case of Ananias will not do. Concerning it he first says, "We infer," growing warmer, he says, "We irresistably conclude;" and finally, "We have shown clear evidence." It grows under his hand. His mere inference becomes clear evidence! This is worse than a "mere guess." I want a little clearer evidence.

On the main proposition, much is not necessary. The Scriptures do not say in so many words that laying on hands was for the setting apart of the deacons. But the apostles said they would appoint them; they laid hands on them, says the historian; then the laying on of hands was the mode of appointing them. This is the one thing which the apostles did. Now, Bro. L. has nothing to offset this. Nothing in the transaction favors his view. It is a little amusing to hear him say that each "must have a gift of the Spirit to guide him in the work." They were all men full of the Spirit; but that they needed any miraculous gift to "serve tables" is not very evident, especially when the apostles were present.

In the case of Barnabas and Saul, hands were imposed again without saying what for. But the brethren were commanded to "separate i. e. Barnabas and Saul;" they laid hands upon them; then laying on hands is a form of separating, or setting apart. In every case of appointment, we find that hands were laid upon the persons appointed. In these cases appointment is mentioned, while the gift of the Spirit is not. Besides

Barnabas is said to be full of the Spirit before this transaction. How, then could it be to confer the Holy Spirit? Barnabas and Paul had preached, had received extraordinary gifts of the Spirit and doubtless had used them before this. Bro. L. says that Paul "knew personally none of the churches of Judea, but confined his labors, from the beginning, to the heathen regions, where Christ had not been preached." But Paul says, "first unto them at Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles etc." Before this setting apart at Antioch, Barnabas and Paul had carried relief to the bretheren who dwelt in Judea. So that it appears that he labored with the Jews awhile, and this setting apart marked the beginning of his labors among the Gentiles, of whom he was the great apostle. It is true he preached some to the Gentiles before; but he had not before this begun the great work to which he had been called.

Paul laid hands on Timothy and he received a gift. Bro. L. has not shown that this was the gift of the Spirit or of office or something else. He guesses it was the Spirit. He says it was conferred by the hands of Paul and others jointly, called "the hands of the Presbytery." He has not proved this. He cannot prove that Paul was one of the Presbytery. It is admitted that, at the time Paul conferred the gift, that the presbtery also laid their hands upon him for some purpose. It was not to confer the gift, for Paul says he did that. But as hands have been imposed for appointment, we conclude that Timothy was appointed by the hands of

the Presbytery and empowered by the hands of Paul.

C. M. W.

Our brother understands the art of shifting responsibilities from his own shoulders to others. Therefore he complains time and again that bro. Lipscomb does not prove this, that and the other. My dear sir, bro. Lipscomb started out to prove nothing in the world. He is not logically or justly called upon to prove a single thing. You are the man that must do the proving. You laid down the position that none save the apostles or those receiving the Spirit directly from Christ could impart it to others. Our only work is to object and deny. Your work is to prove. We did throw objections in the way, and give explanations that fully harmonize with other Scriptures, the cases on which you rely for your other proposition, that hands in apostolic days were laid upon persons to induct them into office.

In reference to the Samaritans, he assumes Philip was at Samaria, when Peter and John came down. This is an assumption devoid of foundation. Philip was traveling and preaching. He made but little stay in any place. He preached in various places. He is represented as being sent to the South of Jerusalem toward Gaza, and then made a tour of all the cities, in this same chapter. But these are not given in close and regular order, as to time.

The knowledge of events did not spread then as now. News traveled slowly. Paul was a noted persecutor. Nothing would more likely attract attention than his conversion. No

report spread more rapidly. Yet three years afterward the apostles and they of Jerusalem were ignorant of this conversion. They were afraid of him, and Barnabas had to vouch for his conversion before they would believe it. Samaria was not so far from Jerusalem as Damascus. Yet between the two countries there was very little communication. It may have been a full year before the apostles came down. It may have been a less time. But a conclusion based on the presumption that Philip was then there, is a very doubtful one.

Why did not Philip impart the Spirit when there? I do not know. Neither do I know why the apostles failed to impart it to thousands to whom they preached. It is probable that, as the Jews doubted if the Samaritans were proper subjects of Gospel grace, Philip could not take so great a step, but leave it to Peter, who properly was entitled to open the door of the kingdom to the nations of the earth.

The case fails utterly to prove that none save those who received the Spirit directly from Christ could impart it to others. It proves the Apostles could and did impart it. It proves nothing more.

Our brother ridicules the idea that the seven needed a special gift to serve tables. One thing is sure. Either persons possessing special gifts of the Spirit were chosen to do this work, or special gifts were given to enable them to do it. If they had the special gifts before, they were chosen because the gifts were needed to enable them to discharge faithfully and well this most difficult and delicate work ever imposed upon the church. It had

been neglected or abused by those with and without the gifts, even with the apostles present.

I do not hesitate to say that this work was and is the most difficult to perform of any required of the church. We fear our brother has never done much of it, else he would think differently concerning it.

We say again: In the light of the truth, that in every instance of laying on of hands in the Bible, where the design is specifically stated, it is said to be for the impartation of the Spirit and of the further truth; that here the exercise of spiritual gifts, not mentioned previous to this time, followed immediately the imposition of hands, we have grave doubts whether the hands were not laid upon them to impart the Spirit, to enable them to do the work to which they were appointed.

On Paul's case our brother connects his conclusion with our premise and calls the absurdity ours. He says we have Paul receiving the miraculous gift of the Spirit from Ananias, and then the ordinary gift through baptism. We have no such thing. We do not believe that Peter told the household of Cornelius to be baptized and they should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the reason they had already received it. The greater measure contains the lesser. God saw fit to give the Spirit to them in a fuller measure, when ready to receive baptism as an evidence to the Jews that he had accepted them. So with Paul. It seems to me a most absurd thing, that Christ should have given Paul the gift of the Spirit that enabled him to confound others, and to

preach the gospel to the heathen with power and grace, and yet for three days, while possessed of this spirit he should not know what to do himself. It was strange inspiration, truly and surely. Then for Ananias to tell Paul, "the Lord sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost" when Paul already possessed a much fuller measure of the Spirit than Ananias, seems to me a little unreasonable. Yet according to our brother's theory this is true. Paul possessed, according to him, the highest apostolic gift, received directly from Christ, Ananias only the modest gift of a teacher received in some other way at second hand.

Our brother is now convinced that Paul received it about this time. We may safely say we hope, that he believes he received it either when the Savior appeared to him or when Ananias laid hands on him. Now does he, does any one, believe that Paul was possessed of the gifts of the Spirit and that too in the full apostolic measure, those three days of darkness, distress and uncertainty, when he did not know what to do? I think our brother on reflection will not say he believes this. The gifts of the Spirit conferred wisdom and knowledge of the divine mind. The apostolic measure imparted the mind of God to them. 1st Cor. 2-12. There is but one alternative "about this time" he received the gift of the Spirit that inspired him. The gift of the Spirit that comes through baptism did not inspire. It must have come when Ananias laid hands on him, and said, "the Lord sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight

and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Certainly, too, the connection shows that these were to come as the results of laying on of hands.

Again, the Savior appeared to Saul on the way. Our brother thinks he then imparted to him the Spirit. He imparted the Spirit to none others in this way, by personal appearance. He told the twelve, "I must go away, if I go not away the comforter will not come." He could not come while Jesus was here in person. None received the Spirit from him when personally present.

Paul saying, "I was not a whit behind the chiefest apostles, and that I received not the Gospel of man, and that it pleased God to reveal his Son in him, that he might preach him among the heathen. Certainly Christ appeared to Paul and revealed Christ in Paul, and this was done through the Spirit. But this has not the most remote bearing on this question that I can see. And why the Spirit received through the imposition of hands of a servant of God, should make a man behind others who received it otherwise, provided he received as full a measure of the Spirit, I cannot see. Ananias placed his hand on Paul, and said he was sent that he might receive his sight and the Holy Spirit. He received his sight and the manifestation was such that he said, "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins," Peter when the Holy Spirit came at the house of Cornelius, said who can forbid water that these should not be baptized, and he commanded them to be baptized.

Ananias needed conviction that Paul a noted persecutor and blas-

phemer was accepted of God. Peter and the Jews needed evidence that the Gentiles were accepted, he gave the testimony in each case and doubtless the same testimony.

Bro. Wilmeth says Bro. L. has not shown that the gift to Timothy was a gift of the Spirit or a gift of office or something else. Bro. Lipscomb never undertakes to show things of which he knows nothing. Bro. Lipscomb has never yet learned a thing about a gift of office in the Bible, or that there be such a gift. And if office be a gift he does not see how it could dwell in a man. Bro. Lipscomb reads of the gifts of the Spirit conferred by laying on of hands and no other. When he reads of a gift dwelling in a teacher and as teachers were gifted persons, and that that gift was given by the laying on of hands, he accepts it as such without trying to prove anything about it. We would expect Romanists and Episcopalians to talk of the gift and grace of office, but we hardly expected a free born child in our Father's household thus to speak. Nor does bro. Wilmeth believe it, it was a diversion to carry a point.

Paul says, "Paul the Presbyter." (Presbutas) Phil. verse 9. He says the gift was given by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. It was given by my hands. This is all we said. We never undertake to prove Paul's language true.

Our brother questions the accuracy of our statements concerning Paul not laboring with or knowing personally the churches of the Jews. We give Paul's statement, "neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into

Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.

"Now of the things which I write unto you, before God I lie not. Afterward I came into the regions of Syria and Silicia; and was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ Jesus. But they heard only, that he, which persecutes us in times past now preacheth the faith which he once destroyed and they glorified God in me." Gal. 1. 17-24. Which shows our statement to be accurate.

Now brethren we have dwelt upon this subject much more than we had intended. But it must be evident to all that much of the idea concerning laying on of hands as induction into office is involved in doubt and uncertainty. A man must believe that Paul was endowed with all the gifts of knowledge and wisdom pertaining to the apostolic work, while he was waiting in distress and sorrow for three days, not knowing what to do that he might be saved, or that he received gifts of the Spirit by the imposition of the hands of Ananias. For he was possessed of spiritual gifts from this time onward. He must believe that while possessed of a much fuller measure of the Spirit than Ananias, yet Ananias was sent to him that he might receive the Holy Spirit, or he must believe, when Ananias put his hands on him, and said "the Lord sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost," and then and there he did receive the Holy Ghost as well as his sight.

It is clear and plain too that he was simply recognized as a prophet and a teacher too, because he did only the work of such, and manifested only the gifts and powers of such, until the laying on of the hands of the teachers at Antioch, then he assumed the position, did the work, and manifested the gifts and powers of an apostle. Laying on of hands conferred Spiritual gifts. Hands are laid on, spiritual gifts of an unusual and extraordinary character are immediately manifested. Brethren make of it what you will, we have grave doubts if hands were ever formally imposed in Apostolic time save for the impartation of Spiritual gifts, because in every case, save two, it is said specifically, it was for the impartation of Spiritual gifts or spiritual gifts are the result, and in two cases gifts and powers hitherto unknown are immediately manifested by those on whom hands are laid. They are never said to be laid for another purpose.

D. L.

LETTERS TO JACOB CREATH.

NO. IX.

Some months ago we published a letter from the *Review*, written by B. F. Leonard to Jacob Creath. He has been addressing a series of articles to Elder Creath through the *Review* in regard to the fidelity of the disciples to their principles. He has reached number nine in his series, which we herewith give to our readers. We know not who B. F. Leonard is. He assumes to be an observant and friendly outsider familiar with our teachings and our practices, regret-

ting our betrayal of our early professions. He certainly is familiar with our teachings and our practice, and has not failed to mark the discrepancy between them. We commend the article to our readers.

DEAR SIR:—I now approach a subject, the discussion of which I would gladly avoid, did I perceive a disposition on the part of your abler writers to set the question side by side with the great principle that has so far occupied our attention, and to draw conclusions that I consider in harmony with the principle itself. I mean the propriety of your having schools designed to prepare young men for what is called the ministry. You have abandoned the old and more appropriate name of "Theological Seminary" for that of "Bible College;" but because you have thus exchanged names it does not follow that you have in hand an institution differing in any wise from that possessed by the "sects." Shakespeare asks, "What's in a name? implying that there is nothing in it. Every attentive observer of human affairs, however, has noticed that the world in general is ruled by names. When your people first started a theological institute for the education of candidates for the clerical profession the enterprise would have been ruined at once had the current name (then made odious among you by the *Christian Baptist*) been applied to the school. Your wise men managed this matter most admirably, I admit, by rejecting the old appellation and introducing the euphonious but deceptive name, "Bible College." Your people, of course, could not

but patronize schools that promised instruction in the Scriptures under the supervision of able professors sound in the faith. Hence, as a religious body, you are in some measure committed to a system which A. Campbell once denounced with great severity.

I repeat that I would gladly avoid the discussion of this subject. I would avoid it, not because I perceive any weakness in that side of the question which I feel compelled to take, but because I dislike to stir up those prejudices generally manifested when a favorite but foolish or injurious scheme is boldly attacked. As a people you have largely engaged in these pious educational enterprises. You have expended much money and given much time to make them successful. You have so far obtained from them what you think are good results. When a stranger, therefore, or even one of your own brethren, calls their lawfulness or expediency into question he will almost certainly find arrayed against him an indignant host of men whose interests or associations determine them to defend that order of things which already obtains. Whately says there is a presumption in favor of every existing institution. Most men act in accordance with this principle. They take for granted that "whatever is, is right," and are seldom willing to listen candidly to a person who demands of them a valid reason, or, rather, who shows them that they have no such reason, for the things which they hold or practice. Men, like horses, love to travel in the beaten path with the wheels in the ruts. They seldom need persuasion to keep

the old path of carnal expediency, but sometimes all the logic and rhetoric in the world will not induce them to seek the true scriptural way. Now your college men, I judge, will avail themselves of this bent in human nature. They have established themselves among you; they possess the land; and who is bold enough to attempt to dislodge them from their strong towers? Perhaps I can disturb their fancied security without danger to myself. I am too far off for the shafts of contumely to hurt me; and as I write neither for bread nor popularity, I can afford to tell the truth without reserve.

Were I very anxious about my safety, however, when attacked by some Bombastes Furioso, more dangerous to his friends than to his foes, I could shelter myself behind a man large enough to cover me and many more from all the darts that furious collegiates can ever hurl. I allude to A. Campbell. Let us turn to the sixth volume of the *Christian Baptist* and hear him speak in the strength of his manhood before witching expediency led him astray:

"A few men in the United States, not more, perhaps, than half a dozen Doctors of Divinity, have done more within forty years to divest the Baptists of their ancient simplicity and love for the Bible than all the Doctors of Modern Divinity among them will restore in one century. Scarcely a relict of the ancient simplicity of the Waldenses, Albigenes, and those persecuted Christians from whom the Baptists in these United States are proud to reckon their descent, or to identify with themselves as fellow-professors of the same gospel and

order of worship, now remains. These modern good and wise *leading men*, being intoxicated with titles and worldly respectability, have co-operated to become imitators of their more respectable neighbors, the Presbyterians and Episcopalians. They have formed a young St. Giles for every old St. Giles among the Pedobaptists, and have actually got the whole machinery of the popular establishment in full employment to build up great meeting-houses, parsonages and colleges; to have a learned priesthood, tithes and offerings, conventions, missionaries, tracts and education societies, with all the 'benevolent schemes' of the day. And those who will not say *Amen* to the whole paraphernalia are heretics, unregenerated sinners like myself. Their more fortunate and more respectable neighbors are pleased to see them follow up in the *rear*, for they want to see them of the same spirit with themselves, knowing full well that they can always *keep them in the rear!*"

This was given as a true picture of the Baptists in the year 1828. Alas! that we must call it a truer picture of the Disciples in the year of greater light—1874! Your "wise and leading men," the avowed admirers and reputed followers of this same Alexander Campbell, are now "intoxicated with titles and worldly respectability." They are "co-operating to become imitators of their more respectable neighbors." They "have actually got the whole machinery of the popular establishments in full employment TO BUILD UP GREAT MEETING HOUSES, parsonages and COLLEGES; to have a learned priesthood, tithes and offerings; conven-

tions, missionaries, tract and education societies, with all the benevolent schemes of the day." As with the Baptists then, so with you now. Your "more fortunate and respectable neighbors" are delighted to see you bury the hatchet, and "follow in the rear" in the grand march of worldly progression. Yes, and those among you "who will not say *Amen* to the whole scheme of carnality," are classed with the "unregenerated"—with the natural, unrefined, unspiritual rabble. Let a late writer in your *Quarterly* bear witness to this last fact. He virtually affirms that the men who are contending for the ancient order against modern innovations are destitute of spiritual perceptions, and therefore blind to the higher inner Christian life.

But I am reminded that A. Campbell, in his denunciations of the corruptions around him, had reference to none but *sectarian* enterprises, and that he afterward advocated *Christian* enterprises of a similar kind. I admit that he changed, or seemed to change, his mind in regard to these matters; but can the *inconsistency* of this great man be used as an apology for these devices of the world? They are *all sectarian*: they can not be *Christian*, for the simple and unanswerable reason that the seal of Christ is not on them.

But to speak particularly of Bible Colleges. One charge that I have to bring against them is that just intimated—they are worldly. Like all other colleges, they are founded on money, not on the Bible. To be successful they must have endowment, talent and patronage. To obtain these they must court the

favor of the world, and set their sails to catch the *trade* winds of society. Hence they are not to be depended on in any crisis or emergency that involves principle in opposition to popularity. In every age of the world it has required many sacrifices to advocate the pure word of truth against innovation and error. But colleges cannot afford to make such sacrifices. They are expensive institutions and cannot exist without a constant supply of money. But this money must come from worldly-minded people, for they are the folks who control it. Generally speaking, the world's people have the world's wealth. Christ's people, as a class, have little stock in the corporations of Mammon. Colleges, dependent, as yours are, on patronage must cater to popular whims in order to secure pupils. The competition is too great and the public conscience is too lax for them to succeed in any other way. So in all struggles for truth and right they are generally silent or else favor the party which they deem the strongest. Such is the way of the world in all matters of business, and colleges (yours with the rest) follow, not the law of the Lord, but the law of trade. According to the morality of business, humbug is allowable, and any amount of dishonesty is permitted, provided it is not expressly forbidden by statute law. Schools also try their hand at trickery. Flashy, deceiving catalogues, self-commendation and hired puffing are used to gull the people. Students put in the required time, and are graduated without much regard to the amount of knowledge acquired. Fond parents pay the bills, and boast

of their children's lying diplomas. Such is the course generally pursued in our country.

Now what good can come out of such a system? Can you expect honesty, purity, holiness? Can you demand love of the truth, and unswerving devotion to principle? Certainly not. I may be misinformed, but I believe your Bible colleges are no exception to the general rule. Their abuses may not yet be plainly manifested, but they will surely show themselves in all their deformity. The worldly leaven works, and it will work till the whole mass is corrupted. What are your Bible schools now doing? Whither is their influence tending? What stand are they taking in the present crisis of your people? Are they boldly stemming the flood of worldly innovation that is now pouring in upon you, and threatening to overwhelm you? Not at all. They are either silent or else advocating the wrong side. They need but little more encouragement from the wealthy and fashionable to be fully committed to all your new movements.

This carnal tendency of theological schools is calculated to subordinate the Church to the world. The result is accomplished in this way. The world molds the school, the school molds the pastor, and the pastor molds the church. The church in turn caters to the world to obtain support for the pastor. Thus you have a complete circle of worldliness in which little or no religion is found. In accordance with this secularizing process, the ministry of the word becomes a mere profession like that of medicine or law. The distinction

of clergy and laity obtains; and congregations are degraded into a sort of firm or joint-stock company for the purpose of Sunday recreation. Of such a firm the pastor is the *pious* member! A pleasant, spruce fellow hired by the year to preach, and pray, and be good for the rest!! Now I do not say that theological schools or Bible colleges have originated this state of things, but I do affirm that they are potent means of fostering the spirit and developing the ungodly result.

In harmony with the foregoing facts is the modern "*pastorate*." To be a successful pastor requires neither learning nor piety. It requires pretty much the same qualifications that are needed to make a successful politician. It is conceded by Beecher, the prince of pastors, that the modern preacher must be a different sort of man from the bishop or elder described by Paul. The times have changed, and the priest to achieve success must suit the times in which he lives. In the eyes of the world, success and popularity are identical. The pastor, then, must, above all things, aim at popularity, thus obtaining, if possible, a good name and high salary. Your pastors as yet are rather unskillful, but some of them are learning their trade rather rapidly. They are fast finding out that sound doctrine is at a heavy discount, and liberality above par. They are opening their eyes to the fact so often ignored in years gone by, that their brother clergymen of different denominations have clerical rights as well as they themselves, and that such rights must be cordially recognized. Still progressing, they will

see that denominational differences are allowable, and are to be held as a matter of opinion but not of conscience, and that "*to live and let live*," is the motto of the so-called higher Christian life.

But I must reserve further remarks for another letter.

B. F. LEONARD.

CHURCH WORK.

Bro. Lipscomb: In the *ADVOCATE* No. 13, page 294, you say if his (Bro. Sewell's) arguments tend to that evil (Popery) it was perfectly legitimate to show so, and would have been respectful.

Now if Bro. S.'s own language does not show all that I intimated I cannot show it. He said, if I mistake not, that we must submit to the overseer. Now I thought that that little word, *must*, meant something; but you say we must if the overseer is guided by the word of God. Now with the greatest respect to you, and your teaching (for I will say that if I had to submit to any fallible man on this earth, you would be the man, because I do believe you are as near the book as any man it has ever been my pleasure to read, yet we are all subject to frailty, liable to teach wrong, therefore I say we must submit to the infallible teacher (or overseer.) Now the question is, who is to determine the correctness of the teaching of the overseer. You say when he, the overseer, transcends the will of God it is wrong to obey him. Who shall decide whether he (the overseer) has transcended the will of God or not. Again you say the child must obey its parents; this is all well

enough, because God has commanded, "children obey your parents." But let us contrast: the Lord speaking to his children, said, walk after me and obey my voice." Deut. 13: 4 "Obey my voice and I will be your God." 7: 23. "Ought to obey God rather than man." Acts 5: 29. His servants ye are to whom ye obey." Rom. 6. 16: But enough of this, know you have never denied this. I know it was right for the congregation to submit to those the Lord did place over them, for he did place them in the church as it pleased him. 1st Cor. 11-12. You say that the congregation needs overlookers now as then, let us look again at both sides and see the difference. Then they had no perfect law to look into, now we have. Then men were inspired to enable them to teach correctly—1st Cor. 13, 10—also Advocate No. 13, Page 396, then they knew in part, looked through a glass dimly, "had the mind of a child &c, but now we know as we are known, see face to face, have put away childish things &c. 1 Cor. 13: 9-12 Then each said to his neighbor, know the Lord, now all know the Lord from the least to the greatest. This, to my mind, is enough to show that we do not need the overseer now as then.

But again, you say some must look after the wants of the poor and sick &c, now if the word *some* was left out all would be well enough. I will ask again is it not the duty of every child of God to attend to these things? Now, if we appoint a few individuals to this work, will not the balance of the congregation feel relieved of this duty. I believe such persons are needed in the church now as then, and

I further believe that each member is one of these. and with this thought before each one, the duty would be attended to much better than now.

You say the trouble as you have seen it is, they will not select as the Spirit directs, but from worldly considerations. And this will ever be the trouble so long as man, poor fallible man selects. Let each one of God's priests consider himself selected, and all the trouble ends in this particular. You say that the miraculous gifts of the early churches, that inspired men (and enabled I suppose) to look after the affairs of the church has certainly ceased. Amen to this. Is the law less perfect now than then? is the same duty to be performed and no one set apart to perform it? It cannot be. It is a common duty now, Each one looks, or ought to look into the perfect law of liberty, and there learn his duty and do it, then he can claim the promise. When it was imperfect this could not be done. Then it was necessary to have overseers, now I think not. One more thought and I am done. You say they, (the overseers) must see that all study the word of God and do it. Has the great teacher commanded this? If he has, and we do not obey we would not obey one though he were to rise from the dead.

I do hope you will excuse the length of this article and publish the same if you think it worthy. I do think more evil has grown out of this than all other subjects ever agitated by our people.

Yours Truly,

J. G. B.
Cainsville, Wilson Co., Tenn.

I presume there is just as much

necessity now to say every man to his neighbor, "know the Lord" as there was in apostolic days. "Neighbor" here is not a proper translation. Citizen, or fellow citizen is much more nearly the idea. The great majority of translators of the Bible so render it. The meaning is, that none shall become citizens of the kingdom of God without a knowledge of the Lord, as was the case in Judaism when infants constituted a part of the kingdom. It was just as true that none could enter that kingdom without knowing the Lord in apostolic days as now. Our brother's reasoning, it seems to me, would introduce a very lawless and disorderly state of affairs in congregations and in families, were he to apply the same rules to families. The same difficulties prevail there as in the church. The child must submit to the parents, the wife to the husband, the servants to their masters, but only in the Lord. Now who is to determine what is in the Lord? The husband or the wife? the parent or the child? Each must determine for himself. But God has based these directions on the presumption that, there is a common basis or standard of judgment in all men disposed to do right, that all may and can see alike. This is true. So that in the common affairs of life, but little friction arises from these difficulties. Just as little would arise in the church, were the relationships as closely observed. The trouble is, they are not observed.

Our brother is right when he says and all should feel that they are selected to do the work of caring for the poor. All should do it, but

it would be just a little troublesome were each one to see to every case of sickness and need, in a congregation. If all undertook to see to the cases, they would most likely give more trouble than benefit. Without some one to direct in the matter, at one time the sick would be over crowded with attention, then neglected. A simple director to look after and see the case receive such attention as is needed, must be had.

Again take the worship, some one or two persons must take the direction of the worship, not do it but direct in it, or confusion will result. The impertinent and indiscreet novices will ruin it, if some do not direct. In order to avoid this same one must be tacitly or formally recognized as the proper director in the matter. We confess to a preference for a general tacit recognition of the fitness without the formality of appointment. The proper person is so much more certain to be approved and all idea of office is lost sight of. There is then only fitness for the work in the mind. We doubt if the elders who had the oversight in ancient times were inspired. Their duty was to admonish and remind the members of their failings. The same work is needed now. The selecting persons to overlook the work of the church is about as scripturally performed as our other work. Our observation has been that men who substitute their own judgment for the will of God in one thing, are apt to do it in other things.

The Bible has commanded the younger to submit to the elder, as much as the wife to the husband. Obedience to those having the over-

sight over us is as much a part of obedience to God as is the obedience of the child to the parent. Yet obedience in neither case is to go beyond obedience to God. This is the highest duty. It limits and modifies all other and lower obligations. Our own judgment must be the final court of decision as to the church member, the wife, the child. In a conflict of judgment between the overseer and the individual as to what is right, the Bible is to be appealed to by both. With proper care this difference will seldom arise. Should it arise and be not reconciled, the church must decide which accords with the Bible. If the church cannot satisfy the parties, and the difference is so great as to preclude church association, then he against whom the church decides as being contrary to the word of God, has no other alternative left under a sense his own fealty to God than to allow himself to be separated from the congregation, and then pursue his own course before God. The same principles are true and hold good in all the minor relationships of life. The other view leaves none to take cognizance of either the faith or actions of individuals. Whenever one does it he becomes an overseer. If no one can do it, the whole combined cannot. Some one must take cognizance and call the attention of the body to the matter.

Obedience to those whom God sets over us, within the proper limitations is obedience to God. There is no antagonism between obedience to those whom God commands to be over, and obedience to God himself.

D. L.

From the Christian Monitor.

He is not Crowned except he Strive Lawfully.

BY WILLIAM O. FOLEY.

"And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully."
2 Tim. ii : 5.

Paul often compared the Christian life to a game where a prize was awarded to the victor. The Olympic games, the most noted in Greece, were celebrated once every four years on the banks of the beautiful river Alpheus. They were very popular and were attended by the kings and nobility of the country, and the spectators were numbered by thousands. Those entering the lists for the contests of physical power had to comply with all the severe regulations, and the prizes were bestowed with the most scrupulous honesty. These prizes were simply wreaths of wild olive and were designedly made of small value in themselves, in order that the competitors might be stimulated by hopes of fame and glory, which indeed always attended those who were victorious.

They contended for a corruptible crown, but the Christian contends for one that is incorruptible—"a crown of glory that fades not away." What are the laws which shall govern him in his contest?

Those who contended for the prizes in these heathen games prepared themselves by ten months exercise in the combats for which they entered. "They were temperate in all things" says Paul, adopting such a diet and such habits of life as would leave them in the most perfect physical condition. Ridding their bodies

of all grossness or superfluities of flesh or blood, and developing only those powers and muscles which would be called into action in the contest. It is said our modern prize fighters, after undergoing a season of severe training, have their bodies brought into such a perfect physical condition that the severe whacks and blows they are subject to in the fight do not leave the livid or green hues we are accustomed to see as the consequence of bruises with mortals under ordinary circumstances. So must we, if we would obtain the crown of life which the Lord has promised to them that love him, bring our bodies into subjection. In our holy warfare, preparation is as essential in order to gain the prize, as in the contests of physical power. We must "mortify the deeds of the body through the spirit" if we would live, nor must we "set our affections on things on earth but on things above," nor make provision to fulfill the lusts of the flesh, but free ourselves from everything that would entangle us here and prevent us from making good soldiers of the cross. Keep our ears closed to everything that would tend to weaken our faith, and our eyes continually on the pathway that leads to the city of our God.

We must "put on the whole armor of God in order to stand against the wiles of the devil, "for, we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." On every hand the adversary of our souls opposes us. We are never secure from his temptations, while we are on the earth. He

tempted our Savior while he hung upon the cross, and so he will tempt us even upon beds of sickness, and when we are at the verge of the grave. Therefore, should we keep our armor bright and ever ready for use and be looking out continually for his attacks.

If afflictions are sent upon us we must endure them. If tried in prison, cheerfully submit. Even at the stake we shall have strength to endure the sufferings and gain the victory and inherit everlasting life, if we put our trust in Christ who has already suffered death for the remission of the sins of all.

"Flee all youthful lusts and follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart." "The servant of the Lord must not be contentious, but be gentle unto all men." Truly the pages of the sacred oracles are replete with instructions to guide the man of God in every action of life. He need not err, indeed he is inexcusable if he does err. If he hearkens to the blessed Christ as he commanded him to do when he passed from earth to take up His abode with the Father above, he can have no apology for a moment idly spent or in efforts to gain earth's corruptible treasures, which he cannot consecrate to the service of God.

The man of God cannot strive secretly, but openly. His light must shine out boldly as a light set on a table and not hid under a bushel. "He is declared to be the epistle of Christ written not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." Christ must be con-

fessed before men by all who would have Him confess them before the Father in Heaven. The contest of a Christian is to be seen of men and his bearing under its trials and sufferings is for an example to his fellow men. He should exhibit that spirit and heroism, that bravery in the achievement of the glorious victory "that will show and cause all men to perceive how terrible is Christ the Son of God in the counsels of men, and with what glorious triumph he adorns those whom he tries here under the name of suffering."

A continuance in well doing is also required. The good deeds of one day may be destroyed in their influence by the evil actions of the next, and such a man's condition will be worse than if he had never "tasted that the Lord is gracious." The crown is obtained only by those who run the whole race. The goal is only at the end of our earthly life. It is he who perseveres till he reaches it "that shall be made a pillar in the temple of God and shall go no more out."

The crown of life is within the reach of every one. "The race is not to the swift alone, nor the battle to the strong." It is proffered to every one who will reach forth and take it, on the conditions with which it is offered through Jesus Christ. Man is likewise free to reject this crown so freely offered, but who does not shudder at the terrible judgment pronounced against them who refuse to obey God, for their portion is with the devil and his angels.

He who is wise will hearken to the voice of the knocker at the door and will bid him enter. He will

buy the gold tried in the fire that he may be rich indeed, and white raiment wherewith to clothe himself that the shame of his nakedness may not appear, he will seek the rebukes and chastisements of the Lord as evidence of his love.

Death of Bro. J. C. Oliver.

The death of this zealous and faithful brother caused us much sorrow. We knew him well—knew him in his private and public life. After uniting with the Disciples he made our house his home for months. He was truly a man of prayer, and was not afraid nor ashamed to contend for and defend the truth at all times.

We had unbounded confidence in him—we loved him devotedly, and hope to meet him beyond the River, where there is no trouble. He was universally beloved where he was known, and labored incessantly to advance primitive Christianity. A more incessant student of the Bible we have never known.

We will ever fondly cherish the memory of our departed brother.

MANSEL KENDRICK.

Near Corinth, Miss., June 19th, 1874.

QUERY.

Bro's L. & S.: Is it the duty of a Brother on Lords day, to go and preach to sinners, thereby depriving himself of worshiping with the disciples?
J. A. R.

We doubt not the Apostles and Evangelists of early times did so frequently. It will be difficult to

build up in new places, it must be done chiefly by preaching, and the Lord's-day is the best time to get the people together to hear preaching. We have sometimes preached in places where we had no opportunity of taking the supper; but we never feel quite so well over it as when we can meet with brethren. Yet we think that where a man has a chance to build up in a new place, he would be perfectly justifiable in so doing. This difficulty might be avoided, by a preacher providing himself with the emblems and taking the supper alone, if there were no others to take it with him. But we doubt whether the apostles and evangelist of early times did this. There is no account of it.

E. G. S.

Truth Progressing.

Eds. Advocate: The Philosopher who was compelled to renounce the doctrine of the revolution of the earth is said to have stamped his feet and in an undertone exclaimed, "Nevertheless the world *does move*."

A few days since a Dr. Atkisson, of Marshall county, visited our town and gave us the benefit of a well-matured sermon on the "Unity of the Church." His text was, "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

From this text you would hardly expect a Cumberland Presbyterian preacher, in the midst of his own brethren and in their own house, to attempt to show that "the Church is one—has but *one head*, and is entitled to wear but *one name*, and that name CHRISTIAN." It was cheering to listen for nearly two hours to the sweeping exposure of sectarianism

and the clear demonstrations of the fallacy of creeds and of the paramount authority of the "Bible and the Bible alone." His picture of the various churches sending missionaries to convert the heathen was exceedingly affecting. He supposed a heathen interrogating a Methodist as to the origin and import of his name, and who could go no farther than to John Wesley of England. Next came an Electionist who could go no farther than to John Calvin—and lastly, "what must our missionary say? From Sugg's Creek on Cumberland River, Tennessee in the lifetime of some of our own citizens." A fact rendered more striking from the fact that we have very recently buried one of the *original seven* that constituted Father Donald's first C. P. Church.

The Dr. told with fine effect the anecdote of Webster's refusing to aid missions because he was opposed to dividing the heathen, who were then at peace, and setting them at war among themselves as Christians are here—but who would give as much as any one to convert the Christians of Boston and make them harmonize.

But it would be folly to attempt a report of the sermon. Suffice it to say that while there were many things introduced incidentally that were not strictly up to the letter of the law yet there was so much good sense and *truth* displayed that I am constrained to say, "nevertheless the world *does move*."

The sermon would have been well received, generally, but for the fact that our brethren were out in force and gave their *too hearty* approbation. What a pity that we are stumbling-

blocks in the way of the reception of truth !

HOMO.

McMinnville, Tenn., June 22,
1874.

Last Half of Vol. 16.

Number 26, began the last half of the present year's volume. And we doubt not there are many who would gladly send us one dollar, and take the *ADVOCATE* the balance of the year, if the matter were only presented to them. We therefore ask our readers to present this matter to their brethren and friends and see how many they can add to our present list of subscribers. We are satisfied that just a little attention on their part would greatly enlarge our subscription list, and thus largely extend our field of usefulness. The *ADVOCATE* certainly ought to be read by more than new read it, and might be, with a little exertion.

We intend, by the help of God, to make the *ADVOCATE* more and more useful, both in the edification of the churches, and in teaching aliens the way of truth and righteousness. We are exceedingly anxious to see the *ADVOCATE* established upon a still firmer basis, and see its field of usefulness much enlarged. To do this we must have the number of subscribers increased. May we not hope then that the brethren everywhere will aid some in this work? Just a little aid from each one of our readers would amount to a very great lift to us, and to great extension of the Cause of truth.

ED'RS.

Graduating Paraphernalia.

Our young ladies are beginning to prepare for the great day that shall celebrate their completion of academic studies and launch them into active social life. In a few weeks they will be school girls no longer, but crowned with all the honors and bloom of mature young womanhood. Hitherto the petals have been folded close together in the bud; presently they are to expand into the full-blown rose. One of the great questions of the hour now is, "What shall we wear commencement day? Mull or swiss, or silk or calico? How shall our dresses be made, how trimmed, what kind of lace shall we have, what style of shoes, what colored sashes shall encircle our waists, what sort of a ring as a memento?" Then are the essays to be written, the examinations to be reviewed for the exhibitions in the way of colloquies, recitations and music to be rehearsed. Oh, dear, how can it all be crowded into the next month, and shan't we be most dead when it's over?

As to the essays, we pause a minute from what we were going to say to assure those who have delicately complimented our talents by soliciting written salutatories and ideas for essays, that we are ever and ever so much overwhelmed by their flattering requests, but really, the children's wardrobe needs attention at this season of the year, to say nothing of gaping columns that evermore, like the horse leech's daughter, cry, "Give, give," and we have't the time; beside, we are decidedly of the opinion that it is best for each aspirant for forensic honors to paddle

her own canoe, and sink or swim upon her own individual merits.

Now as to the graduating dress. Last year we received from suffering parents a large number of protests against the requirements made by many literary institutions respecting the dress of the graduates. A gentleman in narrow circumstances, with three daughters at school, said their commencement wardrobe cost him \$30 apiece—\$90 in all; that it was only suitable to be worn on the rarest occasions, and really of no service whatever to his daughters except on the eventful day. Another father, with much pinching, kept his daughter at school till she finished the course, and in addition to the uniform he was obliged to provide for her to receive her diploma in, had to pay \$8 for a class ring for her. He didn't see the beauty of this arrangement. A poor girl, member of this same class, gave a bond that the first wages she earned when she began to teach should go to pay for this \$8 class ring. If it was Webster's Unabridged Dictionary or Appleton's Cyclopaedia that was required as a memento, we could see some sense in it. But to go without the very necessities of life, and scrimp and want as must to conform to the general usage, seems to us absolutely silly and downright cruel. It ought to be changed altogether.

Yesterday we were all through Stewart's to get items for dress material in another column, and we saw an abundance of beautiful fabrics at twenty-five cents, thirty cents, and forty cents a yard, quite good enough to graduate in, and of service till worn out. There is tus-

solli stripe, pure, white, durable, at thirty cents a yard; satine guipure, plain and brocaded, as pretty almost as silk, and looking like new every time it's washed; there are cambrics at twenty-five cents; percales, with lace and fancy borders, all tints at the same price; and the prettiest French calicoes we've seen in many a day, at the same price.

If our young ladies really wish to enfranchise themselves, let them ignore puffs and ruffles, and attire themselves, "not with gold or pearls, or costly array" but with pure intelligence and good works.

Now, after we get the dress, how shall we make it? in the simplest manner possible. How much do you think, girls, the average fashionable woman hangs about her hips when she goes out for an airing on Broadway? From nine to eleven pounds. This is wicked, for it is ruinous to health. "Oh, 'tis a burden, Cromwell 'tis a burden too heavy for the man that hopes for heaven!" The other day we complimented a beautiful woman upon the plain skirt she wore; to be sure the material was of the finest, and needed nothing to "set it off." "I'm making another," said she, "that will take me about four months to finish, and if you don't see any thing of me you may know what I'm at." That lady burns up the books on her center table when the bindings grow shabby, and gets her friends to write her letters for her. No danger of her seeing this; she's puffing that skirt, and hasn't time to read the papers. One can be tasteful and be plain. A bias fold, a narrow edge a bit of delicate lace, a neatly fitting corsage,

natural flowers in the hair, will make any girl of good health, easy manners and good sense, look "sweet." And when you stand there on the platform and read an essay bristling with ideas, glittering with gems of thought, read it with expression and fluency and force, anybody that has no more sense than to undervalue you because your dress is plain, is infinitely beneath your contempt.

Principals and teachers can do a great deal to prevent the extravagance of commencement days. In every graduating class there are those who are poor and proud, that are distressed beyond measure at the pecuniary exacticns made on these occasions.

We hear that there is a college in the West the young ladies of which have determined to wear calico at the approaching commencement. We hope nothing will induce them to change this determination. We hail everything that promises to emancipate woman from the tyranny of fashion and the oppression of the present mode of dress, and we would have the sex everywhere pure and womanly.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

Church News.

Brethren L. & S.: We have just closed a ten days meeting at Nevell's prairie, Houston Co. Tex. with sixteen additions to the church.

Yours in Christ,

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville, Texas, June 16th. 1874.

B. K. Smith's Series of Sermons,

Bro. B. K. Smith, of Indianapolis, Indiana, is delivering and publishing a series of sermons, "Embodying a complete synopsis of the Divine

Scheme of Human Redemption and Recovery from sin." Bro. Smith is issuing these Sermons in pamphlets, containing three sermons in each, at 30 cts. per pamphlet.

Address,

B. K. SMITH,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Obituaries.

Died, February 24, 1874, little Anna, Daughter of T. C. Chaddick, in Ball Prairie, Robertson Co. Texas. We should not grieve after the dear little ones, though it seems hard to give them up. When they go thus in their infancy and innocence we know all is right with them, and that they are thus delivered from all the sufferings, cares, and anxieties of this troublesome world. Yet we miss them, and the tear will unbidden start. But if we do our part faithfully, we hope to meet little Anna where we shall part never more.

C.

Died, in Fort Worth, Texas, June 8th 1874. Willie Lipscomb Anderson, adopted son of Mrs. T. C. Van Zandt, aged 17 years.

The immediate cause of his death was heart disease, and dropsy, which was superinduced by rheumatism, from which he suffered from early childhood.

In Nov. 1872, he united with the church, and was baptized by Bro. Gano, and from that time till confined to his room, was a constant attendant at the Sunday School, the Lords supper and the Bible Class. He died assuring us of his readiness to depart, and his faith in finding rest from his sufferings, and happiness in heaven.

IDA M. JARVIS.

Died at Sparta May 16 1874. Bettie Rhea, infant daughter of brother and sister John S. Rhea, aged 16 months.

Little Bettie's short life was a life of suffering; day after day the hand of affliction was upon her till death came and called her away to a world where disease and death are never known. As we looked on the faded wreath of flowers that the loving hands of a sister had placed over her grave we remembered the words of David concerning man. "As a flower of the field so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more." But though the flowers fade and mingle with the dust they will come forth again; and little Bettie too will rise again, freed from disease and pain, clothed with an incorruptible, immortal body made like to the glorious image of the Lord Jesus Christ.

J. M. KIDWELL.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

To The Little Folks.—No. 11.

“My little folks, I will give you a few scraps of my experience. I have seen many very pleasant things during my life, and would have had many more had it not been for people who have unpleasant ways. I have seen boys who were supplied with play-things—balls, marbles, &c, engage in play with other boys who had none, and oftentimes the boy who owned the play things would take the advantage of his possessions to exhibit a doctrinal, overbearing disposition. If his play fellows did not act to suit his unreasonable whims and gratify his selfishness, he would snatch his play-things away from them and break up the play. I have seen little girls act in this way too, when playing with their dolls, with their little associates. This makes matters unpleasant. So, many a time, when there might be enjoyment there is unpleasantness. And all on account of a sour, unaccommodating disposition of one person in the crowd. Life is short at best, and we should all study to be happy ourselves and make those happy with whom we have to do.

I have seen persons who would neither do themselves nor be willing for others to do. I have seen such even in the church. Sometimes it is necessary to raise money for some special purpose, and the subject is mentioned to the brethren; when

some exceedingly scrupulous brother would object to any money being raised by the church in any other way than by weekly contribution on the Lord's day—each as the Lord has prospered him. And this class seem never to be prospered, for they are never known to put a cent into the treasury. If there is any necessary work to be done on the meetinghouse they are sure to oppose it; and if asked to help pay for it, they will say they had nothing to do in having the work done,—let those pay for it that had it done.

I have known some to make constant complaint that there is not sociability and love enough manifested by the brethren and sisters toward each other, when they themselves would sit in some remote corner at the meetings and look cold enough to freeze out the whole congregation, if looks and indifference could do it. And when the meeting is dismissed, they get out of the door and are gone so quick that no one gets a chance to speak to them, to ask them about their health, or that of their family, or anything else.

Some there are who oppose every thing that is suggested, yet never suggest anything themselves. Such an one will make a speech in opposition to what is proposed, yet in all his talk you can not learn what he is in favor of—only that he is opposed to what is suggested. He won't let the ox have a single wisp of straw from the manger. He thinks he is exactly suited for an elder, and if he should be appointed to take the oversight of the church, he thinks he should be paid for his services, yet he is opposed to any one being paid

for laboring as an overseer of the church or as a preacher.

I have known some opposed to Sunday-school, saying there is no authority for it in the Bible; they will not even participate in a Bible class, if the brethren and sisters seem to enjoy it any. I knew one of these who thought it a sin to laugh. He was once betrayed into a full, broad smile, and I don't know whether he ever got over it.

I have known some persons so anxious to have the Gospel preached that they were in favor of getting up some organization independent of the church, to raise money and employ preachers. And I have known others so sensitive in this matter that they were not in favor of churches having consultation with each other to take any steps for the spread of the Gospel—nor even in favor of giving a preacher anything.

I have known preachers who would not preach unless they had an assurance beforehand of how many dollars they were to be paid. I have known brethren to let better and more efficient preachers suffer want for the necessities of life.

I know many excellent brethren in Texas, and if they would co-operate together, many of these crooked things could be straightened, and the cause of Christianity would be in a flourishing condition. We want more energy, more co-operation, more preaching, a more equitable and just support of preachers, a better discipline in the churches; and a more brotherly, God-fearing, God-loving membership.

UNCLE JOE.

Spare Well, Spend Well.

It is a critical time in a boy's history when he begins to earn a little money and has the spending of it in his hands. The way in which he invests his first shillings is a matter of far greater importance than he ever imagines. It may furnish the key to all his future career. It is quite as important to learn to "spend well." A boy miser is a most contemptible, hopeless character, but a frugal, economical boy, is laying the foundation of a substantial, and most likely of a successful business career.

When the candy stores tempt you, learn to pass on.

If necessary to brace up your resolution, leave your wallet at home. I know a boy, who has been but a year in his situation, who spent everything he could command last season on expensive candies and ice cream. There was no one to control him. His friends were at a distance, and he drew on them for funds to keep his clothing respectable. They were busy people who had a general impression that his salary was not enough to support him; so they supplied his wants from time to time. They have but just discovered how the money went, and you may be sure that they were not well pleased to find their confidence had been so abused. At one time he had made himself quite ill by his excessive indulgence in confectionery, and his friends had felt great anxiety about his "hard work" which was so overtaxing to him.

Don't indulge in luxuries in food, clothing or surroundings, which you cannot afford. If you feel, after a

purchase, "This was not right," be sure you have made a bad bargain. If a sick mother or sister has a moral claim on you for the money, no blessing will attend a selfish expenditure of it. The noble lesson of self-denial is one you cannot begin to learn too early, because your Heavenly Father enjoins upon you.

Think well over your expenditures and it will help you wonderfully to make profitable investments. Good tidy clothing throughout is a very valuable thing for any boy, and is a recommendation wherever he goes. It should correspond, however, with his occupation, and the different parts harmonize with each other, or the good effect is lost. Neatness in preference to showiness is a sound rule. A flashy necktie never shows off well upon soiled linen, and it is a marked fact that they very often go together. If you trifle away your dollars in boyhood, you will most likely see the time when you will realize very forcibly how many cents it takes to make one. Better count the pennies now, and you will stand a far better chance some day to have dollars to count in your pocket-book.—*Exchange.*

What is Christ to us?

He is our way; we walk in him.
He is our truth; we embrace him.
He is our Lord; we choose him to rule over us.

He is our Master; we serve him.
He is our Prophet, pointing out the future.

He is our Priest, having atoned for us.

He is our Advocate, ever living to make intercession for us.

He is our Savior, saving to the uttermost.

He is our Teacher, instructing us in the way of salvation.

He is our root; we grow from him.

He is our bread; we feed upon him.

He is our fold; we enter it by him.

He is our Shepherd, leading us into green pastures.

He is our true vine; we abide in him.

He is the water of life; we slake our thirst in him.

He is the Chief among ten thousand; we admire him above everything.

He is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person; we strive to reflect his likeness.

He is upholder of all things; we rest upon him.

He is our wisdom; we are guided by him.

He is our righteousness; we cast all our perfections upon him.

He is our sanctification; we draw all the sources of Holy life from him.

He is our redemption, redeeming us from all iniquity.

He is our healer, healing all our diseases.

He is our friend, relieving us in all our necessities.

He is our brother, cheering us in our difficulties.—*N. Bishop.*

What Alcohol will do.

It may seem strange, but it is nev-

ertheless true, that alcohol, regularly applied to a thrifty farmer's stomach, will remove the boards from the fence, let cattle into his crops, kill his fruit trees, mortgage his farm, and sow his fields with wild oats and thistles. It will take the paint off his building, break the glass out of the windows and fill them with rags. It will take the gloss from his clothes and the polish from his manners, subdue his reason, arouse his passions, bring sorrow and disgrace upon his family, and topple him into a drunkard's grave. It will do this to the artisan and the capitalist, the matron and the maiden, as well as to the farmer; for, in its deadly enmity to the human race, alcohol is no respecter of persons.—*The Temperance Worker.*

My Captain's Orders.

"How is it I don't seem to hear you speak bad words?" asked an "old salt" of a boy on board a man-of-war.

"Oh, 'cause I don't forget my Captain's orders," answered the boy brightly.

"Captain's orders!" cried the old sailor; "I didn't know he gave any."

"He did," said Jem, "and I keep 'em safe here," putting his hand on his breast. "Here they are," said Jem slowly and distinctly; "I say unto you, swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth for it is His footstool; neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the Great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your com-

munication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.' Matt. v. 34-37."

"From the good old log-book, I see," said the sailor. "Ah, yes, you've got your orders."

How to SUCCEED.—If your seat is too hard to sit upon, stand up. If a rock rises up before you, roll it away, or climb over it. If you wish for confidence, prove yourself worthy of it. Don't be content with doing what another has done—surpass it. Deserve success and it will come. The boy was not born a man. The sun does not rise like a rocket, or go down like a bullet fired from a gun; slowly but surely it makes its round, and never tires. It is as easy to be a leader as a wheel horse. If the job be long, the pay will be greater; if the task be hard, the more competent you must be to do it.

When we turn away from some duty, or some fellow creature, saying that our hearts are too sick and sore with some great yearning of our own, we may often sever the line on which a divine message was coming to us. We shut out the man, and we shut out the angel who had sent him to open the door.—*Edward Garret.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Laying on of hands—once more.....	625
Letters to Jacob Creath.....	631
Church work.....	635
He is not crowned except he strive lawfully.....	638
Death of Bro. J. C. Oliver.....	640
Query.....	640
Truth Progressing.....	641
Last Half of Vol. 16.....	641
Graduating Paraphrenalia.....	642
Church News.....	644
Obituaries.....	644
Fireside.	
To the Little Folks.....	645
Spare well—Spend well.....	646
What is Christ to us.....	647
My Captains Orders.....	648

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 28.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JULY 9, 1874.

Baptism a Sign.

Bro. Sewell: A discussion was held between R. W. Thomas and J. Morris, Baptists, and Bro. W. B. Flippin and myself, on the proposition, "Christian baptism is for (in order to) the remission of sins." Mr. R. W. T. took the position that baptism was a sign, or type, of remission of sins; and that, too, in his closing speech, when there was no chance of a reply. In order to enforce his idea, he supposed a shoe and boot shop, with a sign over the door of a shoe or boot. A man comes along wanting a pair of shoes, or boots, instead of going into the shop, and purchasing the shoes or boots, he walks up and sticks his foot into the sign. Pretty sharp that, and produced some mirth.

It would be well for the people at large to have the benefit of the argument and illustration, particularly the Baptist brethren.

By your permission therefore I will examine the matter a little, that all may be benefitted. First, then, I will endeavor to ascertain the import of the word *sign*, according to the

best authority. Webster says, "that by which anything is made known, or represented, that which furnishes evidence, a work, an indication, a *proof*, &c. This is his first definition. Type, says the same author, is a work or impression of something; stamp, impression, sign. Antitype, is from the Greek *antitupos*, anti, against and *tupos*, type, figure, that which is shadowed out, by the type, and so correlative to it."

"Thus the paschal lamb, in the Scripture, is the type, of which Christ is the antitype."

We now quote from MacKnight's notes on the very passage on which Mr. T. commented—1 Pet. 3. 21. The word *tupos*, type, denotes a thing, that is so formed, as to convey an exact image of itself by an impression on another substance capable of the impression. In Scripture, it signifies a pattern according to which a thing is made. Thus the visionary tabernacle shown to Moses, in the Mount, is called *tupos* type, or pattern, because he was to make the material tabernacle exactly like it. Heb. 8: 5.

In Scripture, likewise, *tupos*, a type, signifies an example of moral

conduct to be followed, or avoided, 16; or 10. 6-11.

The word, *antitypos*, antitype denote; the thing forward in imitation, of the type or pattern. Heb. 9: 24.

The Mosaic tabernacles are called *antitypos*, antitypes, or likenesses of the true tabernacle, or habitation of the Deity, because they were formed according to the *typon*, pattern, shown to Moses, which was considered as the true tabernacle.

Some remarkable persons, and events, which are recorded in Scripture, were so ordered by God as to be fit emblems, or representations of future persons and events. (See Gal. 4. 24 and note 1.)

These persons, and events are called types, and the things which they represented are called antitypes. Thus Rom. 5: 14, Adam is called *typos*, the type of Christ, who on that account is called the second Adam.

Thus, also, the water of baptism is here called the antitype to the water of the flood, because the flood was a type or emblem of baptism, in the three following particulars.

1. As by building the ark and entering into it, Noah showed a strong faith in the promises of God, concerning his preservation by the very water which was to destroy the antediluvians for their sins; So by giving ourselves to be buried in the waters of baptism, we show a like faith in God's promises that, though we die and are buried, he will save us from death, the punishment of sin, by raising us from the dead at the last day.

2. As the preserving of Noah alive during the nine months he was in the flood, is an emblem of the souls

of believers while among the dead, so the preserving of believers alive while buried in the waters of baptism, is a prefiguration of the same event.

3. As the waters of the deluge destroyed the antediluvians, but preserved Noah, bearing up the ark in which he was shut up till the waters were assuaged, and he went out of it to live again on the earth, so baptism may be said to destroy the wicked, and to save the righteous, as it prefigures both these events: the death of the sinner, it prefigures by burying of the baptized person in the water; and the salvation of the righteous, by raising the baptized person out of the water to live a new life.

These things considered, may not our Lord's words to Nicodemus, except a man be born of water;" again, of water—be an allusion to the history of the deluge, and a confirmation of its typical meaning?

For Noah coming forth from the waters to live again on the earth, after having been full nine months in the water, might fitly be called his being born of water: consequently, as baptism is the antitype, or thing signified by the deluge, a person's coming out of the water of baptism may have been called by our Lord his being "born of water."

Now, to call baptism, the "type," or "sign" of remission of sins, which act had occurred anterior to baptism, according the above authorities, and the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject of types and antitypes, is a perversion of the Bible teaching, and common sense.

Besides, there could be no evidence, according to the authorities quoted above, of remission of sins,

either to the subject or any one else without the "sign" the antitype, which is the mark, the evidence, the proof or stamp.

Persons who are very anxious on the matter of their salvation, would do well to submit to the authority of the Savior at once, and be born again and receive, the "mark," the "sign," the "evidence," of pardon. A person who supposes his or her sins are pardoned, but is not baptized for one, two or six months afterward, is all this time in a state of delusion, thinking their sins are pardoned, when there is no "evidence" of it.

Or, if they are the Lord's, there is no proof of it; his sign, or mark is not on them. But as the anti-type must bear an exact relation to the type, or thing formed, correspond precisely with the pattern, and as Noah did not, and could not realize salvation from the old world into the new, until the ark rested on the mountain, and waters were assuaged, so persons must pass through immersion, or baptism before they have the sign, mark, or evidence of pardon. We should not fail to notice the illustration of the shoe and boot shop, and the sign over the door. It is supposed that the shoes and boots are pardon of sins, and the door, baptism.

We will now suppose a Baptist church assembled, with Mr. T. as the pastor; a good person comes forward supposing his sins are forgiven "for Christ's sake" and therefore desires entrance into the church, and the privilege of commemorating at the communion table. But, says Mr. T. have you got on your shoes, or boots? Yes sir, responds the seeker quickly. But Mr.

T. says, you must go back and stick your foot into the sign, or bring the sign along, i. e. be baptized. Why, says the seeker for admission, I did not know I had to put on the shoes and boots, and the sign too! Why, says the seeker, I feel that my sins are all forgiven, and I am satisfied. Well, but, says Mr. T., you must have the sign, the mark, the obedience, the proof. But says the seeker for admission, slapping his breast, I have got that right in here. Well, says Mr. T. in plain terms, I tell you sir, you must be baptized before you can get into the Baptist Church, and commune with our people.

We are not satisfied to let this opportunity pass without quoting from the Bible Union revised New Testament, the very passage under consideration. 1 Pet. 3. 20.

"Wherein a few, that is eight souls, were saved, through water, which in an antitype, immersion saves us also, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the requirement of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ). "Immersion saves us," i. e. the antitype saves us. No, says friend T., we must be saved first, must realize pardon, must have the requirement of a good conscience, then we may do what God requires; I cannot very well close this article without quoting Dr. Hackett's commentary on Acts 2. 38 in contrast with our friend.

Eis aphesin amartion, in order to the forgiveness of sins. (Matt. 26, 28. Luke 3: 3)

We connect naturally with both preceding verbs. This clause states the motive or object which should

induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces the entire exhortation—not one part of it to the exclusion of the others. Acts 22: 16.

The Dr. says, “without delay be baptized, or with a stricter adherence to the form, have thyself baptized, (one of the uses of the middle is to perform an act which a person procures another to perform for him) and wash away thy sins.

This clause states a result of the baptism, in language derived from the nature of that ordinance.

It answers to *eis aphasisin amartion*. (Acts 2: 38.) i. e. submit to the rite in order to be forgiven.”

If now, as was stated by Mr. T. during the discussion alluded to above, this reformation has made two steps toward Rome, and one in reformation, because we advocate baptism as one of the conditions of remission of sins, it so turns out that we are found in company with such learned and good Baptists as Dr. Hacket, William Jones of London, Porter, Orchard, the Baptist historian, and others we could mention.

I hope this article, though rather prolix, will not be too lengthy for your columns.

G. W. CONE.

Newburgh, Izzard Co., Ark., June 17, 1874.

The Law of Sin and Death.

Dear Bro. Gibbons: I now attempt a response to your article in the Advocate of May 28th, which I have just received. In regard to your remark concerning the man who said his horse was sixteen feet high,

I will only say, that if you think I have so little candor that I would insincerely advocate a position, simply because I had taken it once, I will make no effort whatever to disabuse your mind. The great Judge of quick and dead, before whose tribunal we must all stand, knows my heart, and to Him alone I must account for my deportment here.

You propose some logical reasoning on the subject, and give it in this style: “You say that the law of sin and death is that law which the apostle says he was made free from. And so say I, and so says the book.” You then ask, “When was he made free from that law?” and answer, “Not before he had obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine.” This may be logical reasoning, but I must say, I am unable to see the logic. You take it for granted that Paul was made free from this law in his conversion, and assuming this, you reason: The Mosaic law ceased to be binding long before Paul’s conversion. We must not assume so much. It is by no means settled that Paul was made free from this law in his conversion.

The matter stands about thus: If your position is true, he was made free from that law in his conversion; if mine is true, he was made free from it when the Law of Moses ceased to be binding—at the time all the Jews were freed from it in the eye of God.

You say, “That the law of Moses ended and was fulfilled in the death of the Son of God, we need not multiply quotations to prove, and if fulfilled and taken out of the way, it was no more binding on Saul of Tarsus, or any one else, fifty days after the ending of the law of Moses.”

Did the Law end with the death of Christ? If so, then it was no more binding three days, or one day after his death than it was *fifty* days afterward. It follows then that it was not fulfilled, and did not end till the day of Pentecost, when the prophecy of Joel was fulfilled in the pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles.

Jesus said not one jot or one tittle should pass away till *all* be fulfilled, and the disciples were under as much obligation to keep the law till Jesus was coronated King in Heaven, and proclaimed such on earth, as they ever had been.

However, this does not have much bearing upon the subject. You ask, "Did the Law of the Spirit of life, in Christ Jesus make Paul free from the Law of sin and death before it (the Law of the Spirit I suppose) existed?" I answer, No; for I understand that the Law of the Spirit of life *immediately* succeeded the Law of Moses. You would have the people entirely without law for a space of fifty days. This would be quite a predicament! You ask if Paul was free from the law of Sin and death while he was persecuting the Church.

I answer, He was,—from the law of sin he speaks of in Rom. 8: 2, viz: the law of Moses. You seem to see the matter very plainly, and think it strange that any person should differ from you. I suppose it is unnecessary for me to say that the opposite looks equally plain to me. This kind of argument doesn't have much weight. Readers will judge from the reasoning, however much we may say about its looking so plain.

You qualify your former statement, to wit: "It is a plain and simple case," with the phrase, "who is a common English scholar, and who has read the Bible with any care."

Perhaps this accounts for my not being able to see it like yourself. I do not make any pretensions to scholarship, nor do I claim to have studied the Bible as much as I ought to have done. Perhaps I ought to take back what I have said, and sit at the feet of one who is "a common English scholar, and has read the Bible with care" to learn what it teaches.

But I believe I'll wait till I see that I am in error. It is quite strange that there are so few "common English scholars who have read the Bible with any care," besides yourself and Bro. Lipscomb. At least I have not consulted any others who hold your views.

You ask, "Why not say he meant the Law of the Spirit of life, when he said, 'For what the law could not do?'" The only reason I can give, is, that it is unnecessary to say he meant a thing which it is evident he did not mean. For the same reason that we should not say Sunday comes twice in a week—that it is not true. You call my expression, to wit: That it might be said that sin was indirectly the author of the law of Moses a very strange saying, and say it is as untrue as the saying that by Beel ebub Jesus cast out devils.

This is pretty *tight*, but I guess I'll have to look over it, for I cannot think you meant any unkindness. You propose to cast this into the refiner's fire, and from the investigation, you deduce this wonderful conclusion: "How sin could in any

sense, be the author of the law of Moses, I never could see!" Why, my good brother, did you not show wherein my reasoning failed to sustain my proposition? But I will not contend with you on this point, for there is not much depending on it.

I admitted when I said this,—or intimated rather—that it would require a little *straining*, and did not base much on the expression. "Again, you say the law of Moses was introduced to condemn sin in the flesh, and add that Paul said it was too weak to do it. Dear Bro., where is that to be found?" I answer, it is found in Rom. 8: 3,—“For what the law could not do *in that it was weak* through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin *condemned sin in the flesh.*” This is as plain as I could make it if I were to try.

In conclusion I will say that I have said about all I wish to say on this subject. If you feel disposed to write again I will take pleasure in reading all you wish to say. I submit these remarks without any unkind feelings, and may the day never come when our friendship shall be diminished. May the good Lord help us to so live and act that when we leave this world of sorrows we may meet in that land of peace and happiness, to enjoy the peaceful presence of God forever, is my prayer.

In faith, hope, and love,

Your Bro., truly,

PESSIMUS.

Marietta, Miss.; June 26, 1874.

P. S. I accept Bro. Clark's explanation that "all immersion is not baptism in its limited or accepted sense."

For his gratification, I will drop the assumed signature of "Pessimus" here and subscribe myself,

Yours in plain English,

A. W. PRYCE.

ABSURDITIES.

Many are the absurdities into which men run, for the sake of defending and sustaining theories on the subject of religion. Take, for instance, baptism. Nearly all the religious denominations claim that the sinner receives remission of sins before baptism. But when they come to read the Scriptures of the New Testament, there are so many passages that plainly teach that baptism comes before the promise of pardon, that they find no means in their connection by which to get rid of them, or to explain them away. But the theory of pardon before baptism must be sustained, no matter what becomes of common sense, or the word of God. Any and everything beneath the sun, that the ingenuity of man can invent is resorted to, to sustain the theory. And no less so is the claim concerning infant baptism, and infant membership in the church. When the preachers desire to sustain these things, they find it very convenient to claim that baptism comes in the room of circumcision. That in the days of Abraham and the law of Moses, children were circumcised, and were members of those covenants, and that therefore infants are subjects of baptism. This claim of baptism coming in the room of circumcision, is upon the hypothesis that circumcision has been done away. For if circumcision has not

been done away, then it still stands in its own place, and is still binding, and cannot be dispensed with. Every Jew would still have to be circumcised, and then if he would become a Christian, he would have to be baptized also. There is no chance therefore to claim that baptism has come in the room of circumcision, only by claiming that circumcision has been done away. And if circumcision has been done away, then that establishes a change in covenants or dispensations, beyond all controversy. For there never was a more positive law enacted on this earth than the law or covenant of circumcision. When the covenant was first given to Abraham, it was said positively in the law concerning it to Abraham, that every soul not circumcised, should be cut off from his people. Gen. 17: 14. This law of circumcision was also incorporated into the law of Moses, and was just as binding during the existence of that law, as it was in the days of Abraham. If, therefore, the time ever came when baptism was established in the room or stead of circumcision, then circumcision was at the same time done away. And if thus done away, then there has been a change both in covenants and laws. Every time, therefore, that a Pedobaptist claims that baptism comes in the room of circumcision, he thereby claims beyond all controversy, the doing away with one covenant and law, and the establishment of another in its place. But when these same men want to prove that baptism is a non-essential, and that men can be saved as well without it as with it, they find it very

convenient to claim that there has been no change of dispensations and laws, from the beginning to the present time. That all men, in all ages have been and are saved in precisely the same way—that there has been no change in the law of pardon, from the garden of Eden down to the present time—that all men, in all ages and countries always have, and do now approach God and obtain his favors in precisely the same way. Every time that these men claim that there has never been any change in covenants and laws, they palpably contradict their own claim, "that baptism comes in the room of circumcision." If baptism does come in the room of circumcision then the claim that there has been no change in covenants, is false. But on the other hand, if the claim that there has been no change in covenants be true, the claim that baptism comes in the stead of circumcision is false. Both these positions, one of which flatly contradicts the other, cannot be true. One or the other, is certainly false. Both cannot be true. And it is the effort to sustain theories unknown in the Bible that drives them into these absurdities and contradictions. Those who just take the Bible in its own simplicity, are never driven into any such difficulties. The book of God does not contradict itself, and those who simply follow it, are never troubled with such inconsistencies. But then there are other absurdities and difficulties that come up with each of these claims. It is most certainly true, that when one institution or law comes in the room or stead of another, then it is in every way just as binding, and

subject to the same regulations in every respect, as the one in the place of which it comes. If therefore baptism takes the place of circumcision, then it is just as binding every way. Now, circumcision was so very binding, so very essential, that in every instance in which it was disregarded, the one that disregarded or refused it had to be cut off from his people; had to be destroyed. And from this anathema there was no appeal for him who thus despised or refused a positive divine institution of the Lord.

Yet those who claim that baptism comes in the room of circumcision,—and if so it must therefore be subject to the same laws—tell us that *baptism* is a *non-essential*. Although it comes as they claim, in the place of an institution that brought death to every one rejecting it, still they claim that baptism is a non-essential—that the sinner can be saved as well without it as with it! There never was a greater absurdity. Those who claim that baptism is in the stead of circumcision are the last ones that ought ever to claim that it is a non-essential. If I wished to do away with the importance of baptism, I am quite sure I would never intimate that it came instead of circumcision. For then it would make it so binding that all who refused it would have to be destroyed. But such are the absurdities to which false theories will lead. The absurdities of the claim that there has been no change in the law of pardon are equally great. If it be true that there has been no change since Eden, then whatever laws of pardon were in force during the Patriarchal or Jewish

ages, are still in force. In the Jewish age, when any one had become a sinner, in order to obtain pardon, he had to bring a certain described animal, without blemish, to the tabernacle, and placing his hands upon the head of it, was to slay it, and the priest was to take the blood into the tabernacle and offer it there and thus make an atonement for him, and it was to be forgiven him. And now if there has been no change in laws, this is still as binding as it ever was. And therefore those men who make this claim, if correct, are under as many obligations to do these things as the Jews were. For if there has been no change, and all are to obtain pardon the same way they did in the Jewish age, then we are all under that same law yet, for that is the way they obtained it. Those, therefore that make this claim, ought to be hunting up the temple, and looking up a priest, so that they might offer a sin-offering, so that they may obtain pardon. But alas for them, the temple is gone, with all its furniture, its altars, its mercy-seat, and its candlestick. So, if people now are to be saved as the Jews were, they are forever doomed, since that is utterly impossible. But one thing is very certain; If God did not change his institutions, and law of pardon, then *men have* changed them; for there has been a change, to a positive certainty. Let any man undertake to find anywhere in the Old Testament or New, any such procedure as is found in the popular revivals of modern denominations. You might read the Bible constantly for forty years, and never find anything like it. The truth is that the very denominations that

are now claiming that there has never been any change in God's law of pardon to man, have themselves set up something entirely new—something wholly unknown to the Bible, either Old Testament or New. They have made changes never heard of in God's divine economy. Let any one attempt to find in the Bible anything like a modern mourning bench scene of getting religion. Just as well look for the history of Jesus in the book of Job. But why do they wish to make out that there has been no change in the law of pardon? Just simply to get baptism out. The argument really runs about thus: "People in ancient times were saved without baptism; there has been no change in the law of pardon, or the means of saving men; therefore men can be saved now without baptism." It is claimed all over the land that baptism is no part of the law of pardon to man, and that it never has been. The absurdity of these claims is, that it runs those who make them into direct conflict with the word of God. Whenever men affirm that there has been no change of covenants, they contradict God, who said in the days of Jeremiah, "I will make a new covenant," etc. Then in the days of the apostles God says through them that he has made a *new* covenant, established upon better promises than the old one. And the only question now is, shall we believe God, or men in this matter? Then the assertion that baptism is no part of the law of pardon, contradicts the whole New Testament on that subject. Take for example Acts 2: 38. In this passage, both questions are settled. It is settled here that there

has been a change in the law of pardon to man, and that now, baptism is a part of that law. "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 Ghost." Just such a proclamation as this never was made to man on this earth before, from the garden of Eden to the time that the Holy Spirit uttered it through Peter, on the first Pentecost after the death of Jesus. Men were never before told to repent and be baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ* for remission of sins. Here then is a *new* law of pardon; one that never was proclaimed to man before. And all the world cannot point to such an utterance in the Bible previous to this time. So then here is, in spite of all opposition, a change in the law of pardon to man. And besides, this is the proclamation, the law of pardon that was to go to all the world, and therefore *the law* under which we live. This, therefore, is the law of pardon by which all aliens are to obtain pardon, and enter into the kingdom of God. It also shows beyond all controversy, and to the end of time, that baptism is a part of the law of pardon to all the world. And when those men that oppose baptism as a non essential have exhausted all their arguments ten thousand times, this *new* law of pardon, including baptism, will still stand, and contradict and condemn them as strongly as ever. It is always before them, haunting them, and forever will be, till they accept it as it is. So long as there is a single mortal of earth to be brought into the kingdom of Christ, just so long will this law of

pardon be in force. How absurd, therefore, for man to set up his wisdom in opposition to God's wisdom. Every time they administer what they call baptism, they do something never heard of upon this earth till John the Baptist came. And yet they are loud in their claims, that there has been no change in the law of pardon. Why not then avoid all these absurdities, conflicts and contradictions, by admitting that God has made a *new* covenant, through which all the world is to be saved, and let baptism remain where God has placed it in the law of pardon to man. Almost innumerable troubles, and divisions, and conflicts among those who claim to be the children of God might thereby be avoided, and union and harmony prevail, where contention, confusion, strife and every evil work now prevails.

E. G. S.

Spiritual Gifts.

Brethren L. & S.: In No. 25, Gospel Advocate, there is an article from Bro. Jonathan Newman on healing the sick; and a few words in reply from you (Bro. Lipscomb.) That said Scripture, James v: 14-15, should yet be carried out in practice, etc. Now of course I am no critic, do not want this understood that way. But I wish to give you my understanding of the passage. In Mark xvi; 17-18, we have a promise from the Savior that supernatural signs should follow when the Apostles, were going into all the world. Among the signs we find, They shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover, verse 18.

Then by reading 12th chapter 1st Cdr., Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit, verse 4. And then, 9th verse we have, To another faith by the same Spirit. This surely cannot be the faith given by hearing preaching for they all had that, and not simply *another*—same verse, To another the gifts of healing. See 28th and 30th verses. Now in these verses we have the very thing promised by Christ. Something not common to all Christians, but something belonging to the supernatural teachers, verse 28. Some Apostles, prophets, Teachers, after that miracles. Then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. See Eph. iv: 10 to 13. In this we see nearly the same relating to those supernatural teachers, among which the Elders were appointed, at least some of them, and it is reasonable to suppose all while Christianity was to be established.

And now Paul in Eph. iv: 13, shows how long we may expect such a class of teachers. *Till* we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a *perfect* man, etc. Now that word *till* certainly shows when such things were to stop. Paul talking of these things, 1st Cor. xiii: 8, says, whether there be tongues they shall cease, prophecies fail, and knowledge (supernatural) shall vanish away. When will this take place? Paul said those teachers were to continue *till* we became perfect and certainly during the preaching of the Apostles when they had preached it to every creature and wrote these things out they were as perfect as it ever can get in this life. Then it seems that there is but one

thing to settle and that is Did they reach that state of perfection? Hear Paul. For the law made nothing perfect. But the bringing in of a better hope *did*, by which we draw nigh unto God. Heb. vii: 9. For by one offering he *hath perfected* forever them that are sanctified. Now we see those supernatural works were to go on *till* we were made perfect and then cease. And Paul says in another place, All Scripture is given, etc., that the man of God may be *perfect*. Now if we have been successful in our looking over these matters then the Elders of James were of the class referred to and belonged to the Apostolic age.

I send this, and if there is an item worth anything in it, use it, if not commit it to the waste box.

Truly,

JOSEPH WHEELER.

Dry Cove, Jackson Co., Ala., June 23, 1874.

A TALK TO STUDENTS.

BY JAMES T. FIELDS.

Mr. Fields visited Exeter Academy on the 21st of May, and made the following capital speech to the students. After a few well chosen introductory words he said:

"There never was a greater chance for first-rate men in all professions than just now, now in our own era. And this you, who are studying that you may be successful, ought to know. Remember, I say the great chance is for men who are A, No. 1, not for those who are Z, No. 26. but for thoroughbred, accurate scholars.

When a young graduate once complained to Daniel Webster that the professions were all full, and that there was no room left for *him*, the great lawyer and statesman simply replied, "There is always room at the top, young man!" Now the difficulty in our America is, that while we are all "pretty well" educated, very few of us are *first-raters* and carry all the guns we might. We forget that if a man does not know a thing *accurately* he positively does not know it at all. It is only now and then that we launch a real solid, substantial scholar, complete in all points, into the world. Look at Congress to day! Look anywhere! At long intervals, Wayland, Webster, Bancroft, Everett, Choate, Prescott, Channing, Longfellow, Sumner, Motley, Lowell—and then a whole *parterre* of semi-intellectual peacocks only strutting about on exhibition, with a few fine feathers sweeping along the dusty highways of learning. Is it not amazing, that since 1855 there has hardly graduated from any American College a man who has yet made any great mark either as a lawyer, an orator, a statesman, a poet, a preacher, an essayist or an historian? In all the sciences we have done nobly, but it is really time for us to show better results in other departments of learning.

"Did it ever occur to you, my friends, that you never hear out of own country those every day phrases so common among us,—'*pretty near*,' '*about right*,' '*near enough*,' All over England the word *Right* is always sounding in your ears, and it goes into your scholarship as well as into their railroad. You may depend upon it, we never shall truly get on

in politics, in morals, in government, until we also can cry out '*Right!*' much oftener than we can now. *In-accuracy* in everything is our rock ahead, and it is especially marked in our scholarship. Why, there is not a third-rate town in all Germany today that could not beat any of our larger cities in the number of accurate, thoroughly informed scholars. We are content with *smatterers*. They demand *thoroughness*. When I hear it said of a man he is a '*pretty good scholar*,' I can't help thinking of a '*pretty good*' egg. Unless an egg is absolutely perfect we send it away from the table. Ignorance is hateful, and simply to *vener* ourselves with learning is a deadly mistake. I think it a great piece of good fortune for any one to be born in America, the greatest good luck in the world; but how we dare to be so ignorant of so many things is to me unaccountable. Just see how simple the whole matter of acquiring information is. Given *Brains* (and we always claim the privilege of knocking a man down if he disputes with us the fact of this possession), and all we can require and *must acquire*, are these three—*Attention*, *Perseverance*, and *Memory*.

"These can all be had for the asking; they can all be strengthened if they happen to be weak in any special case. You notice I do not reckon in *Morals*, for I cannot conceive of a *real* student, a young man of brains or common sense, who loves learning, and means to be a first rater, by and by; I cannot conceive of *his* having any time or inclination for those idiotic immoralities which turn a man into a brute. I take it, that sort of

thing is not in our line, and so I do not intend to insult you by mixing up baser matter with things needful, which we are all striving for, viz: the *Great Truths* of life. Go in for fun and genuine enjoyment. It is a capital rule to *play* a little every day of our lives. Heaven knows our faces are long enough, naturally, in such a climate as this, but we have only just so many years for real study, and youth won't stretch much beyond the twenties in a country so full of wear and tear as the one we are born into.

I plead with you then for *Accuracy*. Be sure of everything you know. A *half-baked* scholar is merely an underdone goose. He is simply a quack in every sense. Don't go about in this world of ours, that sorely needs *completeness* in *character*, like so many locks without keys or keys with missing locks.

"And don't be afraid of 'lions in the way.' Nine times out of ten the reported lions do not exist at all; or if they do, and can't be slain, go around them and thus avoid danger. The difficulty is that many of us are too indolent to keep out of harm's way. I am immensely fond of that plucky reply of a man to an indolent, timid friend. 'Suppose,' said the person who was always borrowing trouble, 'suppose now, somebody should tell you that you were going to die next Tuesday in a certain street in Boston. What would you do?' 'Do?' said the other, 'why, *I wouldn't be there!*'"

"All our dictionaries contain at least one very foolish word. When Mirabeau's Secretary once said to him, 'Sir, what you require is impos-

sible; 'Impossible,' cried Mirabeau, starting from his chair, 'never name to me again that blockhead of a word.' Now, downright accurate scholarship is impossible nowhere, and here in America we must come to it very soon. We have already delayed it too long. It will not do to shirk it any longer. When you hear a student reply to a question in mathematics, or Greek, or history, 'I know the answer very well, but I can't find words to express it,' don't you believe him. He does not know the answer. He may *think* that he does, but the poor old chap is mistaken in his knowledge; if he knew *definitely*, the words would somehow twist themselves out of his mouth, though they maimed his reluctant jaws for life.

"It is a great thing to *start* right. If we *begin* wrong, the chances are we shall never arrive at the point proposed. We shall go on and on in the wrong direction that leads nowhere. We have a story of a traveler, who, wishing to reach Taunton, in the opposite direction from the right one to that town. Meeting a farmer in the road he drew up and asked, 'How far is it to Taunton, if I keep straight on?' 'Well said the farmer with a twinkle in his intelligent eye, 'if ye keep straight on the way ye're going now, its about 25,000 miles; but if you turn right round and go tother way, its about half a mile.'

"And now God bless you, my dear fellows and show you the straight road to knowledge, and wisdom, and virtue. Your great, expanding, vigorous, native country has a first-rate place waiting for every first-rate man Exeter has to send her. Don't, I pray

you then, waste a single hour of youth; dont squander a moment of this golden gift of time, remember

"The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight:
But they while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night.

—N. Y. Observer.

To the Disciples of Christ in Texas

Delegates to the annual Meeting of Disciples to be held in Waco, Texas, on the 10th of July, 1874, who pass over the International and Great Northern Railroad, should procure *Round Trip* tickets at the point of starting. These will be sold on the 8th, 9th, and 10th of July. The rate will be one fare and one fifth for the round trip. They can be procured at the following stations: Mineola, Tyler, Longview Troupe, Kilgore, Jacksonville, Palestine, Grapeland, Crockett, Lovelady, Huntsville, Phelps, Willis, Spring, and Jewett.

By paying full fare on the Central Railroad from the point of starting to Waco, delegates will be returned free on that road to the same point, on the certificate of the Secretary of the meeting. The train arrives at Waco at 9: 10 P. M., and it is important that all should reach Waco on Thursday the 9th July, and be at the opening of the meeting the 10th.

THOMAS MOORE,
J. T. WALTON,
J. H. BANTON,
J. LEHMANN,
W. M. RAGLAND.

Committee.

June 24, 1874.

To the Brethren and all Friends of Education.

At a late meeting of the Trustees of Add Ran College, Hood Co., Texas, the undersigned were appointed to address you a circular letter.

This College is in need of a library, this the proprietor is not able to furnish, having made every possible sacrifice to buy and equip the building as it is. Any donation, however small, in the way of books will be thankfully received.

Brethren, cast your bread upon the waters, and you will find it many days hence in the rich harvest of a grateful and educated youth.

Faternally,

J. H. HARBISON,

A. M. ARNOT,

JAS. BROCK.

Add Ran College. Tex., June 22nd, 1874.

Human Organizations.

Brethren Lipscomb & Sewell: Enclosed find two dollars for the Advocate for one year, for brother James Nice, of Bunker's Hill, Lewis Co., Mo., my brother-in-law, whom I immersed in Kentucky when he was a school boy, when we had to cut the ice to immerse him, and I also immersed his wife when I lived in Lewis Co., Mo.—and who are now here on a visit to see us. I asked him to subscribe for the Advocate and he did so, and I make this statement to show that if each one of your subscribers will try he can send you one subscriber, which will increase the already great usefulness of your pa-

per. I think your subscribers ought to do this if for no other reason than the deadly blow you struck "human inventions" in the last number, showing the fruits they had produced in my old mother State, Virginia, Illinois and in your own State, Tennessee. After such proofs as you gave, and after such proofs as history gives of these fences to guard Anti-Christ for the last twelve hundred years, what our people can want to paint anew the fall of that ungodly and idolatrous, that foulest and filthiest old withered harlot, the Romish Hierarchy, so as to make her look young and beautiful in our hands is something that I cannot comprehend. There is no middle ground between the *Bible Alone*, and popery. If we are convinced that the Bible alone is wrong, let us abandon it at once, and not by piecemeal, and get out on Romish and sectarian ground, and on the "wide sea of uncertainties" where we were fifty years ago and where we can be in fashion with this old mother and her daughters.

If we once abandon the Rock of God's word we must expect and deserve to go to the bottom of perdition. There is no possible ground to rest upon between popery and our Rock. The burden lies upon those who say there is a middle ground to show it. They need not appeal to the word of God to prove a thing which it knows nothing of, such as the Infallibility of the Pope, organs, State Meetings, Conventions, Missionary Societies, *et cetera*. They need not appeal to history for proof, before the Council of Nice in 325, when the foundations of Anti-Christ were deeply and broadly laid. Some of our people seem to

have as great a *hankering* after these crumbs and fragments of Anti-Christ as the Jews had for the flesh-pots of Egypt. These *sappers and miners* among us seem determined never to cease their efforts, until they destroy our religious liberties, slyly and imperceptibly. A frequent recurrence to first principles has been found absolutely necessary to the preservation of civil and religious liberty. The right to spread the gospel is a right which inheres in single churches and individuals; it was given to them by the Head of the churches, the apostolic churches exercised it, and never delegated that right to plans, because they could not do it, if they would have done it, while they remained faithful to the Head. The right to spread the gospel is a right between single churches, and not a right *over* them nor *above* them, as these plans are. We impose upon these sappers and miners the restraints and language of the New Testament.

Single churches originally had the power to spread the gospel and did spread it. We refer to the Acts of Apostles and the New Testament for proof of this declaration. Will some friend of these "human inventions" be good enough to inform us where the right or power came from to form these plans? Do speak out, brethren, and tell us by what authority do you form these State Meetings and plans. When and where did the power pass from the hands of single churches to spread the gospel, into the hands of twenty men? How did it pass? By construction—by stretching the New Testament like an India rubber, which is the way the Jews, the original Christians lost their lan-

guage and liberties, and it is the way in which we have lost our language, liberties, and properties. There are always two parties in religion and politics, one for constructive power, the other is for the letter of the compact—the former leads to ruin always. This transference of the right of single churches to spread the gospel cannot pass from their hands to bodies of clergymen, by irplication or construction, it must be by written proof from the Head of the churches, or from the churches themselves. We call for the right of these plans to spread the gospel. Those who are old enough to remember the campaign of the first Bonaparte into Russia, will call to mind the famous Holy Alliance; (answering to our Evangelical Alliance) formed by the several crowned heads of Europe. Its professed object was the peace and stability of the European nations. Our great Daniel Webster said the world seemed to receive this treaty upon its first promulgation, with general charity. It was commonly understood to be nothing more than an expression of thanks for the successful termination of the momentous contest in which these sovereigns had been engaged. See Webster's speech on the Greek Revolution. In the name of the Most Holy Trinity, said their manifesto, their Majesties solemnly declare, that the present act has no other object than to publish in the face of the whole world their fixed resolution, both in the administration of their respective States, and in their political relations with every other government, to take for their guide the precepts of that Holy Religion—(as we have in the Bible)

namely, the precepts of justice, charity, and peace, which, far from being applicable to private concerns only, must have an immediate influence on the councils of nations, and guide all their steps, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions, and remedying their imperfections. (This is the pretended object of our plans.) All this appeared vastly well. It is probable they were sincere; and the Czar Alexander, at least, the great soul of the Alliance, was actuated by the most beneficent motives. This Alliance, then, was made to keep the peace of Europe; and to enforce that peace and the observance of the principles of justice and the gospel among the nations (in the language of Webster) by a million and a half of bayonets. But now there arose a momentous question; what do these princes deem to be the principles of justice and the gospel, with regard to human governments? Oh, the Divine Rights of Kings, of course, and the absolute destitution of all political rights on the part of the people! It was not long before they revealed the principles on which their conduct was to be governed. The first principle they put forth was in these words: "all popular or constitutional rights are holden no otherwise than as grants from the crown." Says Webster, society (churches) upon this principle has no rights of its own: it takes good government when it can get it, as a boon and a concession; but can demand nothing. It is to live in that favor which emanates from regal authority; and if it have the misfortune to lose that favor, there is nothing to protect it against injustice and oppression.

It can rightfully make no endeavor for a change by itself. All its duty is described in one single word submission. The Holy Alliance was not slow to draw the same conclusions. In the Layback circular of May 21, they declared, that useful and necessary changes in legislation ought to emanate from the free will and intelligent conviction of those whom God has rendered responsible for power; and that all that deviate from this line, necessarily tend to disorder, commotions and evils far more insupportable than those which they pretended to remedy." This I give to illustrate a principle; I could give much more. I say with Webster, I want words to express my abhorrence of this abominable principle. I trust every enlightened Christian and reader of the Advocate will oppose it, and support the Advocate in doing it. These human plans are a key not only to let in at the door all who are willing to come in, but a key to shut the door against all churches not willing to come into the plan of the Guardians and Trustees of the churches. When God gives an example or a command how a thing is to be done, he thereby forbids its being done in any other way. He has given examples of the gospel being spread by single churches, and has thereby forbidden us to spread it by plans. When a thing is not done as the law directs it to be done, it is not done at all. The logic of railroads, school-houses was invented as a side issue, to cover the somerset that was turned in 1849. Romanism is only an extension of the principle of plans and organs, and why should we wish to try or use tools which

have ruined all others who have employed them? Why wish to undo all that we have done? We are now in a transition state: why make the Scripture stand cap in hand to tradition to know whether it has leave to speak or not? In the *Review*, of June 16, 1874, we have this said: "We desire to labor on God's plan, so far as he has given any. Where the New Testament fails to teach us, we hope to do all sensibly and not to disregard any word of God." That sentence embodies the entire principle of Romanism, and is a gross violation of the principle to be silent where the Bible is silent, and all who adopt it going post-haste to Rome, and it will be a wreck if they get there. Have we pledged ourselves to be governed by our periodicals and great men, or by the Bible? Those who can swallow that bait will not choke at anything.

Yours truly,

JACOB GREATH.

Palmyra, Mo., June 29, 1874.

CO-OPERATION.

ELDER DAVID LIPSCOMB:

My Dear Brother:—In the *ADVOCATE* of the 18th June,—after publishing an account of the convention of the disciples of West Tennessee, taken from the *Christian Examiner*, of Virginia, and having made some strictures upon the author's reference to the "Louisville and Nashville Plans,"—you proceed to take a review, somewhat extended, of an article of my own, published in the *ADVOCATE*, of May 14th, inviting the attention of the brethren to the subject of co-operation in or-

der to the spread of the Gospel, in and out of our State. From the kind and respectful, as well as protracted nature of your notice, it will be expected by yourself, as well as your readers, that I should, at least present an acknowledgment of the same. In doing so, I shall endeavor to exhibit the same courteous, fraternal spirit displayed by yourself.

You have a good deal to say about and against "Plans," "Schemes," "high sounding Titles," and "Dignitaries," etc., etc. Now, my kind brother, let all this be as proper as it may, under some circumstances, and in some connections, I can't see or feel the force of it, in regard to my article.

Read that article again, *carefully*—May 14, No. 20, p. 469—and let your readers examine it, and point out to me the line where *Plan* or *Scheme* is even mentioned! Inform me what the "high-sounding titles and dignitaries" are! What the anti-scriptural or unscriptural 'functions' or 'functionaries' are, that I have used! What the 'theories' that I have there 'formulated'! Now, when you have done this, I will acknowledge the force of your criticism and review of my article.

In the providence of God, my lot having been cast among the Tennessee brethren, and desiring to contribute my humble mite to the furtherance of the common cause, in which we are all embarked. I respectfully suggested to the brethren, the propriety of calling a convention—not to invent and adopt unscriptural plans and schemes, not to formulate anti-scriptural themes, not to constitute functions, unknown to God's word

not to confer high-sounding titles, or constitute dignitaries; (I repeat, read my article again, and tell me where they are found)—but to do what? Why, in addition to the local preaching which we already have, to consult together, and co-operate in regard to sending out evangelists to proclaim the gospel in the different sections, East, West, Middle, as well as throughout the whole of our State. That's my proposition, as you will perceive by an attentive reading, and I am no more responsible for these Babylonish plans, systems, schemes, theories, functions, functionaries, high-sounding titles, dignitaries, so vividly pictured upon the fertile imagination of my brother, than he is himself. It will be time enough to arraign and condemn me for them, when I have proposed and advocated them. Until then, at least so far as I am concerned, let them sleep, and sleep and slumber on. But as my proposition has called forth my brother's review and criticism, permit me in the same spirit in which I made it—to ask him, and to ask the Tennessee brotherhood, is it right? or is it not right, to have evangelists sent out; the gospel preached, throughout Middle Tennessee, West Tennessee?—throughout the whole State? Is it right for us all to co-operate in this work? That's the issue plainly and squarely made out,—will my good brother negative that proposition?—Will the Tennessee brotherhood deny that it is proper? What says the glorious commission of our divine Lord? "*Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.*" Is it incumbent on us, as we can to carry out the spirit

and 'e t r of this divine, authoritative injunction? How is this to be done? Is it not, by sending out evangelists? What saith the Scripture here? 'How then shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? And how believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, *except they be sent?* As it is written, 'how beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things'? As reasons the apostle to the Gentile. Rom. x. 14, 15,

And should we not all co-operate in this good work of sending this 'gospel of peace; these glad tidings of good things' to our dying fellow-citizens? Well, that is just the length and breadth, and height and depth of my proposition; that we come together; consult together; co-operate together, in this work. I repeat the *question*, Is this *right*, or is it *wrong*? If it is wrong, why then let it go down to the grave, with the seal of brother Lipscomb's disapprobation resting upon it. But, I think it is at least worthy of a trial, before the sentence of condemnation is passed upon it. And therefore, I renew the proposition, upon my own responsibility, respectfully and deferentially, however—that we meet together, at such time and place, as the brethren may agree upon,—and in the fear of God, and governed by the counsels of his divine word, carefully and prayerfully consider this matter. There are some other matters rather of a personal nature, on which I wish to bestow some attention;—but, as I do not desire to be tedious, I will close for the present;

reserving these for a future article. In the meanwhile, wishing you health, strength and peace, I am,

Yours fraternally,

G. W. ABELL.

Murfreesboro, June 21st, 1874.

We felt some hesitancy in reviewing our brother's article, because he was greatly a stranger to the readers of the Advocate and we wished to say nothing that would in any manner cause them or others to esteem lightly one so earnest, so devoted, so persistently faithful in the labor of the Lord as he has proved himself to be by twenty-five or thirty years of self-sacrificing and unfaltering labor in the cause of our master. We never met Bro. Abell personally until a few months past, since his removal to Tenn. But from a child we have known of his labor of faith and love. We oppose then, his plans, not him. When we published his article we felt confident it would fall still-born, and determined we would say not a word until ample time for responses should be given. Not a reponse reached us to his call.

But he challenges us to point out "the line where plan or scheme is mentioned." My brother, you drew your picture so well there was no need of labelling with its name, as a girl did her picture of the horse to let it be known what it was.

The plan was to have a co-operation of the churches of the whole State, to send out a State Evangelist to travel throughout the whole State. A co-operation of the churches in East, Middle and West Tennessee, to send out an evangelist for each of these divisions. Now that is a plan,

and needs not a name to let it be known.

So, at least, Bro. Abell seems to think when he wrote that twice published, though uncopyrighted letter to his Virginia brethren, in which he admonishes them to quit wrangling about "plans" and take the "Lord's plan," and contribute every first day of the week, and thus have a replenished treasury instead of dead, unpaid pledges. The plan they had, was a State Evangelist sent out by a State Co-operation meeting, and district evangelists sent out by a district co operation meeting. If a plan, then and there, why not one here and now? But it is a plan so fully as to be recognized without a label.

A State evangelist is a functionary, so is a district evangelist. The offices are functions. Both the functions and functionary are unknown to the Bible. The State Evangelist is a higher functionary and a more spread out one than the district one. The district ones are superior to the common evangelists of the Lord Jesus Christ. They are titles high-sounding, they indicate dignities, they who fill dignities are dignitaries.

The plan involves the meeting together of churches, by messengers and of churches delegating their work to a body taken out of the different churches, but distinct from any one or all of them—a body unknown to the kingdom of God as set up and put in motion by the Lord Jesus Christ. This meeting must again delegate its work to boards. It, with all these necessary functions are additions to the church of God, made by man.

All these, we insist, are needless, they gender strife, envy, bitterness. They work much evil, no good. They open the flood-gate of human expediency. They authorize human tinkering at divine institutions. This once opened, when and where shall it be closed? These organizations absorb the work and functions of the churches, dry up their life and energy, and leave no truth in the then useless institutions of the Almighty.

Our brother queries to me and our Tennessee brethren as to whether it is right to have evangelists sent out, is it right to have the gospel preached throughout the world, is a mere diversion? It is the exact parallel to the course of the Sets, who, when we deny the action of the Spirit in the heart save through the divine appointments, ask, Do not you believe in the operation of the Spirit? Or they boldly affirm that we do not. Our brother knows that I do. He knows that I affirmed it in the review of his article. He knows we all believe it. Does our brother not realize that the asking of these questions amounts to an intimation that we do not believe in teaching the world the way of truth and righteousness? Does he not know that it does us gross injustice? Does he not know that he does himself a wrong and injury in making such intimations? Why ask such questions? Does the objection to his plan, amount in his esteem to a denial of the propriety of the work, that he asks such questions?

He knows much of our objection to these plans, was because they were inefficient in this work. A most serious objection to all these human appendages is, they affect their devo-

tees like the sectarian churches do theirs, so influence them that they cannot do justice to their opponents, cannot state their opponents position correctly. We speak plainly but kindly on this matter, because there is a question of moral right as well as fraternity involved in the matter.

How can he ask, is it right to have evangelists sent out; the gospel preached throughout Middle, East and West Tennessee? Throughout the whole State? Is it right for us all to co-operate in this work? and then affirm, "That is the issue squarely and fairly made out."

Now you injure yourself, my brother by such assertions. They may do in papers who refuse to let us be heard in them. But every reader of the Advocate knows this is not the issue, and no akin to it. They know that the assertion is a misrepresentation of me and of the brethren in Tenn. They do not see how it can be made in the face of what was said in my article, save on the ground, that our brother and others hold that if we object to their expediences for doing the work, we object to the work itself. This always seemed to me the height of presumption.

Now, we deny that these expediences are any part of God's way. The gospel was preached in his way, over larger fields than Tennessee and Va. combined. Every Christian in the world co operated in this work. Not a single high-sounding title was given, not one went forth to preach Christ in any other than Christ's own name. Not one was placed above another, save as his work placed him. Not a single function, or functionary was created save what belonged to the simple congregations of the Lord

without any combinations whatever.

Now the true and only issue is, are the simple congregations of Christ, without new modifications or combinations, without creating new functions through their Heaven appointed agencies, sufficient for the work of God? That's the issue squarely and fairly made, my brother. To this I intend in kindness and love to hold you firmly and strictly. Shall speak plainly when you raise false issues or make misrepresentations. We give you full credit for making these from the force of habit or from seeing and hearing others, who misrepresent us, do these things, without any wrong intent on your part. But we never intend to let you do it again from a lack of knowledge of what we do believe and teach:

Truly, in Christian love, your Bro.

D. L.

Church News.

Bro. Lipscomb: The new house erected by our brethren five miles north of Lebanon, on the turnpike-road leading to Cumberland River, was occupied for the first time on Saturday before the fifth Lord's day in last month. On Lord's day, the crowd was the largest that I have seen together for many years. It was variously estimated at from 1500 to 2000 persons. The benches were carried out to a grove near by, and the crowd seated as well as could be, under the circumstances. Some seated themselves on logs, others on the grass, while a very large proportion of them had to stand upon their feet. The brethren and friends had an ample supply of provisions on the

ground, and after the discourse, all were invited to partake, and listen to the second discourse, which was delivered after an intermission of one and a half hours. There was also preaching at night. Bro. Kidwell preached at night.

The meeting was continued by Bro. Kidwell day and night until Lord's day night. The immediate result of the meeting was fourteen additions, all by confession and baptism; something near half of them were heads of families. Bro. Huffman was present most of the time, urging the brethren and sisters to faithfulness in the Christian life. The people manifested great anxiety to hear the words of truth which were so impressively uttered by our earnest and unpretending Bro. The crowds were large and the interest good to the close of the meeting. This new congregation commences with something near fifty members. They are in a fine country and in the midst of a people who are hard to beat for moral and social qualities. They have a neat house which they call Philadelphia. It cost them about \$1250, and the beauty of it is that it is all about paid. It is a neat frame house, well finished and furnished and will comfortably seat about 400 persons.

Bro. K. also had sixteen additions a short time before this at Lafayette, in Macon County,

J. M. H.

The Spread of the Gospel.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: Your reference to my article to Bro. Headington, on Plans, leads me to believe you

must think me in some measure committed to "plans." I wish to say that I stand to-day just where I did when you saw me. I am opposed to all humanisms, whatever, in the great scheme of the gospel.

By humanism, I mean—of course—any other plan, or arrangement, than that ordained of God. I have all confidence in God's wisdom in devising—in the power of Jesus in executing, and the Holy Spirit in consummating our redemption. I have worked on the Lord's plan, ever since I commenced preaching, I am still working on that. I go and preach the Gospel, the people hearing, believe and I baptize into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, I have done so for some years now. In the mean time I have supported a large family, and I think the reports of my meetings will compare favorably with those who have labored constantly in the interest of plans. I have generally went to hold meetings, not knowing whether the people would pay me or no, but have not failed of getting some help, and generally as much as I should have had.

I believe if every church would develop what talent it has—and reach out as far as it could on Lord's day, that is, send out its preachers all round on Lord's day, as far as they could go, and come again some day—to preach, and put those to work whom they baptize, these in turn reaching out again their arms, &c. It seems to me would be the natural order of things, and would eventually spread over the whole world. Our greatest difficulty is in trying to do too much. We are impatient, the

world must all be converted in a day. We forget that the Lord was 4000 years preparing the world for the reception of the Gospel, and that nearly 2000 years more passed away before it began to have much success, &c. I believe God is in the work, and he has ordained the means the plan &c. I have so much confidence in Jesus, that I shall never adopt anything, not in harmony with the New Testament.

Ever yours in Christ,

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville Texas June 27th 1874.

This article is marked "private," but I feel sure Bro. Poe will not object to its publication although there seems a little boasting on the part of Bro. P. It is like Paul's forced boasting, forced by my allusion to this note to Bro. Headington and intended only for my eye. Our readers will with us adjudge it is not immodest. We did not believe Bro. Poe committed to any "plan" or that he could be induced to adopt a plan not clearly Scriptural. But we thought that, he supposed the operations of the early Christians could be formulated into a definite plan. We believe this impossible. But we gave it simply as evidence afforded, of the fact that it was universally regarded that we at Nashville had made no "plan." While some willing to make an evil impression concerning us, were using such terms and making such insinuations as to lead their readers to believe we had formulated, adopted and advocated a "plan." All of which is directly the opposite of the truth.

D. L.

Obituaries.

Fell asleep in Jesus, June 23, sister Mary Ann Jane Lesueur, aged about fifty two years. She was born in Virginia, but spent most of her life in Tennessee; the latter portion of it in Edgefield where she was residing at the time of her death. Her last illness was long and very severe, though she bore it with great fortitude and patience.

She has been for many years a member of the Church of God, and those who know her say she has been a pious, good woman. A good share of the sorrows and trials of life have fallen to her lot, but she has ever borne them with meekness and patience. She was calm and dispassionate in all her ways.

Approaching death seemed to bring no terrors to her. Though deeply distressed about leaving her children, she had no fears for her future. Sister Lesueur was a kind mother, and will be greatly missed by her children. But they will sorrow not as others who have no hope; and if they will serve the Lord faithfully, on earth, they may meet her where parting will be no more.

E. G. S.

John H. Scaggs—the subject of this sketch was born Lauderdale Co. Ala. in 1837, came to Texas in 1856, went to California in 1857, returned to Texas 1862 and joined the confederate army immediately upon his arrival. After the war closed he settled in Travis Co, Texas. He was married to Miss Clara Nance in 1870 and died at the residence of the undersigned in Fayette Co. Texas May 24th 1874. He leaves a daughter five months old, his wife having died in February. Notwithstanding he—like a great many others respected Christianity—had never realized the fact that it was his duty to obey the gospel. But upon the fourth Lord day in May he was buried in baptism by Bro. W. S. Dabney, and upon the following Lord's day we closed his eyes in death. Farewell Bro. John till the resurrection morn.

W. J. HILDEBRAND.

Schulenburg, Texas, June 16, 1874.

Dear Bro. Liepcomb: My daughter Mrs. Mary L Henderson after a very painful and protracted sickness of consumption, departed this life the 25th day of this month in her thirty eighth year, leaving our children, her husband having died in 1861. In 1864 their house was burned and nearly everything they had taken by the Federal army—I have taken care of them since,

The morn'g before she died, she called all around and gave a long farewell, with such a talk to father mother, brothers and her children as I never heard in all my life. Such

resignation to God's will and such a triumphant faith in death I never witnessed before. Thus you see, my, brother, my children are passing away, only one daughter and three sons left. My trials and troubles are increasing. My own health failing—yet I am trying to work on the farm in the week and preach on Lord's day as I have the chance. This daughter was with me when I saw you last at the meeting in Walton Co. Ga.

May my brethren pray for their poor old brother.

Yours in hope of Immortality,

NATHAN W. SMITH.

Near Ringgold Ga. June 30th. 1874.

PREACHING ON A VELOCIPEDE.

The *Church Missionary Gleaner* has a letter from a missionary at Agurpa in Bengal, in which he gives the account of the evangelistic labors of a native convert:

"Baboo Gurnchurn Bose, who has been with me since his conversion in 1842, as head master of the English school, and has always assisted me in preaching the Gospel to the heathen, is now, notwithstanding his laborious duties in the school, out every morning and evening, combining exercise with preaching. He starts on his velocipede about four or five in the morning, and goes a great distance towards either end of the Barrackpore road. On his way he invariably finds groups of men and women, either as travellers from great distances, or as vendors of vegetables going to the different markets. When they are proceeding in the same direction with him, he joins them and enters into religious conversations, and points out them Jesus Christ as the only Savior of sinners. Should he meet such groups going in the opposite direction, he turns and accompanies them, speaking all the while

about the salvation of their souls. Very frequently the travelling groups rest themselves for a while on the roadside. He also steps and preaches. Presently other groups come up, one after another, and form a large body of hearers of the gospel. The distant people from cities and villages hear of Christ and his salvation."

The reward of righteousness is righteousness itself. True love seeks only true love in return. No mother would expect to be rewarded by money for loving or saving her child. It would be an insult to her whole being to insinuate that she was not sufficiently rewarded by having her child's heart to beat responsive to her own; and so, what reward does God offer to love? What but love—Himself! What reward can He hold out to the man who "hungers after righteousness," better than that "he shall be filled;" for "the Lord loveth righteousness," and giveth us what he loves.—*Norman Macleod.*

Lost Money.

As already stated through the Advocate, our losses this year through the mails have been considerable. We now ask all those who have mailed us money that was lost, to write to us at once, and let us know exactly on what day of the month and year it was mailed, and in what Post-office it was mailed.

ED'RS.

No Number Next Week.

Our Typos ask for next week for their vacation and rest week, and

there will be no number issued then, as we have one week every Summer for that purpose, and yet fill our full number of issues during the year.

ED'RS.

Bro. Pickens in last number of *Weekly*, says, Bro. Lipscomb seems to think some effort had been made to conceal the writer of article on West Tenn. Co-operation. Wherein we seem to think that we cannot tell. We had no such thought, and certainly did not wish to seem to think so. We thought nothing of any smuggling. We saw the groundless thrust at us, we felt indignant at such unfair innuendoes and determined to reply to it. We stated that we had received no account of the meeting, because we had learned a copy of the proceedings was to be sent to the ADVOCATE, none had come to us: as a matter of justice to ourselves, we wished the brethren who had ordered it to know the reason it was not published.

D. L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Baptism a Sign.....	649
The Law of Sin and Death.....	652
Absurd ties	654
Spiritual gifts.....	658
A talk to Students.....	659
To the Disciples of Christ in Texas.....	661
To the Brethren and Friends of Education.....	662
Human Organization.....	662
Co-operation.....	665
Church News.....	669
The Spread of the Gospel.....	669
Obituaries.....	671
Preaching on a velocipede.....	671
Lost Money.....	672
No Number Next Week.....	672

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 29.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JULY 23, 1874.

CO-OPERATION AGAIN.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: Before proceeding to complete my work, in connection with your review of my article:—that is, in relation to the 'personal' features thereof—permit me to make one general remark, in regard to the general subject, and that is: I regard the great effort of heaven as a divine system of co-operation for the salvation of the world, through the proclamation of the gospel of Christ. It is a grand, divine, co-operation, missionary scheme. The Father sent the Son; the Son sent the Holy Spirit; also commissioned and sent forth the Apostles, inspired by that spirit, to make the proclamation of salvation to the perishing millions of earth. Hence, we have here, a practical, divine endorsement of co-operative effort, in this philanthropic, benevolent work.

'We then as workers together with him,'—*sumergountis*—*co-workers, co-laborers, cooperators*;—'beseech you also, that you receive not the grace of God in vain.' 2 Cor. vi: 1. Paul, who was our authority before, Rom. x: 14-15, for 'sending' the preacher,

here becomes our authority, likewise, for 'co-operating' in this work; for in 'co-operating' with God, we mutually co-operate with one another; and that is what we are seeking, by our proposition to the brethren, more effectually to accomplish. But, to turn our attention more especially to the 'personal' features of brother Lipscomb's review of my article. In his argument, (shall I say, against *co-operation*?—or simply against *plans and schemes*?) he attempts to show, 1. Their deleterious tendencies. This he illustrates, by a proposition made by brother Cutler of Virginia, (who, by the way is *not* my successor as State Evangelist; for they have no such 'function' or 'dignitary,' at this time in Virginia, whether humble or 'high-sounding') endorsed and enforced by brother Lucas, one of the editors of the *Excaminer*, to have a committee appointed by the State meeting, to examine candidates for the ministry. Well, if my proposition involved a plan, and I were seeking to establish one; and this proposition were shown to be an off-shoot of such plan, and acknowledged to be wrong; I could

reply, by saying,—this is only an *abuse* of the plan; and upon the same ground that you would condemn the plan, for its *abuse*, you might likewise condemn every institution, whether human or divine. For pray tell me, which of these have not been abused? Has not the institution of marriage, often been shamefully perverted and abused? shall we therefore, for that reason, abolish it? Which of our holy institutions would escape abolition on that principle? But, it will be time enough to discuss the merits and demerits of a plan, when it is found, in my proposition under review. I am not now so intent upon the defence of plans, as of these two brethren, Cutler and Lucas, who have been dragged into this discussion, and a little roughly handled. Now; I know these brethren—know them *well*—and know them not only, as being among the strongest and most eloquent defenders we have, of the faith, whether *in* or *out* of Virginia, so far as my acquaintance extends; and what is far better in my estimation, I know them to be *good* and *true* men, and prepared to seal their eloquent defence of the truth, by the last drop of blood from their veins: and while I do not agree with their proposition, holding that there is no authority on earth higher than that of each congregation; yet, I am confident these two brethren would be among the last, to silence the voice of any good, humble, pious man, who desired to use his tongue, in telling the story of the cross of Christ.

2. You next attempt to show the impracticability of these plans, by showing their tendency to 'starvation'

and making preachers become 'candidates for the poor-house, with a fine prospect for election.' I again repeat, if I were defending plans, could I not, by way of answer to this, ask the question, Have no preachers been in danger of starvation, run, well-nigh being elected to the poor-house, save those who have preached under these plans? This may be a good objection in its place; it is certainly a *practical* one; but it seems to me, it comes with rather poor grace, in the same article, in which we have an objection of directly an opposite kind offered; that is, in conferring high salaries and dignities, upon their creatures. Surely one of these objections should have been reserved, until the other had faded from the memory. But I have not introduced this item to defend the plans, from this 'starvation,' 'poor-house' argument; having proposed none to defend; but to correct some few blunders, into which my good brother has unintentionally fallen, so far as their operation in Virginia is concerned, (as it concerns the other States mentioned, that is, Illinois, Tennessee and Kentucky, I know nothing, and therefore, have nothing to say.) And permit me, my kind brother, to assure you, that, 'I am NOT an exile from my home, the land and people I love above all others, STARVED OUT as a *State evangelist*,' my letter, (which has now passed through its *second* edition in the Advocate, and how many more it yet may, I know not) to the contrary notwithstanding. Read that letter again, carefully, my good brother, and you will find about as much 'starvation' in it, as you will

of 'plans' 'schemes,' 'functions,' 'dignitaries' &c.. &c., in the one containing my proposition for a consultation meeting. It seems to me you may have had a little touch of those 'nightmares' you speak of riding others so heavily. A man may endure all the evils enumerated in my letter, so highly honored by the Advocate; (having been published there *twice*, when not designed for publication there at all), and still be several degrees removed from 'starvation.' Permit me to repeat, with emphasis, 'I am *not* an exile from my home,' the land of my fathers and my children; doubly dear to me, from both fleshly and spiritual considerations, as a '*starved out State Evangelist.*' You say and *truly* say, 'No truer people under the sun live, than the brethren of Old Virginia;' I cordially endorse the tribute, and know it to be just. For about 25 years I acted as their State Evangelist, and during that long period, had nothing to do with the 'poor houses' except to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to their inmates; and was never in the slightest danger of 'starvation.'

To within the last few years, they always paid me punctually *all*, and *more* than all, that they ever promised me. And the exception within the last few years has been due, more to the hardness of the times, and the stringency in financial matters, than any want of good faith, or liberality on their part. Moreover, they will pay me the last dollar they ever promised me. I knew our State Board. They are all honest, honorable, Virginia, Christian gentlemen. And that's the best that can be said

of poor humanity. They will see that the last dime due me, will be paid. When I left Virginia, the 19th of last October, I had no other expectation, than to return. Suffice it to say, the strong importunities of the brethren and sisters at this place, coupled with some other circumstances, needless here to mention, induced me to locate at this point: but, be it distinctly and emphatically understood, '*not as a starved out State evangelist.*'

You are equally unfortunate in your reference to other Virginia brethren, Coleman, Walthall, Crenshaw, Holland, Challen, and you might have added, Goss, Ainsley and others:—*all* of whom, so far as my knowledge extends, are in favor of a Scriptural, co-operative effort to spread the gospel abroad; not *one* of whom, so far as I know, ever left the State, because of the operation of these plans; some of whom have returned, and are now acting as evangelists, as, brother Holland, in the Southeastern district, of whose Board Bro. Walthall is a member; and Bro. Ainsley, in the Tide water district. But, lest I might weary you and your readers, I must conclude by saying, should my proposition for a convention, for consultation, prevail, there is no brother whose presence and co-operation would be more valued than your own.

With much respect and christian regard, your brother in Christ,

G. W. ABELL.

We agree with our brother fully when he says the whole scheme of redemption is a grand co-operative plan, given by God to save man. We

go further than he. He says we have here a Divine endorsement of co-operative effort. We say God has actually ordained the co-operative institution complete and perfect in all its parts. We have only to work in it and Divine co-operation is the result. Our effort is to induce the children of God to co-operate through his own Divine institution, while from my stand-point, our brother seems to be striving to substitute a human co-operation for the Divine. We prefer the Divine one. We will have none other. To work in God's institutions, is to co-operate with God. To co-operate with God, is to co-operate with all who obey the laws of God—with all who co-operate with him.

We object to another thing in our brother's essay. His defence of the character of bros. Cutler and Lucas. Why defend their characters? Who had attacked them? I had said not one word about their characters as men. We never heard a word of harm of either, never intimated a word of harm. Would not have done if I had known harm. Then why defend their characters? Persons reading Bro. Abell's reply who had never seen our article would be led to conclude that we had attacked their characters. This does us a wrong.

We did object to their proposition to have Bro. Abell, Bro. Walthall, Bro. Coleman, Bro. Henly and the old preachers or the young ones examined by any committee of any board appointed by the best and purest of even Old Virginia Christian gentlemen. So does Bro. Abell. Where is the rough handling then?

We do believe such an innovation subversive of the institution of heaven. That is the only question I suggested. We do not believe them right. Their proposition carried out must as completely destroy the character of the churches, as the Presbyterian or Methodist systems do.

Suppose they would not stop these brethren from preaching, is there any assurance that their successors in office would not? Bro. Lucas wishes to stop a whole swarm of preachers, whom he calls "ignorant and immoral zealots" who have entered the Virginia pulpits. When a whole swarm is stopped we do not know who will be left. But he says after a number of non-committal hypotheses, certain things are abuses. Will we condemn a plan for its abuses? When it produces no good fruit, but evil and only evil as all human plans and organizations in religion do, and especially when it stands without a word of Divine warrant, but really subverts Divine institutions, we unhesitatingly condemn it. We say these organizations have never worked good, have perpetually worked evil, they have assumed the work of the churches, usurped their rights, and destroyed their activity. In Virginia they must have bred a swarm of "ignorant and immoral zealots in the pulpits," as no such swarms have been bred here where we have no "plans." He says they have no successor to him in office. They have an office that succeeded his, with only a changed name. To quibble about these names seems to us the veriest trifling.

But we deny these are abuses of the system. They are the universal

and legitimate fruits of the system of man's tinkering with the institutions of the Almighty. Show one single instance in the world, where man has undertaken to modify or change, or even form new combinations in the churches of God, that did not result in just such assumption of the functions of the church. Presbyterianism with its synods and assemblies is but the fruits of forming new combinations in and among the churches. So Methodism with its conferences great and small. Romanism itself is but the growth of an effort to make new combinations of and in the churches of Christ our Savior.

Bro. Abell's plan seems to us to embody the rudiments of all these evils. His plan is an effort to make new combinations in and of the churches of Christ, to sustain functionaries, State and district, that are utterly unknown to the Bible, to create permanent boards and offices, without Divine warrant. These innovations being admitted, we see no point at which to say, thus far and no farther, shalt thou go.

We said not a word about what bro. Coleman, Walthall, Goss, Crenshaw, or Holland thought of co-operation. We know they (some of them) favored, not scriptural but unscriptural co-operation. We favor all scriptural operation and co-operation.

Some of these Scriptures we think he misapplies. The passage from tenth of Romans, concerning the sending of those who preach, certainly has not the most distant allusion to a church sending out a teacher. It refers to God calling and sending the apostles. We

have no preachers or preaching now in the sense of the terms as there used. They referred to the original inspired proclaimers of the gospel who first made it known. If our brother will examine his Greek Testament, he will never quote this passage in such a connection again.

Again, 2nd Cor. vi.: 1. The *we* who are said to be co-workers with God, were the "ambassadors" "the apostles" of the Lord Jesus Christ. They, the co-workers, the ambassadors, were beseeching their Christian brethren, as a distinct class. We believe in one sense we, all the children of God, are co-workers with God; but this passage has no allusion to that truth, as any one may see, who will read the full connection, beginning with the 20th verse of the 5th chapter.

But we believe in co-operation, co-working with God. Every man who obeys the commands of God or induces another to obey them is a co-worker with God. He not only co-operates with God but he co-operates, works together with every other being in the universe, in heaven or on earth that obeys God. God superintends that co-operation, God guides, directs, is the head of that co-operation. That co-operation requires only that we obey God, walk by his law, do his bidding, operate his institutions, and we are in perfect accord and harmony, in complete and full co-operation with God and with every being in the universe who is in harmony with the will of God. This co operation is effected not by forming new institutions, new organs, new functions, or new combinations of God's institutions, but by unfal-

tering fidelity in the institutions of God. To form new institutions, to change or modify God's institutions, to create new functions not formed of God, is to operate without and against God and against every being in harmony with God. For God operates only through his own laws, his own institutions, his own appointments, not through those of others. Co-operation with God is working through God's institutions, organs, functions without change or modification.

As to the points of our brother's starvation, etc., we leave him to explain his own letter in his own way. He, as a wise man, saw the evil coming and stepped out of the way.

Our brother thinks his Virginia brethren will pay him all. We hope and believe so, but if a man had to wait eight or ten months for his bread, he would be getting near the starvation point, I would think.

He thinks us inconsistent, in offering objections antagonistic in their character. Did we not give ample evidence of both? Bro. Munnell, the highest dignitary, the great head centre of the system, gets a salary, in Bro. Lindsey's estimation, so fat that he seems a little jealous of him, in his easy berth. Bro. Lindsey's family are suffering for his salary, Bro. Abell has had to leave home, to keep from being "dunned! dunned!! dunned!!" as he expresses it. We could give many instances of this latter objection. For the lower the dignitary, the less, and the more uncertain the pay. If these high dignitaries thus suffer, what a tale of woe could your backwoods district officials unfold. Our brother wishes

to know if we never knew others starved out. We have. But in other arrangements with individual churches, a man knows more exactly what he is doing, with whom he is dealing and the churches feel their responsibility more directly. A man is to blame if he quits work and persists in depending on a church that does not pay as it goes. He deserves to suffer.

If we will live just as God requires we do not believe we will suffer harm. Do not depend on anybody. If a church helps you, accept it and labor. If it merely promises to help you, do not believe a word of it. Do not depend upon anybody's promises except God's.

We simply conclude by again affirming, that the Scriptures fully and thoroughly furnish the man of God and the church of God to all good works. They present the churches in their simple, separate character and their own functions as the efficient means and complete outfit of thus furnishing him to the full work of God.

All additional combinations, organs, offices and functions are additions to God's word, and to his institutions. They more than furnish him for good works. The works unto which the additions of man furnish him are evil. Must be. Our duty is to work in his institutions just as he gave them, and trustingly leave the result with him. This work is of faith. All beyond this is of reason. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. We cannot have faith where we have no testimony. We have no testimony that any institution or office or combination of institutions

not ordained of God, is acceptable to him. Work in these cannot be of faith. We verily believe it is sin before Almighty God to form any institutions or combination of institutions not directed of God, or to work in such.

We repeat, If there is a brother in the State or out of it, whose heart is in the work, and his own and the congregations who know him judge him suited for the work, who is so earnest as to improve what opportunities he has for doing good; but is debarred because of lack of sustenance, the privilege of telling sinners the way of truth and life, we are certainly willing to do all in our power to enable him to go to the poor and humble and sinful to teach them the way of salvation. If he is a member of a congregation able to assist him, we will try to induce them to do it. We will not wrong them nor violate the relationships of God's family, by taking him out of his proper connection with that church, and assigning him a position unknown to the church of God. If his own congregation is unable to render him proper assistance, let others who know him and who are naturally connected with him and them by proximity and spiritual relations arising from labors in their midst assist. This is Scriptural, it is sensible, it is practical. It creates no new office or function. Farther than Bible authority, we dare not go.

We hope our brother's well and long-tried earnestness and zeal will not lead him into anything lacking Divine warrant. Our God and Father is amply able to accomplish his work through his own appoint-

ments just as he gave them without additions, amendments, modifications or combinations from man. Our part is to work faithfully, earnestly and trustingly in them and leave the consequences with him. "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but shall accomplish that whereunto I sent it." Isaiah 55: 11-12. Now God's word accomplishes that to which it is sent, only through the appointments contained in the word. When work is accomplished through means not provided in the word, the word fails, is not prospered, returns void. Whoever works for the accomplishment of ends through the appointments of the word, works with God to prosper the word; he who works to accomplish God's purposes through other means than those set forth in the word of God works to render that word void.

None of these plans, combinations, organizations are recognized or approved in God's word. Then working through them, renders God's word void. Let us brethren, cooperate with God to prosper his word, and not to render it void.

D. L.

The New Birth.

As it is held by all the protestant religious world that it is necessary for men and women to be regenerated, or born again, in order to an en-

trance into the kingdom of God, but there being a difference among them in regard to the way regeneration takes place, we propose to offer a few thoughts on this subject. Since the Savior of the world declared positively that except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God, there can be no dispute, with those who believe that he who spake these words is the Son of God, (and consequently incapable of speaking an untruth) about the necessity of the second birth; but the Savior declared equally as positively as he did concerning the necessity of the second birth, that, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Then if we believe on the testimony of Jesus, that it is necessary for men and women to be born again, in order to an entrance into the kingdom of God, we must also believe on his testimony that they must be born of water and of the Spirit. Then since it is impossible for men and women to enter the kingdom of God, without being born again, born of water and of the Spirit, it becomes a matter of the greatest importance that they understand in what this birth consists, or how they are born again. A very popular belief in the religious world concerning regeneration is, that the Spirit of God comes in immediate contact with the hearts of sinners, and thus pardons their sins and gives them new hearts. Those on whom this operation is supposed to have taken place, are thought to be regenerated or born again, born of the Spirit, having the Holy Spirit bearing witness with their Spirits that they are the chil-

dren of God. But would such a birth as this be a birth of water and of the Spirit, without which the Savior has declared positively no man can enter the kingdom of God? Certainly not, for there is no water connected with what is claimed to be this kind of birth. It is not claimed that such a birth is of water and Spirit but of Spirit only. Then it could not be the new birth of which our Savior spoke. If those claiming to have been regenerated in the way we have mentioned are born of water at all, they would be born three times. Once of the flesh, then regenerated by the Spirit, and then born of water. Hence we see the inconsistency of this theory with the teaching of the Savior concerning the new birth. But we have not been left to conjecture in a matter of such vital importance as this. The Bible teaches us that, in the days of Jesus and his apostles, water was used in connection with Christianity as plainly as it teaches that there was a Jesus and his apostles, but we have no account of water ever being used in connection with the Christian religion in any other way than in the rite of baptism. Therefore it is plain that baptism is the birth of water to which our Savior alluded. No person who believes the Bible expects to be saved outside of the kingdom of God. No man can enter that kingdom without being born of water and of the Spirit; but "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This is conclusive in regard to what is meant by the water connected with the new birth. But three things are necessary to constitute a birth. First a begetting, then

quickenings, then a bringing forth. We find that these three things were always necessary in order to regeneration in the days of the apostles. The Holy Spirit by the mouth of the apostles first begot faith in the hearts of those who were converted, then when that faith was quickened by repentance, there was a bringing forth of water by being baptized in water and coming out therefrom. This was the way they were born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." The word spoken by the Holy Spirit, and faith was begotten in the sinners heart; for faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God, and because of their belief in what the Spirit spoke, they were induced to repent and be baptized. Hence we see that the Holy Spirit was and is the prime agent in the regeneration of sinners; and without this agency there could be no birth of water and Spirit. Then when men and women have faith begotten in their hearts by the words of the Holy Spirit, the written word of God, (and to say that faith comes in any other way than by the word of God, is to accuse the Holy Spirit by which Paul spoke, of falsity) and that faith is quickened by repentance, and they are baptized into Christ by water baptism, they are most assuredly born of water and of the Spirit. They are then new creatures in Christ. Old things are passed away, and all things are become new. It is thus that they are born again of incorruptible seed by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever. There are, howev-

er, many pious and sincere persons, who do not believe that by simply believing the words of the Holy Spirit, and repenting of their sins,—that is having a sorrow for sin great enough to cause them to forsake their sins,—and being baptized into Christ, sinners can be regenerated at all; but think that it is necessary for the Spirit to act immediately on their hearts to regenerate them, and bear witness to them that they are regenerated; or in other words bear witness with their Spirits that they are the children of God. As was before stated, this kind of birth would not be a birth of water and Spirit, inasmuch as there is no water connected with it; and those claiming to be regenerated in this way cannot possibly claim that they have entered the kingdom of God on earth, or that they can enter his heavenly kingdom, without making the Son of God a liar, for he has declared positively that no man can enter God's kingdom without being born of water and of the Spirit. But the advocates of the theory of regeneration without water claim to know that their theory is true (although it contradicts Christ,) because they think they have the Spirit of God bearing witness with their Spirits that they are the children of God. The apostle John tells us not to believe every Spirit, but to try the Spirits whether they be of God. The apostle Paul says that even Satan himself was transformed into an angel of light. Then, although some Spirit which may seem to be a Spirit of light, may testify to man that he is a child of God without being born of water and of the Spirit,

in order to know whether this Spirit is the Spirit of God, we must try it.

Now, we know that the Spirit of God will not testify that any of the teaching of the Son of God is untrue, but will bear witness to the truth of all which the Son taught. Thus we see that the Spirit that bears witness to man that he is a child of God before he has been born such of water and of the Spirit, cannot be the Spirit of God, for it is the children of God who shall inherit this kingdom; but the Son says no man can enter that kingdom except he be born of water and of the Spirit. Then this Spirit not being the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit of truth, must be the Spirit of error which worketh in the children of disobedience: for this Spirit teaches people that they can become God's children without obedience. It is the same Spirit which testified to Eve in the garden of Eden, that if she eat the forbidden fruit, she should not surely die, although God had said that if she eat of it she should surely die. Now God says by his Son that no man can enter the kingdom of God except he be born of water and of the Spirit; but this Spirit says that a man *can* enter God's kingdom without being born of *water*, but this Spirit being very wise, rarely ever ventures to leave out more than one word of God's law at one time in quoting his law, as that is generally enough to enable him to accomplish his design, which is to deceive the people and to get them to believe him instead of believing God. In order to deceive Eve, he only changed God's law by adding one little word.

In order to deceive the descendants of Eve he changes God's law by sometimes leaving out one word, and at other times adding one. Eve hearkened to this Spirit instead of hearkening to God, and was deceived; for Paul says "the woman being deceived was in the transgression," which is the same thing as saying she was deceived. Then if she was deceived, she certainly did not believe that God would punish her as he said he would; but because she did not believe that God would punish her did not save her from the punishment, although no doubt she was honest in believing that she would not suffer it; but God punished her just as he said he would. "And if persons now hearken to this Spirit, and believe that they can enter the kingdom of God without being born both of water and of the Spirit, they will find themselves deceived as Eve was, and that they will not be permitted to enter that kingdom, but will, in all probability, have to make their abode with that Spirit which has deceived them: which is just what he intended to accomplish when he first set out to deceive them. Having once got the people to believe that they can become the children of God and so inherit the kingdom which God has prepared for his children, he does not attempt to get them to believe that they can become children without being born of the Spirit, knowing that by so doing his design would become apparent and he would thus defeat himself; and besides, all that is necessary to carry out the designs of this Spirit, is to get the people to disbelieve God; and to believe that they

can enter the kingdom of God without being born both of water and of the Spirit, when God has said they cannot, is as much disbelieving him as it would be to believe that they could enter his kingdom without being born of the Spirit; for if the Savior did not mean water when he said water, we have no right to believe that he meant Spirit or birth when he said Spirit and birth; for the man or the being who will say one thing they do not mean, will say other things which they do not mean. Now we have fully tried this spirit which bears witness with man's Spirit that he has been born again without being born both of water and of the Spirit, and found that it is not the Holy Spirit; but the Holy Spirit does bear witness with the spirits of God's children that they are his children; for Paul says, "the Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirits that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs, of God and joint heirs with Christ." With whose spirits does Paul say the Spirit, (meaning the Holy Spirit) bears witness that they are the children of God? He says "with our Spirits," meaning by "our" himself and those Romans "who were called to be saints" to whom he was writing. Had Paul and those Romans been born of water? It is clearly stated that "he (Paul) arose and was baptized." But had those Romans to whom Paul was writing been born of water? Paul says in this same letter, writing to the same persons to whom he said "the Spirit beareth witness with our Spirits," know ye 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, etc. This language of Paul shows conclusively that they were baptized. It being customary to baptize in water, and there being no other way in which water was used in connection with the religion of the Savior, we cannot escape the conclusion that they were born of water. Then it was not those who had never been born of water who had the Spirit bearing witness that they were the children of God but it was those who had been born of water and of the Spirit. If Paul had been writing to persons who had never been baptized and said to them, you have the Spirit bearing witness, with your Spirits, that you are the children of God, then those who have not been baptized might have some right to say that they have this witness; but since it was those who had been born of water, who had the witness of the Spirit that they were the children of God, it is a gross perversion of Paul's teaching to apply it to those who have never been born of water. It is taking the children's bread and giving it to dogs. But that Spirit which walks about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, having once got the people to believe that God did not mean exactly what he said, well knows what part of God's word to pervert to keep them satisfied with that belief. Thus, the only sure and safe way to keep from being deceived is, not to give heed to seducing Spirits and doctrines of devils; for we know that whatever contradicts God is of the devil; and

when we hear anything taught for doctrines which in the least contradicts what God had said, we must reject it utterly as being of that old serpent; for if we give heed to them the certain consequence will be that we will be deceived as our mother Eve was when she gave heed to the serpent instead of what God said to her. And now when Christ says that no man can enter the kingdom of God except he is born of water and of the Spirit, let us give heed to what he says, even if a host of Spirits bear witness that he did not mean what he said; for it is worse than useless to think that we can serve him acceptably, and that we love him, and that we have his Spirit abiding in us, while we deny that any part of his word is true.

N. N.

THAT FINE.

We were at Leiper's Fork, Williamson Co., Tenn., 1st Lord's day in July. We learned there that A. C. Carnes had been circulating the report that Bro. Ramsey's fine had been remitted by the court, and that I of course knew it, and was concealing or failing to publish the fact. Although whether it was remitted or not remitted had not a particle of bearing on the question presented, still had I known it had been done, I certainly should have mentioned it as a matter of justice to Judge Hickerson. But it was used by the opponents of the position to manufacture public sentiment against me and Bro. Ramsey. Knowing Bro. Ramsey as well as I do, I felt certain nothing of the kind had been done,

or he would have mentioned it. I addressed a note of inquiry for the facts. Here is the response. Remember our point was that had Judge Hickerson been a Christian, with his present views on the subject he would have still been compelled to fine his brother for obeying God, as he understood his duty. We would not be greatly surprised, from the name, were the clerk who collected the fine a member of the church; though we do not know.

D. L.

Bro. Lipscomb. My dear Bro Yours of the 6th has just been re-received and contents noted. And in reply permit me to state that no part of the fine imposed upon me for not serving on the jury at the September term (1873) of the Circuit Court of Warren Co., was remitted. And in further proof of this I enclose the clerk's receipt for the same, embracing his cost of three dollars, every dollar (\$28) of which I paid. What authority A. C. Carnes has for making these statements I know not.

Your Bro.,

S. MC. RAMSEY.

Morrison, Tenn., July 9th, 1874.

Rec'd of Sam. Mc. Ramsey twenty-eight dollars in full of fine of twenty-five dollars and cost at the September term 1873, of the Warren Circuit Court, this March 2nd, 1874.

JOHN J. LOWRY, Cl'k.

Use what talent you possess. The woods would be very silent if no bird sang there but those who sing best.

The Lord's Supper Again.

Brethren L. & S.: Dear Brethren, I, though not a regular reader of the *Advocate*, sometimes read it, and with a great deal of interest. I have read two articles from the pen of bro. E. G. S., relative to the "Lord's Supper," and as I was going to write to Bro. Sewell any way, I thought I would say a few words on the subject which I offer on their merit—if my conclusions are right then they are worth something, if not they are worthless.

First then, I would say that "The Supper," has its type in the shewbread and tabernacle. What was necessary in order to eat the shewbread? A man must be a priest. What else? He must come to the table, as it had a fixed position in the tabernacle. Now what is the antitype of this? a man must become a priest unto God" and eat in the kingdom of Christ—the perfect tabernacle. Now if this be true can any one partake of the "Supper" who is not a "priest" or in other words a Christian—an heir and joint heir with Christ? If so where is the authority? In every instance in the New Testament where the supper is mentioned the speaker or writer is speaking to disciples or Christians. Are "Sectarians" Christians? They either are, or are not. If they are, we ought to become one of the orthodox churches and take a hand in evangelical alliance &c., and not always be "talking about other people." If they are not Christians in the true sense of the term, we ought not to make them believe so by participating in one of the most solemn institutions of the

Lord's house with them. I know that it is urged that there is no Scripture commanding us to not eat with them. Admitting this to be true, and we can disarrange God's whole plan by the same process. For instance, we may quote John; "if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father—Jesus Christ the righteous;" and that God "is faithful and just to forgive us our sins if we confess them and apply it to "alien sinners" in the same way. Paul says in Heb. xiii: 10: We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle. And it seems to me that when our friends trace the church back to Abraham and even to "righteous Abel," it is tabernacle service, or some other service, and not "Christian service."

In 1 Cor. 5: 11 we read; "but now I have written to you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer or a drunkard or an extortioner: with such an one, no not to eat." Also 2 Cor vi; 14-19. Now although it may be said that some of these Scriptures do not refer to the "supper," they nevertheless are some of the "great moral principles," by which some say we are authorized to commune with them." Now I am perfectly willing to admit that these people think they are right; but thinking and faith are two different things. So we may think it is all right to take the supper with them; but is this the way the Christian is to be governed? Nay, verily, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. And as faith is based on testimony, we have no testimony, therefore no faith. And the absence of a thing from the Bible has always been with me a sufficient reason for its rejection." Where the Bible speaks we speak, where the

Bible is silent, we will be silent as the grave." These things may be hard for us to say and they are very hard for me, for my folks are all except one, Baptists, and God knows that I love them and all other Sectarians; and my hearts desire and prayer to God is that they might be saved; yet I cannot change the law of heaven to suit their case; therefore I must labor to change them to suit the law of heaven. May God bless us, and may we not shun to declare the whole counsel of God; yet may we do it kindly and affectionately, using the pure language of the Bible. "Speak gently 'tis a little thing thrown unto life's deep work. And all the good that it shall do eternity shall tell." With kindest regards to all the fallen sons of Adam and my Christian love to you both, I am your brother in the one faith of Jesus Christ.

JOHN B. SMITH.

McMinnville, Warren Co. Tenn. June 30th 1874.

READ CAREFULLY.

At the close of the Christian Convention held at Jackson, Tenn., May 1st and 7th inclusive, the following resolution was *unanimously* adopted:

Resolved, That another convention be held for investigation, encouragement and spiritual enjoyment and in the interest of the Savior's cause at Trenton, Gibson county, Tennessee, commencing July 28th, 1874.

Also, that each church be earnestly requested to send a full delegation to the meeting, authorizing such to report on the condition of the church, etc.

Also, that the *delegates* bear a *written certificate* from the church of their being such, that they may secure the advantages of half fare on the railroads, with which arrangements are expected to be made.

Also, that a committee be appointed to specially invite each church to send delegates; to notify the churches of the questions on which the delegates will be expected to report; to arrange a programme of questions, exercises, etc., for the meeting and transacting whatever other business may be necessary to make it a success.

B. W. Lauderdale, B. F. Bond and W. E. Hall were appointed the committee, who respectfully submit the following to be sent to each congregation in West Tennessee.

DEAR BRETHREN!—You are hereby notified of a convention to be held at Trenton, Gibson county, Tenn., commencing Tuesday, July 28th, 1874, and continuing until the following Thursday night—July 30, the design of which is investigation of God's word; consultation with reference to the cause of Christ; encouragement and spiritual enjoyment.

That such meetings accomplish great good, we presume no one will deny. To make them successful all the churches and preachers must take an interest in them. You are *earnestly* and *urgently* requested to send a *full delegation* to the meeting, authorizing them to report on the condition of the church; and that all the information desired may be elicited, we submit the following questions to which *written* answers are desired.

QUESTIONS :

1. What is the name of the church?
2. Where is it located?
3. What is the nearest post-office?
4. When, and by whom was it planted?
5. How many members?
6. Who are your elders and Deacons?
7. Who is your regular preacher?
8. How often do you have preaching?
9. Do the brethren keep up their weekly meetings?
10. How many additions last year?
11. How much diminished by death, withdrawal or removal?
12. Has the church a house of worship? if so, its value and kind?
13. Has the church a Sunday school? if so, how many teachers and pupils, and how conducted?
14. How much money does the church raise annually, and how is it disbursed?
15. How many contribute to this amount?
16. How much is raised by weekly contributions?
17. How many members in the community who have not united with the congregation?
19. What is the average attendance at the weekly meetings?
20. How many take public part in the worship?
21. How many preachers has the congregation sent out? who and where are they?
22. How many are in process of training?
23. What are the general prospects of the church?

We hope brethren that you will not think these queries impertinent

for they are asked only in the interest of the cause we love.

We also hope you will promptly attend to them, though it costs some trouble and time. For, if we can afford to write them, have them printed, search out all the churches and send to them, which is expensive and laborious and without compensation, surely you ought to reply to them. This we earnestly request and feel that we have a right to expect.

That everything may be done decently and in order, we herewith submit the programme for the next convention, sincerely hoping that our meeting will result in the glory of God and the good of our race.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

1. A committee will meet delegates at depot.
2. The meeting will convene at 2 P. M., Tuesday July 28th.
3. The exercises will be conducted under the auspices of the church at Trenton.
4. Reports from delegates on the condition of the churches.
5. Essay on Evangelists, by David Walk, Memphis, Tenn.
6. Qualification, Election, Ordination and work of Bishops, by B. F. Manire, Winona, Miss.
7. Qualification and work of Deacons, by R. B. Trimble, Mayfield, Kentucky.
8. Church Finance, by W. E. Hall, Jackson Tenn.
9. Family worship, by E. R. Osborne, Union City, Tenn.
10. Lord's day worship, by T. B. Larimore, Mar's Hill, Ala.
11. Instruction of candidates for baptism, by J. H. Roulhac, Hickman, Ky.

12. Whiskey making, whiskey selling, and whiskey drinking by church members, by J. M. Pickens.

13. Church letters, by J. H. Lauderdale, Covington Tenn.

After each essay, questions will be in order, but not promiscuous controversy. The decision of the questions thus suggested, we feel sure, will prove of great interest to the brethren and are respectfully submitted for the serious consideration of all. If any have difficulties note them in few words, and after the essay, present them. This method saves time, arrives readily at the truth and avoids wrangling and much talking around and not to the point.

B. W. LAUDERDALE,

B. F. BOND,

W. E. HALL,

Committee.

Supposed Jontradictions in the Bible.

We have quite a list of supposed contradictions, which was handed us by a brother, with the request that some of them at least, be examined, for the benefit of some of his acquaintances. We will therefore do so.

The Bible, and the religion of Jesus have been, and still are attacked in various ways. And in nine cases out of ten, those who attempt to destroy the veracity of the Bible have never studied that sacred volume at all; but have simply read the writings of those men who have endeavored to destroy confidence in its divine revelation. We are satisfied that not one out of a hundred of those who have written against the Bible

has ever made that book a matter of thorough investigation.

But here is the first item on the list.

1. 'The Father of Joseph, Mary's husband, was *Jacob*.—Matt. 1, 16.

The father of Mary's husband was Heli. Being as was supposed the Son of Joseph, which was the Son of Heli." Luke 3, 31.

This is always one of the chief objections that unbelievers in the Bible are ever ready to bring against it. Notwithstanding this apparent difficulty has been reconciled a thousand times, this class of men never seem to see it. The apparent discrepancy between *Mattew* and *Luke*, only arises from the fact that these men trace the genealogy of the Savior a portion of the way, through different lines, or families. According to the united testimony of all the learned we have ever examined on this subject, this is the true explanation of the matter. *Matt.* brings the genealogy of Christ down from Abraham to David, and through Solomon, the Son of David, on down to Joseph, the husband of Mary, the Mother of Jesus. According to the investigations of Dr. Lightfoot and others, the Jews and Christians of the first century were accustomed to say that Heli was the father of Mary. The early Christians in putting the name Heli into Greek, varied the form of the name a little, but the testimony is clear enough that both referred to the same person, as Joseph was the legal son of Heli, or son-in-law. *Luke* could therefore appropriately call Joseph the son of Heli, while *Mat.* could truthfully say that *Jacob* was the father of Joseph. Joseph was

the real son of Jacob, and the legal son of Heli. Hence Luke could say consistently of Jesus, "Being as was supposed, the son of Joseph, which was the son (son-in-law) of Heli." And as Luke goes through a different family from Matt. he as a matter of course gives different names in his genealogical table. Luke traces through the father and ancestry of Mary, the real mother of Jesus, while Matthew traces through Joseph his supposed father. This explanation leaves the passage without any difficulty whatever.

2. "Joseph was a descendant of Solomon. 'And David the king begat Solomon of her that had been the wife of Uriah.' Joseph was a descendant of *Nathan*. Which was the son of *Matatha*, which was the son *Nathan*, which was the son of David."

The only trouble in this case is a failure to observe the fact that Matthew and Luke trace the genealogy of Christ through different branches of David's family. Matthew coming down through Solomon to Joseph, the husband of Mary, while Luke, in tracing back through Heli, the father of Mary, and legal father of Joseph, goes through *Nathan*, one of David's sons, instead of through Solomon. They both meet in David, but one of them traces through Solomon and the other through *Nathan*, which they had to do, in tracing the genealogy of Jesus through different branches of the parentage of Jesus. From 2 Sam. 5, 14, we are definitely informed that David had a Son named *Nathan*, and one named *Solomon*. And so one counts through *Nathan* to get to Heli, and the other through *Solomon* to get to Jacob, the father

of Joseph, the husband of Mary, and these facts relieve the passage of all appearance of contradiction.

3. "The infant Jesus was taken into Egypt. 'He took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod. But when Herod was dead, he arose and took the young child and his mother and came and dwelt in a city called *Nazareth*.'" Matt. xi: 14-23.

"The infant Jesus was not taken into Egypt. 'And when the days of her purification according to the law were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him before the Lord. And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned to their own city *Nazareth*.'" Luke 2, 22, 39.

We cannot see even the appearance of a contradiction between Matt. and Luke on this subject. Matthew tells us of the flight into Egypt, but does not tell of his parents bringing him to Jerusalem to present him before the Lord. While on the other hand Luke tells us of his presentation before the Lord at Jerusalem, and of the offerings according to the law of Moses, but does not tell us about the flight into Egypt. How these facts make up a contradiction between Matt. and Luke, we are utterly unable to see. Bethlehem, where Jesus was born, was only six miles from Jerusalem, and there was ample time between the birth of Jesus and his flight into Egypt, for his parents to take him to the temple at Jerusalem and present him to the Lord as the Law of Moses required. The

days of her purification were only forty, all told, as you may see in Leviticus 12, 2-4. And according to Matthew, time enough elapsed between his birth and the flight into Egypt, for wise men to come from the East to Jerusalem, to enquire after him that was born king of the Jews. Herod being excited at these things called the chief priests together to enquire where Christ was to be born. They reported at Bethlehem. He then called the wise men, and privately instructed them to go to Bethlehem and search for the child and to bring him word when they had found him. The wise men went to Bethlehem, found the child, worshipped him, gave him presents, and then being warned of God not to return to Herod, went home a different way. Then Joseph after this, departed into Egypt, and Herod sent to destroy all the children about Bethlehem. But it had been so long from the time Christ was born, till Herod sent to destroy Jesus, that he had all the children slain up to two years of age and he made this estimate of time, by the time when the star appeared to the wise men. So it must have been near two years from the birth of Jesus to the slaughter of the young children. So that there was time enough for the purification, and the presentation of the child before the Lord three or four times over, and then to go to Egypt long before Herod sought to destroy him. Then immediately after the death of Herod the parents of Jesus returned to Nazareth, their own city, and dwelt there. So all there is in it, Matt. and Luke relate different items in the history of Jesus without a shadow

of contradiction between them. And by putting both together, we learn from their testimony that Jesus was born in Bethlehem taken to Jerusalem after the days of purification and presented in the temple to the Lord, afterward went to Egypt, and thence returned to Nazareth, and dwelt there till ready to begin his personal ministry on earth. More hereafter.

E. G. S.

"The Gospel Plan of Salvation."

WHAT THINK YE OF IT?

The *Southern Christian Weekly* says: "We have not had the work long enough to examine it thoroughly; but we have known Bro. Brents for a number of years, both as a preacher and writer, and have long been familiar with his method of handling most of the subjects treated in his book. He is a fine reasoner and a good writer. This work is written in a clear, forcible, nervous style—is both readable and instructive, and will, no doubt, prove of incalculable value in clearing away erroneous doctrines which now form one of the chief hindrances to many, in receiving and obeying the Gospel. We hope the book will meet with a ready reception, that it may be widely circulated, and thus enabled to accomplish the good it is so well calculated to do. The mechanical execution and material are, in every way, good enough."

The *American Christian Review* says: "It is a neatly printed and well-bound volume of 667 pages, in good style. The work contains the pith of near a lifetime of thought,

much reading and extended experience touching the matters treated, with all the doctrinal difficulties, perplexities and confusion that lie in the way. He has, with a master hand, met, traced out and explained the greatest difficulties, and, with the utmost patience and in the most laborious manner, cleared away the perplexities and confusion that have kept thousands out of the kingdom of God, and are now keeping thousands, who honestly desire to be Christians, out of Christ. The work is decidedly *well written*. It enters into the matter item by item, and clears up difficult questions lying in the path of every man striving to spread the gospel, and deals with them in a most safe and reliable manner, and makes the truth gleam out at every angle. After clearing away the difficulties it enters its main work, the 'Plan of Salvation' and the *gospel plan* at that. He finds no 'Mosaism' nor 'Legalism' in his way, nor *Pauline* gospel. The gospel of Christ is sufficient for him. We are rejoiced that this book has appeared, and hope it will be extensively read. If our young men desire to understand the gospel, and now to present it to others so that they can understand it, believe it and be saved by it, they can do no better than to obtain this book, and not only *read* it, but study it."

The Christian Examiner says: "Its style is simple, clear and natural to the author. The author's heart is loyal to the core to the Bible, as the only source of sound religious instruction. The work is admirably adapted to the average understanding and intelligence of men, and is thus

fitted to accomplish a grand work among the masses of men. We heartily commend it to the brotherhood in Virginia as one of the best books for their own reading and for distribution among those who may be willing to be informed concerning our religious teaching."

The Apostolic Times, though dissenting from the chapter on the foreknowledge of God, says: "This entire work is well adapted to the minds of the masses of the people, for whom it was especially written, and it will be read with avidity and delight by thousands. We anticipate for it a large and continuous circulation, and we commend it as a work well worthy of the careful study of our brethren, and of extensive circulation among the thoughtful of other churches and of no church."

The Bible Index says: "It is carefully written, and in good English. The author does not rely very much upon his logic to establish the conclusions which he draws, but rather upon the supreme and final authority of the Holy Scriptures, to which he makes constant reference. In the initial chapters he takes in hand, Predestination, Election, and Reprobation, Hereditary Depravity, etc., and before he gets through with these illogical and anti-scriptural dogmas, there is no breath left in them. They are utterly demolished. And we do earnestly recommend those who are troubled with these creations of the sect-thirst, or have friends or acquaintances so afflicted, to buy and read, or cause to be read Bro. Brents' book. The identity of the Church, faith, repentance and baptism—as to what it is and the

proper subject—the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the operation of the Holy Spirit, and the witness of the Holy Spirit, are all dealt with in a critical and thorough manner. Without a more careful reading than we have yet been able to bestow on the latter portions, we are not prepared to say that all Bro. B.'s conclusions are incontrovertible; but we do earnestly admire the respectful style with which he treats the views which it is his duty to refute, and especially the respect, so uncommon, which he displays for the *very words* of the Scriptures. He does not attempt to jump at a meaning, but is careful to deduce it directly from the words used strictly according to the recognized rules of interpretation, without regard to the consequences to which such a course may lead. These are our impressions of this book, and we shall therefore take pleasure in knowing that it has secured the large demand which its intrinsic merits deserve."

The Christian Quarterly, after naming the subjects treated says: "These subjects are discussed with great plainness and generally with marked ability. Want of space will not permit us to point out special features; but we have no hesitation in saying that the work, as a whole, is worthy to be studied—not simply read, and then laid aside, but carefully and earnestly studied. It will, we think, be specially acceptable to young preachers and Sunday-school teachers, as it condenses a large amount of valuable information from books accessible to only a favored few. While not so pretentious as many works upon the subjects of

Anthropology and Soteriology, to the general reader it will be found to contain several advantages over all other works of its kind. It is simple in its arrangement, sufficiently comprehensive in treatment, and relies chiefly on the Word of God to settle all disputed questions."

The Gospel Advocate says: "Bro. Brents is a popular writer for the common people. They read his writings gladly, because they understand them readily. The treatment of his subjects is his own. No man has a more marked individuality as a thinker and writer than Bro. Brents. His association of subjects is also his own. Then the book occupies a place of its own in Christian literature. * * There is a fuller examination of the subject of baptism, and a more copious collection of authorities on this subject than can be found elsewhere. * * It is opportune that such full authorities should be presented. We then commend heartily the circulation of the book, among all classes who can be induced to read it. It will build up and strengthen the faith of the Christian. It will do much to convince the unbeliever and silence the gainsayer."

EXTRACTS OF NOTICES BY DISTINGUISHED PREACHING BRETHREN.

IRA J. CHASE, *Peoria, Ill*: "I think I own the first copy sold north of the Ohio river. I am just delighted with it, especially *Election* and *The Holy Spirit*. I must be permitted to use the arguments almost *verbatim*. Though strangers, personally, I feel quite well acquainted with you through your book. God bless you. May your book have GREAT SALE."

R. B. TRIMBLE, *Mayfield, Ky.*: "Your book is giving perfect satisfaction. I believe it to be THE BOOK of the brotherhood. I am sure it will more than meet the expectations of the brethren,"

J. M. KIDWELL, *Smithville, Tenn.*: "Every one is delighted with it. I think the first four chapters are richly worth many times the price of the book; indeed I think the entire range of subjects well-chosen, and brought so completely within the comprehension of the ordinary reader that great good must result from it. You have also brought such an amount of critical research to bear on some of the leading questions of the day as will make it profitable to the student of the Bible."

W. C. HUFFMAN, *Enon College Tenn.*: "It is more eagerly read and its contents more universally approved than any book published among our brethren for many years. May the Lord bless you in your efforts to do good. Surely your investigations and publications must do great good for the cause of our Redeemer, and add bright stars to your crown."

WASHINGTON BACON, *Tecumseh, Ala.*: "I fear I think too highly of it. There was a vacuum in the literature of this reformation that your book most completely fills. There is no such a work amongst us—it is just the thing; and you can use my name in any way you wish in its commendation—you cannot exaggerate my estimation of it."

G. W. CONE, *Newburg, Ark.*: "I think the work is well done—variety and exhaustion well combined. It would be difficult to select five words

in the English language more expressive of the book than the five given, 'THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SALVATION.'"

DR. J. T. BARCLAY, *Wheeler's Station, Ala.*: "Am really delighted with the work. It most happily supplies a vacuum in our literature long and seriously felt: and should it not have a very extensive circulation I shall be much surprised."

(This book for sale at the Gospel Advocate office, at \$2.50 per copy. Postage 14 cts. each.)

"Songs of Glory."

We have received a copy of the above work, published by Fillmore Brothers, Cincinnati. It is a Sunday-School Music book, on a new plan, being a combination of the round-note system, and of the figure-faced note system. The figures are placed within the round notes, and we consider it a very great improvement upon the common round note system. Those who prefer, can use the round notes, without regard to the figures, while on the other hand, those who prefer can use it as the numeral system, without regard to the round notes.

For prices, see their Advertisement in the Advocate.

E. G. S.

Last Half of Vol. 16.

Number 26, began the last half of the present year's volume. And we doubt not there are many who would gladly send us one dollar, and take the ADVOCATE the balance of the year, if the matter were only present-

ted to them. We therefore ask our readers to present this matter to their brethren and friends and see how many they can add to our present list of subscribers. We are satisfied that just a little attention on their part would greatly enlarge our subscription list, and thus largely extend our field of usefulness. The *ADVOCATE* certainly ought to be read by more than now read it, and might be, with a little exertion.

We intend, by the help of God, to make the *ADVOCATE* more and more useful, both in the edification of the churches, and in teaching aliens the way of truth and righteousness. We are exceedingly anxious to see the *ADVOCATE* established upon a still firmer basis, and see its field of usefulness much enlarged. To do this we must have the number of subscribers increased. May we not hope then that the brethren everywhere will aid some in this work? Just a little aid from each one of our readers would amount to a very great lift to us, and to great extension of the Cause of truth.

ED'RS.

Change of Address.

The address of Bro. T. W. Brents is now, Spencer, Van Buren Co., Tenn., instead of Richmond, Tenn.

Church News.

Embracing the second Lord's day of this month, July, we held another meeting of four days at Locust Grove meeting-house, Warren Co., Ky., where we recently had a discussion with Mr. Frogge, a Methodist preacher. We are satisfied the discussion

resulted favorably to the cause of truth. We held the field in peaceable possession this time, no Methodist preacher showing himself during the meeting. The immediate result of this meeting was, that we had the privilege of burying four persons with their Lord in baptism; two of them being from the Methodists. One of them was Dr. H. O. Cartwright, formerly of Smith County, Tennessee, and a very eminent physician in that section of country and one highly esteemed. Also we mention Bro. John Hill, an aged and substantial citizen of that community, as one of the number. We think we never saw more heartfelt rejoicing, than was manifested on the banks of the stream, when this aged, gray-haired man, somewhat feeble in health, came forth out of the water. We have hope for still further success for the cause of truth in that community. We entreat the brethren there to be faithful in their work of faith and labor of love.

E. G. S.

Bro. Sewell: I closed my meeting at Sycamore Chapel yesterday—and you will be pleased to hear of the success of the Gospel. We had 17 confessions and 2 from the Baptists, making 19 additions to the church. The brethren very much encouraged. To the Lord, be the praise. Some rain, but still dry, in most localities.

Your brother,

F. H. DAVIS.

Coopertown, June 10th, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: We had two more additions to the church here yesterday, by confession and immersion.

Bro. Brents' book is good. Hope for it a large circulation. I am lending it to my neighbors, and all are pleased.

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville, Texas, June 6, 1874.

Bros. Lipscomb & Sewell: We have just had the pleasure of enjoying a visit from our beloved brother, J. T. Paxson, resident of Georgia, who is on his way to Missouri and expects to preach and form acquaintances among the Christians as he goes west. He preached four discourses for us at Pleasant Grove, and we all pronounce him a promising young preacher. He makes the impression on us that he is deeply pious, a man of great faith, quiet, patient, unassuming, and his whole nature seems childlike. From our brief but intimate acquaintance, we take pleasure in recommending him to the confidence of the Christian brethren with whom he may meet in his journey west.

Brother Paxson, may you meet with friends as you travel through this howling wilderness, and may you do much good, is our prayer.

J. M. JOINER.

Ashland, Clay Co., Ala., June 26, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: Permit me to send you a condensed report of how matters are going on here in Mo. Our preaching brethren are few in this part of the State. H. D. Rutter is the only man that is devoting his whole time to the work. He is preaching all the time, in the counties of Crawford, Washington, Phelps, Maries, and Dent. Bro. C.

Drenon is preaching occasionally, and some others I am trying to preach on each Lord's day, and we find a few faithful ones in our travels.

THOS. EVANS.

Steelville Crawford Co. Mo.

Brethren L. & S.: Sirs, having been permitted to read the Advocate some little for the last three or four years, I consider it a most excellent paper for young Christians, as well as older ones. And having come to these conclusions I here inclose two dollars for the Advocate. Having never seen anything in the Advocate concerning the Church at Pine-knot in Greene County Ark., I propose to give you a small sketch of its existence. It was established soon after the war, by our much esteemed brother Benjamin Tennison and has been attended by several of our ablest preachers, among whom was brother Joseph Lemons, and his father. His father is preaching for us once a month at this place. The rest of the time we meet regularly on the first day of the week. The church is in living order.

Yours Truly in the one faith,

L. C. THOMPSON,

Greensboro, Ark. June 9th 1874.

A Word in Season,

Many a farm-house in the country will during the next two or three months be the scene of overflowing hospitality. The mistress of the house will spare no pains to make her guests happy, and, ignoring toil and heat, wear herself out in endeavors to make her visitors enjoy themselves. The duties of hostess and

guests are mutual. Where there is a full retinue of servants to perform all domestic offices, the guests have nothing to do but make themselves agreeable to their hosts and to each other and to enjoy themselves. Where there is but one maid-of-all-work or none, and the whole burden of care and toil falls upon the mistress of the house, it is evidently the privilege of every one for whom she labors to come to her relief.

In this case each lady guest should take charge of her own sleeping-room and assist in wiping the dishes, sweeping, dusting, preparing fruit for the table, and other light offices that suggest themselves to every practical unselfish woman. Friendships ripen rapidly between women over the dish-pan; washing dishes together is almost equivalent to the custom of the Arabs of eating salt together—it makes fast friends. It would not be a bad idea for those who expect Summer visitors to have two or three new aprons of the latest pattern hanging up in the kitchen, having a bib that buttons around the neck and with skirt full enough to button over the dress skirt behind; this apron is a perfect protection of the dress in all ordinary housework. A sweeping cap might be hung in the neighborhood of the broom. It can be neatly made of white paper cambric, cut in a circular form, five fingers in diameter, the edge notched by the scissors. An elastic cord in a welt half a finger from the edge makes it close-fitting, and a black bow can adorn the front. Such a one costs just 10 cents, and its owner wouldn't part with it for a good deal

more than that. With this apron and this cap on, the most dainty lady need not fear the cup-towel or the broom, and may materially lessen the burden that rests on the lady she is visiting.

We have heard so many complaints from friends of being "completely worn out with company," that we make these suggestions in the hope that those who this Summer visit their dear relatives and acquaintances in the country will, when they go away, leave the convictions strong in the minds of those who stay behind that they have entertained angels unawares.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

How can we expect that peace shall abide in hearts under the government of unholy, restless desires, and no earnest efforts to overcome them. It is wonderful what an effect this peace has on all things around us. It is the mind itself which casts a "shroud or a wedding garment" upon the outer world. We in ourselves rejoice, and the gladness of the world is but an echo from our voice.—*Norman Macleod.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Co-operation Again.....	678
The New Birth.....	679
That Fine.....	683
The Lord's Supper Again.....	685
Read Carefully.....	686
Supposed contradictions in the Bible.....	683
"The Gospel plan of Salvation".....	690
"Songs of Glory".....	693
Last Half of Vol 15.....	693
Change of Address.....	674
Church News.....	694
A word in Season.....	695

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 30.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, JULY 30, 1874.

Am I Baptized into Christ?

Mr. Lipscomb: As I believe you to be a friend to all enquiring after truth, I thought I would try to write you a few lines, as I have been in doubt for some years past whether I made the right start or not. I was raised by Baptist parents of the Predestinarian order. In my early days, when I was about 15, I became troubled about my sins. According to Baptist usage they said I was under conviction. They conversed with me on that subject. In speaking concerning persons under conviction a preacher said if I had a hope I would love the brethren, which I very well knew I did. As we were on our way to meeting we came to water, and he said another proof of my pardon was, when I saw water I would think of baptism. I always did after that, so I went for a short time thinking in this way until I concluded to join the church. I went up and gave in a short experience, and they said it was a very good one. So I was baptized. I thought I was right, because my parents were older than I; I thought they knew best.

I had read the Scriptures some, but did not understand them, never had any explanation of them, did not know the distinctions as to the teaching of the Old and New Testaments. If any one had asked me, why I was baptized, I would have said, to get in the church. Now I want to know is this right in the sight of God or not? I fear I shall weary your patience, but I do want to tell you how I have gotten along since that time, almost losing all hope of ever doing my duty in this world. I was married in the year 1856. My husband was a believer of the Christian doctrine, but did not belong to the church, neither does he yet. He began contending for his belief and I for mine. The more I read to convert him, the more Scripture I found in his favor. I gave it up, but said nothing, and for many years past have pondered the thought in my mind, am I right or not? We went on last Sunday to hear cousin R. H. Horn at Farmington church. His sermon was on the subject of prayer. It was a good discourse. My husband says, he thought on that day it was his duty to join the church and

believes he will. Now comes my trouble: Shall I remain as I am, thus wandering and doubting? To join the church and then doubt my baptism being valid in the sight of God would be a miserable life. I study over my condition when I am at my work until my eyes are filled with tears and my soul seems as if it will run over with sorrow.

Will you please give an explanation through your Advocate whether or not such baptism is acceptable with God. I want your views on this subject.

M. C. CARRUTH.

*Vanalstyne, Grayson Co., Texas,
June 18th, 1874.*

AM I BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST?

* * * * *

My father and mother were Lutherans of the strictest order and of course had me sprinkled, but as I can find nothing in the New Testament about sprinkling infants I do not recognize that as baptism at all. During the first part of my life I heard nothing but Lutheran and Methodist preachers. About the age of twenty I heard a few Baptist Chaplains preach during the latter part of the war and wishing to do better than I had been doing I became a member of the Baptist Fraternity according to their confession of faith, and remained with them about five years perfectly satisfied, but when I heard the gospel preached for the first time as preached by the so called Campbellites, I at once found a great difference in the teaching of the two; but rather liking the latter the best. I remained with the Baptists about

two years longer and in this time I heard three more of the Evangelists of the Church of Christ preach, and I was convinced that they were right, and took my stand with them on the Bible alone. I was received without being baptized, it being left to my choice whether to be or not, as I had already been baptized by the Baptists. I have been a member nearly three years, but lately I have become dissatisfied about coming into the church without being baptized after hearing the Gospel preached in its purity, as I think this is the Bible alone way. But if I am wrong I am willing to be convinced by the Bible, but the Savior says, John x: 1, "He that entereth not by the door into the sheep fold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber," and Paul says faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God and how shall they hear without a preacher, and Peter when he was preaching on the day of Pentecost said to the believers, 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. Now according to Paul, faith comes by hearing the Gospel preached, and according to Peter when one believes he is to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. Now the question arises according to all that I have been taught, when did I hear and believe the Gospel of Christ? and when was I baptized for the remission of sins? The Baptists don't baptize for the remission of sins, they baptize for the answer of a good conscience, because a man's sins are already pardoned, but I cannot un-

derstand it this way in the Book. Wherever the Apostles preached the Gospel and the people believed it, they were baptized, both men and women, without the Apostles' recognizing any of the people's former views or religions, and I think it ought to be so now, no matter what our former confessions or professions were, but if I have taken the wrong view I hope you will show me the right as soon as possible. If I am not baptized and came not in the church the way the Apostles took believers in, I want to be as soon as possible. Hoping to hear from you soon, bros L. & S., I am yours in the faith once delivered to the saints,

EDWIN J. HINELY.

*Springfield, Effingham Co., Ga.,
June 28, 1874.*

We publish the foregoing communications. We comment on them reluctantly. We have so often given our convictions on the subject with so little effect that we are discouraged. It is possible our reasons are not sound and solid or they would have more effect. We believe they are good. Now we believe the baptism of both these persons to be valid, and acceptable before God. Neither statement is so full as desired, but we think enough to indicate they believed in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, they desired to serve him. They were baptized because they considered baptism a part of the service to him. It is true our sister says she was but little acquainted with the Scriptures, their proper divisions, etc. Yet she undoubtedly believed in Christ as the Savior, and that he required a repentance from a

course of rebellion against, to one of service to him, and that baptism was required. She believed in Christ, she repented of her sins, she was baptized, she says, to join the church. But why did she wish to join the church? I think certainly because it was God's church, because she wished to obey God, and she believed that baptism was the act ordained of God by which she could enter his church. Then she was baptized to obey God. He that believeth (the Gospel) and is baptized shall be saved. She believed, she was baptized. Who can gainsay the promise of God or doubt its fulfillment?

Whenever man has faith enough to induce him to obey the command he will secure the promise. See Namaan's case. He did not believe at first, he demurred, he was angry and turned away in disgust. His servants presented the reasonableness of the proposition. He finally mustered up faith enough to obey. He was healed: his faith was doubtless made strong by the obedience.

When an individual believes the gospel—believes in Christ and obeys the command I do not see how he can doubt the promise. It seems to me he must doubt the faithfulness of him who promised first. It is not said that a man must understand all the results of baptism, that it may be acceptable. If so who could be baptized? Remission of sins is a result of obedience to God, baptism is a part of the obedience. The design we should have paramount before us is to obey God and so put ourselves in the channel through which the blessings of the Divine Father flow.

The design of baptism on man's

part is to obey God, so to honor him. The result is he remits sins of man. So only indirectly is remission of sins the design of baptism. There is danger of our attaching an inherent virtue to the act or to our understanding of the act to secure the blessing. This is or would be a fatal error. The virtue and power are in God. He pardons the sin when his conditions are complied with.

There was much of error, much of ridiculous and childish nonsense connected with the teaching of these preachers. What is to be done now is to throw aside all this mere human rubbish and cling only to the truth. Doing this will bring you away from the people who teach such things. The preserving and clinging to the truth alone will lead you among the people who teach the truth alone. We can see no reason, why you should ignore or repudiate the correct acts that were taken.

Your believing in Christ was right, your turning from sin was right, you cannot ignore or repudiate or recognize these as nought, we see no greater reason why the baptism based upon that faith, should be.

The above remarks will very greatly apply to Bro. Hinely's case, He says, he heard the gospel in its purity after baptism. That is he heard the gospel before his baptism but it was mixed up with other errors. But he heard the gospel, and he believed the gospel before his baptism. "Preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now brother, you did believe, you were baptized because you believed. Jesus says, He that believeth and is

baptized shall be saved. How can you doubt? We all believe more or less of error with our truth. Unless the error prevents obedience to the truth, it does not counteract the truth. It does not destroy the promise. Pseudo-Baptist errors frequently prevent obedience to the truth. The error that does that is fatal. Peter tells them the result of baptism is they shall receive the remission of sins. But he nor any other sacred writer intimates that the understanding of this or any other result or act of obedience to any command of God, is essential to acceptable obedience to God. The manifestation and development of the spirit of obedience regardless of results, is what God demands. No belief of error destroys the validity of faith in Christ unless it prevents obedience to Christ.

The faith that leads to obedience, leads to the promises attached to obedience. The quotation in reference to those not entering in at the door being thieves and robbers, has no reference to individuals entering the church, but to prophets and others, coming as Christ.

There is no doubt but that the Baptists mistake the time when we can appropriate the promise of pardon. But we can see no reason why this should invalidate the work of obedience, unless it should cause the individual to stop in obedience short of the point where the promise is to be enjoyed.

The great design of God is to induce man to obey him, conform to his law. When man conforms to the law the blessings will be enjoyed, whether he knows the point at which

the blessing is to be enjoyed or not. God's object is to secure obedience. Man's design should be to render obedience. When this is done God gives the blessing. All the understanding needed, is the understanding that leads to obedience. The faith and the understanding that leads to obedience, will obtain the blessing.

A person that believes in Christ and is baptized in obedience to him is baptized into Christ, puts on Christ and is pardoned. No truth saves unless it is obeyed, no error is fatal unless it prevents obedience. The great end is obedience to God.

D. L.

Plainness of the Word of God.

May I suggest that the *very* surface idea produced in the unbiased mind in regard to any subject treated in the Holy Scriptures, when all that is written in reference thereto is taken in its proper connection, and in connection with the whole revealed will of God, is in the *right* direction: though we may not get all the meaning at the first, and perhaps not at the last, yet the idea is in the right direction.

To take a different position is to say that God has not adapted His revelation to the capacity of those for whom He made it. One illustration. Put the New Testament into the hands of a ten year old boy or girl, who has never read a tract, nor heard a sermon on the action of baptism, and tell him or her to read all that is written on that subject, beginning with the baptism of John, and say when, through, how was baptism performed, whether by sprink-

ling, or immersion and what will the answer be? Immersion. Now let us take the Book of God, and ask Him, in childlike docility and humility, what he has said, in regard to the manner of designating those who shall direct "the worship of the Lord's house." Let us do so as though we had never heard a word, (outside of the Bible) in reference thereto; and I think we will not miss it far.

But if we go to the Bible, committed to either side, very plausible arguments can be made for both sides. In the investigation of God's word, we should have no sides. But get low down, into humility's deep vale, so we can hear what God says.

I would suggest that any position taken, and argued, that seems, in the least, to detract from the plenary inspiration of the Apostle Paul, (at any time of his ministry) is *not* in harmony with what is revealed in reference thereto.

It was a miracle for Ananias to remove the physical blindness of Paul, and thereby convince Paul that he was the one authorized to tell him what to do. Whether there was anything else followed (at the time) as the result of the laying on of hands of Ananias, I know not. The filling of the Spirit in that instance may have been prospective—as in the case of the twelve—"Jesus breathed on them," etc. John xx: 23.

Paul said (in Acts 26) Jesus said to him, I have appeared unto thee to make thee a witness, etc., of the things in the which I have appeared, and also of the things in the which I will appear, etc. (at that time.) He

was not done appearing to Paul. If we are governed by the order of Luke's statement, Peter left Samaria after John did.

W. T. RUSH.

God's Plan of Pardoning Men's Sins Under Different Dispensations. No. 1.

Brethren: I propose to show, first that the only way by which the patriarchs could be pardoned was by believing and doing the things which God revealed to them and commanded them to do. They could not know nor do more acceptably to God, than what was revealed to them in the books of Genesis and Job. They were absolutely and necessarily shut up to these revelations, nothing more could they know, or do, unless we can know our duties to God, without the Bible. The patriarchs believed different promises and obeyed different commands to obtain pardon under that dispensation. Abel believed that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and offered a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead yet speaks to us. Hebrews xi: 4. His altar was of stone, as there were no golden altars then. His offering was a lamb, hence a type of the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world, and slain in type from the foundation of the world. John i: 29. Revelation xiii: 8. I hope our religious neighbors will notice, that this was before baptism, and that the altar and the Lamb were not pardon

the altar and Lamb are not faith, unless three things are one thing according to their arithmetic. This is one case. The second case I shall cite, is that of Noah. What did Noah believe? Moved by fear he prepared an ark, and saved his family and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. Hebrews xi: 7. Was building the ark faith alone? He was pardoned by believing that the flood would come, by obeying God in building the ark, and this is the way he obtained pardon before baptism as far as it could be had or enjoyed under that dispensation. The third instance of pardon by faith and obedience before baptism is that of Father Abraham, the friend of God. Paul names his faith and says he obeyed, and speaks of the steps of Abraham. Hebrews xi: 8. Rom. iv: 12. The epistle of James, second chapter, and the book of Genesis—all prove that Abraham was not pardoned by faith alone before baptism; what did Abraham believe? what Noah believe? No. He believed that his posterity would be as innumerable as the stars of heaven and that all the nations of the earth would be blessed with the knowledge of the gospel, pardon of sins according to the gospel, the Holy Spirit and the hope of eternal life. Genesis xii: 17, 22. Galatians 3, Romans 4, and James 2. These three patriarchs, Abel, Noah and Abraham lived, believed, obeyed, were pardoned or justified, walked with God, died and Enoch was translated before Moses was born, or the law given to the Jews, or before baptism was commanded in order to the pardon of sins—and some time before the false

and foolish dogma of pardon by faith alone was invented to set aside believer's immersion, to support infant baptism, a Romish tradition. The above statements respecting the patriarchs and their pardon are as true as the Bible, and will not be questioned by any person who respects the authority of the Bible. According to a tradition of the house of Elias nearly as old as the world, there were two thousand years under the patriarchal age, two thousand years under the law of Moses and two thousand under the Messiah and the seventh thousandth year of the world is to usher in the Great Jubilee of mankind, the Millennial reign of Christ, one thousand years. Now the question is how were the Jews pardoned under the administration of Moses? The exact number of years in round numbers in each age does not affect the truth we are contending for. I might answer, the Jews under Moses were pardoned, not as the patriarchs were, not by believing and doing what they did, but by believing and doing what God commanded them by Moses. They were not required to believe that a flood would come, nor to build an ark, nor to offer Isaac as Abraham did: but to believe and do what Moses said. They said all that the Lord commanded Moses, we will do and be obedient. Exodus xxiv : 7, "Obey my voice and I will be your God." Jer. vii : 23, xi : 4-7. To obey is better than sacrifice, 1 Sam. xv. Christ was the end or purpose of the law to all who obeyed the law—Rom. x : 4. The law pointed the Jews to Christ as the finger-board points out to the traveller. Faith and obedience

to all God's commands runs through all the dispensations of God, patriarchal, Jewish and Christian; but there were different commands to be obeyed under each one of those dispensations to obtain pardon. Noah built the ark, the Jews built the Tabernacle and temple and brought all the offerings required by the law, did all the law required them to do, and looked through the law to Christ, and were pardoned in that way as far as pardon could be had under that system. The system was imperfect and the pardon was imperfect, Paul says it was not possible that the blood of their sacrifices could take away sins.—Hebrews ix—hence their pardon was prospective, figurative or political, their sins were not actually and really taken away. If the Mosaic system had been perfect, then would no place have been sought for the second or gospel age. Hebrews viii : 7. This is the scope of all Paul's epistle to the Hebrews. I would ask any person of ordinary sense, if leaving Egypt, crossing the sea of Edom, building the tabernacle and temple, bringing all the offerings required by the law for their various sins, travelling forty years through the wilderness, et cetera, was faith alone? If there is such a person, he should have cold water poured upon his head, until his reason returns to him, if he ever had any reason. Yet this is the sectarian religion of the latter part of the nineteenth century. "Only one way to pardon sinners from Adam to 1874; and that is without baptism." This is the basis of sectarianism. This is truly an enlightened age—an intelligent age, in money-making, getting religion, joining

sects, having charity, innocent amusements, et cetera.

JACOB CREATH.

Changes in the Religious Denomination.

Change seems to be written on everything, having an origin no higher than man. Why should we expect perfection of an imperfect, finite, and mutable being. We would as soon look to see a world peopled with intelligent beings spring from chaos at his command, as to expect him to create or bring into being one perfect thing. We see an exhibition of his talent, in his history from the time he put forth his hand in Eden and broke the command of God, to the present day. Amidst the dreary waste of time we see the moldering, perishing fragments of man's work of perfection, in the form God and temples, priests and religions, pyramids, statue or statues, cities and laws. In civil governments, and religious matters, we have only to cast our eyes over the path pursued by him to see his complete failure in them, from the time of this departure from the law of God to the days of "the best government the world ever saw. Man has become renowned in his government founding and law enacting propensity. In religious, no less than in political affairs, has he shown an aptitude in making laws by which to govern himself, as if he were both creator and creature, and had the right as well as the power to say how he will govern as well as how he shall be governed. How has all his laws ended? In perfection? In good to

his fellowman? In more good than if he had followed the divine commandment and been content with its requirement? It certainly would take no less than an unbeliever in the providence of God, to say yes to these queries. We see change written not only on man's works of early times; but his modern attempts are stamped with labels of change or exchange, and it requires but a little time, to see their imperfections, and behold them decay.

The Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians were denominations in the country in which I passed my early years. Their principles and doctrines, I became early acquainted with. I notice quite a change in them in many things. In those days I learned from the Methodist that the kingdom of Christ had its origin in the family of Abraham, that it was identical with the Jewish church. I cannot now call to mind a single instance of one who was sprinkled in infancy ever being immersed; even when demanded by the subject. Infant baptism was more common then, than now. In these things we think we see some change, if not in the law of probation, lovefeast and discipline.

Our Baptist friends are in motion also, they have "pulled up the stakes" and moved forward as the day grows brighter. How fondly did they once cling to the Philadelphia confession of faith. That John the Baptist set up the kingdom direct—spiritual influence, or abstract operation of the Spirit, on the heart of the sinner to regenerate him.

Apertolic succession, Mourners bench religion, Christian experience, dreams, visions and super-

natural manifestations. In many of these things there is a decided change for the better. They now claim to have no confession of faith but the New Testament. And quite a diversity of opinion as to when the kingdom was set up. We hear some still plead that it was in the time of John's ministry and from that to the day of Pentecost; but few, however, placing it on that day. I have recently heard some very *pungent* arguments on this subject from an unfortunate parson who happened to come this way in his rambling. I will give your readers the benefit of some of them that they may keep up with the times. On the establishment of the kingdom prior to the day of Pentecost, we have the following. 1st. Cor. 12: 28. "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. The apostles having been called previous to the day of Pentecost were placed in the church before that day. If so, there was certainly a church before the day of Pentecost. He seemed to rest for his conclusion on the assumed fact that, the apostles were the first ones in the church. If so, when was the church before the apostles were appointed? Was any one in it? if so, then the apostles were not the first; and if not, then there was no church in which to put the Apostles when they were chosen. But let us take another view of this text. What had the apostle under consideration when he wrote the text? Evidently the church compared to the human body. The

uniting of many members to compose one body, as the hands, feet, eyes, ears, etc. Hands cannot see or smell, and eyes cannot taste or hear, but all have their separate functions to fill, some honorable and others less honorable. Some in one part and some another of the body. Eyes in the head, and hands at the extremity of the arm, etc.; all to perform a separate duty, (see 17 v.) so that the many members compose the one body, and all are necessary, so much so that hands could not say to the feet, I have no need of you, and the eyes to ears, I have no need of you, or in other words apostles could not say to prophets, I have no need of you. God hath tempered the body together, having given the more abundant honor to the part which lacked, that all might have the proper care one for another, rejoicing and suffering together. Thus they would constitute the body of Christ, and members in particular. Therefore, God has placed you as he has placed the several members of the human body, some in one place and some in another, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, &c. This, it seems to me, would be something near the proper meaning, for the apostle did not stop to state fully the answering clause between the 27th and 28th verses.

But let us take a few facts into consideration now, as we are on this subject. The apostle says, (7 v.,) that these gifts were imparted by a manifestation of the Spirit. When did the Spirit impart the power to speak in different kinds of tongues, work miracles, or interpret tongues? Before the day of Pentecost? Here certainly was the first great manifestation of

those miraculous gifts of the Spirit. To this we think the apostle added, five years after, the following significant text: Eph. 4: 11. "And he gave some, apostles; and some prophets, and some, Evangelists, and some, pastors, and teachers. But when did he do this? See the 8th verse "Wherefore he saith, when he ascended upon high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

Another one of those grand arguments to prove that the kingdom of heaven was set up before the day of Pentecost, is, that that the church transacted business prior to the day of Pentecost, therefore, they were organized before the business was transacted, hence, they were an organized body before Pentecost. In the first place, were they empowered by Christ as the head of the church to do this? if so, it is nowhere recorded. Jesus told the disciples to tarry at Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke 28: 49. Acts 1: 4. He commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father which saith ye have heard of me. 8th verse. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Facts seem to indicate that they would receive power on the day of Pentecost. But Peter said the Scripture must be fulfilled which the Spirit spoke by the mouth of David, not by the mouth of Christ as head of the Church. We will leave these things for the present

and think them over until another time; when we hope to continue and point out many things in which we may see a change in the religious denominations around us.

P. D.

REASON—FAITH.

"Where reason stops, faith begins." The world has failed to see this. Sceptics, infidels, moralists, and all religionists, are willing to go as far in obedience to the commands of God as reason will accompany them. But as a general thing, where reason stops, they stop.

The moral law, as it is termed, is mainly founded on reason, that is, for all required by the moral law, there is good reason plainly to be seen. It was wrong to murder, even before God said "thou shalt not kill." It would have been wrong to take our neighbors goods, without giving their value in return, even if God had never said "thou shalt not steal." There is a reason for these things, and hence, all men agree that they are right.

Men are slow to accept faith however, slow to accept that for which they can see no reason. And yet the most important of God's commands are submitted to us for our obedience, without giving us any reason for the same, and we are required to accept and obey, upon the word of God, because it is His word. God designs we shall believe and obey him, whether we see a reason for what he commands or not.

For instance, there was no reason in the world apparent to man why God should require Abraham to sac-

ricise Isaac, the son of promise. On the contrary, all reason was against it, but his faith in God was stronger and he believed God was able to raise up Isaac from the dead, in order to carry out promises already made, and though he could not see why Isaac must be sacrificed, he obeyed in faith, and by his obedience, obtained the title of "father of the faithful," and "friend of God."

Naaman the leper, could see no reason why seven times dipping in Jordan should heal his malady. Yet, when he obeyed, God's promise was fulfilled.

Uriah could see no reason why a man who was not a Levite might not touch the ark, when it was about to fall and be crushed, and yet he died in consequence of the act.

Saul could not see who he should be required to slay all the Amalekites, with their cattle. Yet, because he disobeyed and saved the king, with the best of the cattle, God punished him. Even though his avowed object was to sacrifice the cattle to the Lord.

Now this class of persons did not belong exclusively to the ancient time. We have thousands now, who are willing to obey God, only so far as reason shall dictate

We can readily see why we should believe in God, before we come to him, for as we are naturally selfish, we must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Believing that there is a reward to be had, we come.

Again, we reason that our sins we must leave them. If we take must be left behind because to be saved from our sins

them with us into the kingdom, we are no better off than before. But who can tell us why it is that we must be baptized for the remission of sins. Reason fails us here, and because it does many draw back and say "impossible" "can water wash away sins." &c. &c. They are not willing to obey save as reason shall dictate. Thus many fail to obey at all. Genuine faith obeys every command of God, because he commands. Believing that he doeth all things well, faith stops not to cavil about the essentiality of God's commands, but accepts them as good and essential—the mean while, expecting the blessing just where God promised to give it. True faith never expects a blessing, save where, and when God promised it. God promises the pardon of sins, upon condition of faith repentance, and baptism. The blessing of pardon then, is to be expected just beyond baptism. Mark 16 : 16. Acts 2 : 38. Gal. 3 : 27. But reason says, "as God is all powerful, he can pardon sin. just as well at the mourner's bench, as at the water." True he could perhaps, but true faith will see at once, that He has not promised to pardon sins at the mourners bench, and that he has promised to pardon those who believe and are baptized. It is easy to be saved when we walk by faith, and obey every command of God, whether he commands or not.

JORN T. POE.

Huntsville, Texas, July, 1st 1873.

Angels.

Bro. Sewell: In No. 26, in your reply to Bro. Gardner's query about say "In what sense they

minister, we cannot tell, what they do, and how, we do not know. And again you say "we have no idea that angels ever appear in a visible form now, as they did to Abraham, Lot, and Jacob or our Savior."

To my my mind it seems clear that they minister now, in two, if not three or more forms.

1. Paul said he was an angel. If Paul was an we angel conclude, the other apostles were, and if the apostles were angels, we conclude all who love the truth of our Lord Jesus Christ are also angels. Paul being an angel, our mind is clear, how he ministered. The ministration, indeed of all the apostles to my mind is clear. Those who love the truth of our Lord Jesus Christ, minister in righteousness. We have a command not to turn off strangers who call to lodge with us, lest we might fail to do our duty to angels.

2nd. There is that class who ministered to the shepherd, Christ, and the sainted sick that you speak of.

3rd. There are angels who minister from the Lords great store house, of fire, wind, rain, drouth, war, pestilence, famine &c. &c. We have one of those angels, on a visit here in Henry County now, in a drouth; fulfilling the word of truth, and unless the Lords spiritual house is builded up more fully, we may expect their visits, and ministrations more frequent.

V. B. WALKER

Paris, Tenn.

Adjustment.

We have received from V. H. Swift and S. D. Mangrum, of the church at

Colliersville, Tennessee, a document addressed to B. W. Lauderdale, B. F. Bond, and W. E. Hall, Committee, asking them why the Consultation Meeting was changed from Colliersville to Trenton, without consulting the congregation in mass, in regard to the matter. Now we think it would be better for all concerned, to adjust this misunderstanding privately, than through the public prints, and therefore, for the present at least, decline publishing the article.

ED'RS.

Supposed Contradictions in the Bible. No. 2.

"4th. Jesus was tempted in the wilderness. And immediately after his baptism, the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness. And he was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan.' Mark i: 12-13."

"Jesus was not tempted in the wilderness. "And the third day (after his baptism) there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and both Jesus and his disciples were called to the marriage.' John ii: 1-2."

There is no resemblance of contradiction between these two passages. John records nothing of the temptation in the wilderness at all; while Matthew tells nothing at all of the marriage in Cana of Galilee, or of the miracle performed there. Neither Matthew, Mark, Luke or John pretends to relate all that occurred in the life-time of Jesus, nor does any one of them relate the events that he does give, in the order in which they occurred. Each one of them wrote the history of these facts long after

they occurred, and wrote the facts that seemed most important, without any special regard to the order in which they occurred. And under these circumstances, it must not be supposed they contradict each other simply because they do not each relate precisely the same things, and in the same order. Only a small portion of the life and actions of the Savior are written down by any one, or even all the apostles, after he began his personal ministry. It is generally understood that he was about three years and a half in his mission, between his baptism and his death, and all that they all record might have taken place in less than one year. So these historians skipped about through his personal ministry, and recorded such items as seemed to them important. Therefore, to conclude that these writers contradict each other because one chances to leave out what another records, is evidence of very little study and investigation of the sacred volume, which they are trying to discredit.

In the first chapter of John, there is an account of Andrew and Peter becoming the disciples of Christ, before any mention is made of the marriage, John i: 40-43. Matthew gives an account of the same two men becoming the disciples of Jesus, after he has finished the account of the temptation. Matt. iv: 21-22. The calling of these two men, Andrew and Peter, is recorded by both Matthew and John, and in this they both agree. But Matthew gives an account of the temptation, while John does not. John gives an account of the marriage in Cana,

which Matthew does not. And according to John and Matthew time enough elapsed after the baptism of Jesus, for the forty day's temptation, for him to come into Galilee after it is over, and call a number of disciples around him, before the marriage occurred. And when Jesus was called to the marriage, his disciples were called also. Therefore, when in the first of the second chapter of John the third day is mentioned, it does not mean the third day after his baptism, but the third after the events recorded in closing part of first chapter; the calling of Philip and Nathaniel, and the conversation with Nathaniel. To say that the marriage was the third day after the baptism of Christ, shows clearly that he who says so, has never studied these books at all. Both histories taken together show clearly that when Jesus was baptized, he went up into the wilderness, where he was tempted forty days. After this was over, he returned into Galilee, made some disciples there, and was after this, called to the marriage, where he turned water into wine. No one who will study this case for one single hour, can suppose for a moment that there is any contradiction between Matthew and John about the temptation of Jesus.

15. Jesus preached his first sermon sitting on the mount.' And seeing the multitude, he went up into a mountain; and when he was set, his disciples came unto him, and he opened his mouth and taught them saying;' Matt. v: 1-2.

"He preached his first sermon standing in the plain.' And he came down with them, and the company

of his disciples, and a great multitude of people came to hear him.' Luke vi: 17-20."

The trouble with our contradiction hunter in this case is, that he has not even read the commencement of the public teaching or preaching of Jesus as given either by Matthew or Luke. He attempts to make each one of them say, in the passages he gives, that the sermons mentioned then are the first that Jesus delivered, and as the one mentioned by Matthew was delivered upon a mountain, and the one mentioned by Luke was in a plain, that therefore they contradict each other. But the truth of the matter is, neither one of these writers says that the sermon referred to is the first one the Savior delivered. Matthew by no means says the sermon on the mount was the first one that Jesus delivered, but on the contrary, he shows in the latter part of the fourth chapter, that Jesus had really been preaching some time before he delivered the sermon on the mount, in 17th verse of the fourth chapter he says; "From that time forth began Jesus to preach and to say, repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And in 23rd verse of the same chapter Matthew says: "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people." Then after all this, in the 5th chapter, a record of the sermon on the mount begins. Now to say that this sermon is the first one that Jesus preached, is to manifest a great degree of ignorance of the Scriptures on the subject. The sermon on the

mount is the first one that Matthew records, but he shows clearly that it was not the first one Jesus delivered. The same may be said in regard to Luke. He shows positively that the sermon mentioned in the sixth chapter as quoted above, is not the first one the Savior delivered. In the fourth chapter of Luke, beginning with 17th verse, we have a brief record of a sermon delivered at Nazareth, on account of which the Jews there attempted to put him to death. Then from Nazareth he went to Capernaum, and taught in the synagogue also. And in the fifth of Luke, he sat in a ship, and taught the people. In fact there are several mentions made in the fifth of Luke, of Jesus preaching, before the one in the sixth chapter comes in, as mentioned above. So it is the extreme of folly to say that the discourse delivered in the plain, is given by Luke as the first one Jesus delivered. The facts are all against the statement. And if it be claimed that he said some of the same things in the sixth of Luke that were said on the mount, it only shows that he preached the same things more than once. And we doubt not he preached the same things many times over, as he preached in so many places, and to so many people. Thus we have shown to a certainty that there is no contradiction between Matthew and Luke, regarding the first sermon of Jesus our Savior. If the man who proposed these things as contradictory will only take the pains to read what these writers both say of the history and preaching of Jesus previous to the sermons he mentions, he will see every vestige of his supposed contra-

dictions disappear, and will see that the two perfectly agree.

"6. John was in prison when Jesus went into Galilee. 'Now after that John was put into prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God.' Mark i: 14."

"John was not in prison when Jesus went into Galilee. 'The day following, Jesus would go forth into Galilee.' John i: 43. 'After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and John was also baptizing in Enon. For John was not yet cast into prison.' John iii: 23-24."

The point of supposed contradiction in this sixth item is, that Mark says Jesus came into Galilee after John was put into prison, while in John it is said the Baptist was not yet put into prison when Jesus came into Galilee. Now if it could be made clear that Mark and John both had reference to the same trip of Jesus into Galilee, then there might be some room for a claim of contradiction. But a careful examination of the facts will convince any one that they were not both speaking of the same trip. The law of Moses required the Jews to go to Jerusalem three times a year, to attend the annual feasts. Jesus no doubt observed these requirements closely, for he fulfilled every jot and tittle of the law. This then would carry him backwards and forwards from Galilee to Jerusalem at least three times a year, and he may have gone much oftener than that. And since he made so many trips from Jerusalem and Judea into Galilee, these historians and biographers of his would very naturally speak, some of them

of one trip, and some of another. Jesus went into Galilee, as mentioned above, in John i: 43. Was there at the marriage, in Cana. Then in second chapter of John, and 13th verse, we read, "And the Jews' pass-over was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem," and he was there when Nicodemus came to him by night. Then in third chapter, 22nd, 23rd and 24th verses we have the information that Jesus and his disciples came into Judea, probably from the city of Jerusalem, and there they tarried and baptized, while John also was baptizing in Enon, and it was at this time that it was declared, that John was not yet cast into prison. Then in the fourth chapter of John, we are informed that Jesus went again into Galilee. He most likely made six or eight, or more trips from Galilee to Jerusalem and back again, during his personal ministry. John shows that he made some of these trips before John the Baptist was cast into prison, while Mark fails to mention any of these, but begins with one that occurred just after John's imprisonment. So John and Mark are simply speaking of different trips, and thus both of them speak the truth, and there is no contradiction whatever between them on this subject.

E, G. S.

Teachers Wanted.

We need four more teachers. We desire to organize a permanent faculty. We cannot pay large salaries the first year. When teachers have been connected with the institution one session, if we are pleased with

them, we wish to give them permanent professorships. Those desiring such a situation will please address the principal, giving explicit information relative to age, experience, qualifications, terms, family, health, profession, &c. &c. No one one needs apply for a situation here except an earnest, consistent, faithful, devout, Christian. We educate our pupils for eternity; and are determined to have no one, either pupil or teacher, among us, whose deportment might be detrimental to the Spiritual interests of others.

We cannot be expected to answer all the applications; but will, in September, inform those selected of their selections. Address,

T. B. LARIMORE,
Florence, Alabama.

Church News.

Bro. Lipscomb: I have just closed a meeting at Concord, with 22 additions. Bro. Rutherford was with me part of the time. Our numbers at Concord since the first of Jan. up to this date has been 39. Remember me in your prayers. May the Lord bless you is the prayer of your Bro.
E. W. DABNEY.

Brenham, Washington Co., Texas.

Brethren L. & S.: I preached for the brethren again embracing the first Lord's day of the present month. Had a large audience, good attention and the meeting resulted in 8 additions, one by confession and immersion, one intelligent lady from the Baptists and six by relation, the brethren there are getting on very

well and the prospects favorable for more additions.

To the Lord be all the praise.

Yours in the one hope,

JAMES A. DICKSON.

Miller Grove, Texas July 13th
1874.

Queries.

Brethren L. & S.: "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea and there he tarried with them and baptized.

And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim because there was much water there, and they came and were baptized." John iii: 22-23.

Who were they that were baptized? Please explain,

Yours truly,

W. R. LAURENCE,

Giddings, July 13th.

Jews, evidently, for the preaching that was done by John, and in fact none that was done previous to the death of Christ, extended to any but the Jews, and Enon was in Judea.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: I am requested by certain brethren of the Rock Spring congregation, to ask you to answer through the Gospel Advocate, this question: what do the 13th and 14th verses of the 9th chapter of Acts mean.

Your brother in Christ,

J. W. HAILEY.

Nolensville, Tenn., July 10, 1874

These are the verses: "Then Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how

much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority to bind all that call on thy name." This is the language of Ananias to the Lord, when he told him to go to Saul of Tarsus to tell him what to do. We understand that Ananias was intending to urge the fact that Saul was a vile persecutor of Christians, as a reason why he should not go to hunt him up. Ananias had heard by, or from many persons how Saul had been persecuting the church at Jerusalem, and he had also heard that Saul had carried letters of authority with him on this trip from the high priests, to bind all that should call upon the name of the Lord. Ananias evidently thought that under these circumstances it would be a very dangerous trip for him to make. He evidently had not heard of what had happened to Saul by the way, and how humble he was at the time, but no doubt thought that he would be ready even to bind him, if he went where he was, and he did not like to go. But the Lord removed all difficulties and fears out of the way, and he then went his way, and found that Saul was done his persecutions, and told him what to do.

E. G. S.

Schools.

We call the attention of our readers to the advertisement of Bro. J. E. Scobey of Murfreesboro, Tenn. He is an active and competent teacher, and is doing good work in the cause of education. Brethren, remember him when you go to send your daughters to school.

Also see the advertisement of South Kentucky College; bro. T. A. Crenshaw, Principal. We had the pleasure of a visit from Bro. Crenshaw to Middle Tennessee recently, and find him a pleasant, warm-hearted Christian gentleman, and we doubt not, a good teacher. Try him and see. Judging from the catalogues of these schools, they are both in a flourishing condition.

E. G. S.

Evangelizing among the Colored People.

Bro's. L. & S: I left home at 1 o'clock A. M. June 13th. for Mayfield Ky., by the N. W. R. R. and reached it at 11. 40. stopped there nine days, preached 10 sermons, one in the Christian Church at 3 o'clock P. M. Lord's day. Was listened to attentively by good audiences, and I think from what I could learn it was the impression of those who heard, that the truth was presented. Yet from some cause it was not immediately obeyed—several spoke respectfully and warmly of it, but hesitated in going further. I am satisfied that it is better for those who cannot read for themselves to hear it often to understand its requirements, so as to obey intelligently. But whether it will be thus, depends upon the full and persevering co operation of the brotherhood. It is too great a work to be treated lightly. We want light on the subject. And not light only but substantial aid. I met with some good brethren there. Bro. Dr. Landrum J. H. Happy, F. M. Kibby the pastor, and our old acquaintance and faithful servant of the Lord, R. B. Trimble, and others who appear to be interest-

ed and anxious for the moral and religious improvement of my people in their community. The church there contributed to my work fifteen dollars, I left Mayfield on the 22nd for Paducah, reached it 12.40, by the P. M. R. R. met and stopped with, while in the City, my old acquaintance and faithful brother, Lee Boyd (colored). He carried and introduced me to a number of the white brethren. Elder Geo. E. Flower brethren Ashbrooks, Robertson, Williams, Dr. Young and others, whose names I can't recollect. Bro. F. M. Green of Ohio, general agent of the Sunday School work was holding the last of a series of eight Sunday School Institutes in Ky. during the month of June, I attended three of his exercises and was both interested and instructed. Preached three sermons in the A. M. E. Church, four at old brother Lee Boyd's house, and five in the Christian Church. The hearing was quite good. The Pastor of the A. M. E. church, Eld R. J. Mortimore is decidedly the most unsectarian and intelligent colored minister I have ever met. At the close of my labors there he presented resolutions expressive of thanks for what he called Christian courtesy on the part of the officers of the Christian Church in opening the house for the colored people to worship in and for the instructive discourses delivered. They were unanimously approved, as far as I could learn, the appreciation of the conduct of our brethren, I cer-

tainly was glad to see, yet as I said then they did no more than our our brethren are doing in some other places. At 5. o'clock A. M. July 4th I left Paducah by the E. P. R. R. for Princeton after a pleasant ride of forty-five miles, I reached it, met several Brethren that were looking for me, as the brethren were on my arrival at both the other places. Brethren Turner, Higby, Calvert, Grasey, Hart, and others, seem much interested in the effort to instruct the colored people. I stopped there ten days, preached 9 sermons in the Christian church; the church contributed \$11:30. I should have stated the church in Paducah contributed \$8.00. Leaving Princeton at 7:10, A. M. on the 14th, I had to stop-over 12 hours at Nortonville, where I left the E. & P. R. R. and took the St. Louis & South-Eastern R R and reached Hopkinsville at 9:20 p m; stopped a week with the brethren, and preached in the Christian church six times, in the M E (Colored Methodists of America) Church twice; think the impression made was good. Was encouraged by Brethren Dr Gish, E H Hopper, Poindexter, Grant, Metcalf and others. The contribution there was \$14 20. I left there 10:30 A M, the 22nd, arrived home at 2 p m, after an absence of 41 days; preached 39 sermons and lectured 7 times on Sunday school work, and mental and moral culture, traveled 406 miles received \$48 50, paid out 18 50, I thank the Lord and the brethren. Though I had no accessions, I think good was accomplished. In and near Mayfield, we have six colored members, and in Paducah six; near

Princeton one; in Hopkinsville five; only eighteen in and near these towns. With a persistent and faithful effort I am satisfied these numbers could be greatly increased. May we all be more faithful.

Yours in the one hope,

DANIEL WADKINS.

Nashville July 23rd 1874.

The Bible Immortal.

In the year 303, when that last great effort was made by the Emperor Diocletian to extinguish the Christian name, he send on the 23rd of February his legions to the great church of Nicomedia. When the doors were forced open and the soldiers entered, they searched and searched with diligence, but they searched in vain for any visible symbol of the Deity whom the Christians worshipped. No banners, no crucifixes, no images of the saints were to be found in any part of the building, noble though it was, and towering as it did, and as historians tell us, above the very palace of the Cæsars. But as they searched they fell upon one record—upon one object on which they proceeded to vent their bitterest vengeance. They committed the Bible to the flames; and we all know, my friends, that that last great effort of Satan to use Pagan Rome as an instrument for annihilating Christianity was simply directed to the extermination of the sacred book. Now, it strikes me that there two very important lessons here. In the first place, do we not learn from the anecdote, or rather does not this anecdote remind us that the true test—the primitive test of the Christian Church—is the

sole supremacy of the Holy Scriptures of God?

But there is another lesson to be learned from that little anecdote which I venture to bring to your memory, and that is, that Satan was wise in his generation when he bade the emissaries of Pagan Rome direct all their efforts to the suppression of the Scriptures. You will remember that all the edicts that were fulminated at that time ordered the demolition of the Christian sanctuaries, that they called for the degradation of officers even in the highest posts of trust about the Imperial person, if they held and professed the Christian faith; but the virulence of all this animosity, was directed against that little book, which has for so many years, with God's increasing blessing, circulated to the uttermost parts of the earth. And why? Because the enemy knew well that so long as the Bible survives, the Church will live. The enemy knew well that so long as the Scriptures remain, full as they are from Genesis to Revelation of Jesus Christ and him crucified, the Church will over and over again re-assert her existence.—*Bishop of Carlisle.*

Every true hero grows by patience. People who have always been prosperous are seldom the most worthy, and never in moral excellence the most strong. He who has not been compelled to suffer, has probably not begun to learn how to be magnanimous; as it is only by patience and fortitude that we can know what it is to overcome evils, or feel the pleasure of forgiving them.

CLIMATIC.

These are the days wherein express-men rejoice, while railway directors and steamboat owners exalt their horns and greatly magnify their thrifty office. Fashion and June beckon to the sea-shore, the mountains, the verdurous plains. Society smiles and follows. If, in our intemperate climate, even the mountain-tops seem to melt with fervent heat in July and August, and even the sea to seethe and blaze, society sits in its bones, as it were, behind closed blinds, stayed with fans and comforted with ices, and is not, on the whole, uncomfortable. But how shall that great industrious world which sustained society, in itself be sustained? The workers in Wall Street or Baxter street, carriers of brick and mortar and wearier carriers of doubtful obligations, editors, printers, writers, preachers, artisans, mechanics, housewives, boarding-house keepers, drudges of all degree, to whom a vernal holiday looks as far off and as fair as heaven—how shall these escape the long fever of the American midsummer? Or the farmers' households who take summer boarders, the vast retinue of over-worked servants, the laborers in wheat-field and hay-field and garden, when savage Leo romps and tears through the zodiac, how shall these groan and sweat under their weary burden and not fall beneath it?

Nature is kind. If she heat the earth seven times hot for her own economies, she says plainly enough that we have only let down our individual fires to be reasonably comfortable. All winter long we have

have been crowding fuel into this portable furnace that we call the body, because we wanted caloric. Now we fill it with an equal bulk because we want something else. And for the reason that we are not bred stokers, the misused machine is always out of order and but half capable.

Sir Charles Fox, the great engineer, who died last week in London, built nothing finer than his own capacity to work. Among other notable successes he constructed the building for the great exhibition of 1851. To complete it in time he worked upon the drawing eighteen hours a day for seven weeks. During the last fortnight he slept only in his chair, dozing a few minutes at intervals. He came out of this match against Time unharmed. But he said that he owed his endurance and his brightness to his simple diet, which was bread, fruit and vegetables. Every morning he found his brain teeming with ideas, his body tingling with energy. If Charles the Second pronounced his roast worthy to be knighted as Sir Loin, Mr. Fox would have treated his loaf and his rice, his apple and his tomato, with kindred honors. Both strength and endurance he maintained followed on a light diet. The cool blood could not develop fever nor starve nerves and tissues.

It seems to be an established fact that the heavy eaters are the least muscular and the least intelligent of men. The inhabitants of northern Europe, northeastern Asia, and North America, the Buracts, the Tungoos, the Laps, gormandize flesh, and are stupid and cowardly. When Pythagoras, Plato,

Newton, Descartes, had a job of peculiarly difficult thinking on hand they cut down their supplies, and forsook meat altogether. The earlier Greek athletes, not more famous for their strength than for their ease of action and endurance, ate no animal food. Mohammed over ran a world on barley. The great Onar, celebrated for his purity and genius not less than for his resistless valor, lived on dates and grains and water.

The Saracens have a respectable name in history for courage, persistence, and shrewdness—vegetarians every wan Ali of them. Xenophon tells some large stories about the hardy pupils in the old Persian schools, Westons, and Winships among them in plenty, though with much prettier names. Watercresses and bread were the whole of their diet; and yet those same soldiers scarce ever were quiet, such was their formidable strength and activity, Cousins-german to them seem the athletes of the Himalayas. One of them is often stronger than three Europeans. He lifts a man by the breast and back between his palms and holds him at arms' length. These fare sumptuously every day on rice, with occasional cocoanut. The Chili miners add their testimony to the efficacy of meagreness. They make nothing of carrying on their backs three hundred and sixty pounds weight from the bottom of the mine, three hundred feet deep, to the top, ladders being a labor saving device unused among them. They dine and sup, and sup and dine, on beans and bread, and bread, and, apparently, hauger for no flesh-pots. The Arabs of the

desert point the same moral. They are knit up of health. It is said that their patriarchs live two hundred years. They subsist on dates and camels' milk, in so small quantities that an autopsy shows the stomach seems to be much contracted. But stomach seems cheaply exchanged for such *verve* and vigor as they get in the barter.

Nor is it the heathen alone who thrive and keep cool on husks and east wind. The most vigorous Sablellian among us must concede to Jonathan Edwards the possession of marvelous power of accomplishment. That endless worker found his highest condition attained on *z* per diem of one pound of light food. John Wesley labored eighteen hours a day, riding, perhaps, seven hours in twenty four, and preaching five times, publishing forty volumes and keeping up his vital flame for ninety years with carefully limited fuel. Swedenborg after an early excess, heard a voice as from heaven, saying: "Eat not so much." Thereafter he sinned not against his stomach, and so fine and clear became his muddy vesture of decay, that it no longer grossly closed him in, and he thought he saw all the windows of heaven opened.

Summer dinners are a weariness to the flesh. Perhaps the Arab example of a handful of dates dipped in butter may not commend itself to our profuse housewives, but it is certainly better, whether considered from the aesthetic, human, or physiological point of view, than the heterogeneous "spread" of a well-to-do family, whose female head looketh well to the ways of her household. Anybody who reads that letter of Cicero in

which he describes the preparations made by his distinguished guest, the mighty Julius, to enjoy his elaborate dinner, conceives a wholesome preference for rice and baked apples over that coarse enjoyment called a feast, which lasts him for many a day.

If heaven be within us, so is climate to a great degree. Much meat and many pickles, and unhindered coffee and tea, and the assimilation of unlimited lard and butter, and the quaffing of plenteous wine, and all through these summer months, in the delusion that this "generous" diet is needed to maintain our strength must kindle equatorial fires within us. Bread and milk, vegetables, fruit, coarse grains, shall give us to live in an unbroken June till the frosts offer excuse again to butchers' stalls. And if comfort be worth so much, is not capacity worth more? When abstinence buys nimble wits, activity, hope, courage, the very joy of existence, is it too dear a price to pay? The vision of hundreds of thousands of weary women grilling over the stove in these hot noon-tides to prepare useless caloric for the burning veins of their kind is uncheerful. If Dejanira were wise, she would feed her Hercules for a season from the larder of the garden, the field, the dairy. Though he grumble, yet is grumbling less harmful to him, and to her than indigestion. But after a month of purgation he would not grumble. He would feel that he could mount on wings as with eagles. That he could run and not be weary. That he could walk and not faint. And he would thank her who forbade him to oppose August within to August without.—*Christian Union.*

WHO ROB ORCHARDS?

In a certain village in the far West was an atheist. He was a great admirer of Robert Dale Owen and Fanny Wright, but he could see no beauty or excellence in the Son of Righteousness.

This man, of course, never entered any place of worship. Indeed, in the fruit season he was specially busy on the Sundays in defending his orchard from his great enemies, the woodpecker and the idle, profligate persons of the village, who on that day usually made sad havoc among his apples and peaches.

One day while at work with his son-in-law—an atheist like himself, although a more kind and courteous gentleman—as a pastor of a congregation was passing, he very rudely accosted the minister:

"Sir, what is the use of your preaching? What good do you do by it? Why don't you teach these fellows better morals? Why don't you tell them something about stealing in your sermons, and keep them from robbing my orchards?"

To this the minister pleasantly replied, "My dear sir, I am sorry that you are so annoyed, and I should most willingly read the fellows who rob your orchard a lecture on thieving, but the truth is, they are so like you and the major here that I never get a chance."

"Good, good," replied the major laughing; on which the elder atheist, blushing a little and in an apologetical tone, said:

"Well, well, I believe it is true enough; it is not the church-going people that steal my apples."

Obituaries.

Bro's L. & S: For the comfort of the disconsolate parents, I will record the death of little Sarah Alice Shaw, only daughter of T. M. and Margaret A. Shaw. She died of Irritation of the stomach on the 26th day of June 1874 after an illness of six days.

Alice lacked a little of being nine years old, and was a beautiful and affectionate little girl, ready at all times to do all in her power to requite the affection of her loving parents.

It looks hard to rob fond parents of such a source of hope and pleasure, but if we could foresee the future as our father can, we would doubtless be able to say, "thy will be done. Jesus has said, 'of such is the kingdom of heaven,'" and dear little Alice has gone to enjoy the company of those whose joys are unmingled with the fruits of sin.

Go to thy rest, fairchild!

Go to thy dreamless bed,

While yet so gentle, undefiled,

With blessings on thy head.

W. Y. KUYKENDALL.

Cookville Tenn.

Died, March 30th 1874. Sister S. M. wife of T. J. Whitfield. She gave herself to the Lord in 1870, and was an earnest member of the church till her death, and died triumphing in the cross of Christ. and in the hope of immortality and eternal life. She leaves a husband, two children, besides many friends to mourn their loss of her. But they mourn not as those who have no hope; "for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him." The separation by death of husband and wife on this earth is sad. But their reunion where parting will be no more will be joyful forevermore. How consoling the hope of the Gospel.

W.

Bros. L. S.: At the request of his father, I announce to the readers of the Advocate the death of James F. Straughn. Son of Bro. Greene B. Strughn. James died of Typhoid fever, in Cairo Ill., on May 18th 1874. Was born in Blandville Ky. 1845. Being at the time of his death 27 years of age. He leaves a Christian wife, father and mother to mourn their irreparable loss. Poor James, he died without hope in Christ.

R. J. T.

Mayfield Ky. July 2, 1874.

Bells.

The attention of those in want of Bells for Churches, Schools, etc., is

called to the advertisement of Vanduzen & Tift, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Full descriptive catalogues, with prices, etc., will be sent free on application to them.

FOR THE CHILDREN'S SAKE.

BY LEWIS B. JACKSON.

How often in the street cars and on the public thoroughfares do you and I catch a word or a sentence of conversion that starts a train of reflection which we make useful to ourselves and to our friends? Just now I was witness to a meeting of two matronly looking women, who had evidently not seen each other for some time, and the one speaking of her residence as now far away from the other, in terms of regret, immediately added, "but so the place is better for the children, and I put up with everything for the children's sake." And I turned to look at the speaker; there was nothing attractive in the features; but that is little with me, for my good mother instilled into me the maxim "handsome is that handsome does," a half century ago, and outward ugliness does not prevent me from recognizing inward grace. And the words, "for the children's sake," invested the speaker with a respect and interest I should not otherwise have thought of.

As I pondered on the suggestive utterance, I wondered if the children appreciated the sacrifices made for them, and then I remembered my own thoughtlessness and ingratitude. And then more pleasant reminiscences recalled instances of parental self denial

and rich returns which children have sometimes made for the devotion and care they have received. And how the timely thought of what is due to the children, has sometimes saved a parent who was going astray. The idea of parental responsibility has been brought home with great power to one who was thoughtlessly leading a child into danger, as when a little boy dining out with his father, where wine was used, was asked what he would have, artlessly replied: "I'll take what father takes;" or, as in another instance, where a boy following his father out to the barn just after a deep fall of snow, was seen exerting himself to step into his father's tracks. In each of these cases the father's thought was arrested, and a change of life and habit was at once resolved on, so that it might be safe for the boy to imitate his father's example, and follow in his father's steps.—*N. Y. Observer.*

is no tonic better than the consciousness than one amounts to something.' But we are sorry for the woman who thinks she does *not* because she only keeps house."

John Bright, in a recent address in the convocation of the Society of Friends in London, on temperance legislation, said that until the religious portion of the community take up the subject there is no hope for it. He added, that social influence was against abstinence. For thirty-four years, from the time he became a householder, he had not bought any wine or sprituous liquors whatever. He had in his house no decanters, and he thought he had no wine glasses; he had not had them since 1839, when he took to housekeeping. It had cost him some inconvenience and trouble, but altogether he had had no occasion to regret the step he then took.

Some discouraged wives fancy that they do nothing worthy when they only make a good and happy home. For such we quote the following paragraph from an exchange:

"It takes a deal of brains to keep house, to make a home, even if you don't do the manual labor. The woman who makes a perfect one puts into the work probably enough talent to have made a fortune. But if she prefers the latter result, she had best not marry. She may be able to do other things better, more profitably, but very few of us in this world get into just the place or have just the work we want. "There

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Am I baptized into Christ?.....	699
Plainness of the word of God.....	701
God's Plan of pardoning mens sins.....	702
Changes in the Religious Denominations..	702
Reason—faith	706
Angels.....	707
Supposed contradiction in the Bible No. 2.	708
Teachers Wanted.....	711
Church News.....	712
Queries.....	712
Schools.....	713
Evangelizing among the colored people.....	713
The Bible Immortal	715
Climatic	716
Who Rob Orchards?.....	718
Obituaries	719
For the Childrens Sake.....	719

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 31.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, AUGUST 6, 1874.

WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

A DISCOURSE BY GRANVILLE LIPSCOMB, DELIVERED AT BETHEL CHURCH, WILSON COUNTY, TENN., SECOND LORDS' DAY IN JUNE, 1874. PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.

"The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." Romans viii : 16.

The members of the New Covenant have a higher position than that of servants. The Lord proposes that those who are pardoned through the Gospel of his Son shall be adopted into his family and become *his children* and that as such they shall receive the Spirit of adoption by which they can approach him as their "Father." This is a much higher position than that of servants. Servants do not heir the estate of the master, but more frequently than otherwise compose part of the inheritance; but the *children* are the heirs.

We esteem it a great blessing to be adopted into God's family and to have become his children.

has at his or her disposal quantities of gold and silver, or a number of earth's broad fertile acres. But if this be a blessing how much greater the blessing, how much more to be desired it is, to be a *child of God* and for that reason an *heir of God*, an heir of him who possesses all of earth and heaven, indeed the vast resources of the universe are his, and his children shall inherit in his vast estate. Again : we think it a great honor to have for a joint heir in the wealth of this world one who commands the respect and esteem of his fellow mortals, one who is so noble and so amiable that all who know him can justly render him praise and admiration. But how much greater must be the honor to share the wealth of the Almighty Father with his Son, "who only hath immortality" who is the "fairest among ten thousand and altogether lovely," whom angels adore, who holds the keys of death and hell, and who is the "King of kings and the Lord of Lords." These high honors and inestimable blessings belong to those who have been adopted into God's family and

Who then, we may ask, are the children of God? This is a very important question; you perceive our being heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ depends upon our being children of God. Paul says: "If children then heirs." If we are not children of God we are not heirs of God, nor joint heirs with Christ. So important was this claim that the apostle saw proper to summon two witnesses to prove it. I say *two* witnesses because he mentions the "Spirit itself" and "our spirit." The "Spirit itself" is the Holy Spirit and by "our spirit" he means the spirit of the individual who is a child of God. The Holy Spirit is one witness and the spirit of every child of God is the other. A plurality of witnesses were required in this case. Notice, it does not say the Spirit itself beareth witness to our spirit, though the passage is often quoted in this way, this would make but one witness: but it says the "Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit." The Holy Spirit is one witness and our spirit is the other. When I say that I bear witness *with* my neighbor to a certain matter, all readily understand from this expression that I am one witness, and he another witness. It seems to me that Paul's language is equally as clear. We propose to examine these two witnesses in the order they are mentioned, first the Holy Spirit and then the human Spirit.

Here I would remark, there is no question with any one who believes Paul's statement, but what the Holy Spirit *does* bear witness in showing who are the children of God. This we all admit. The question is *how*

does the Holy Spirit bear witness, and what shall be regarded as the Holy Spirit's testimony?

I am aware this subject has been, and is yet one of much controversy. And yet all the teaching on the subject, perhaps, is included in two theories. And that we may have the subject properly before our minds, I beg leave to state them. One theory held by various classes of religious teachers is, that the Holy Spirit bears witness through the feelings or emotions, and that these are to be taken as the Holy Spirit's testimony. In strict harmony with the theory, is the practice of those who believe it. These when endeavoring to find out who are the children of God require the relation of an experience, which generally consists in giving a sincere narration of the travels of their mind, the state of their feelings and emotions, that by these it may be determined whether or not they are children of God.

Another theory is that the Holy Spirit's testimony is *in words*, and that the Holy Scriptures are the words of the Holy Spirit, and that any passage of the Holy Scriptures taken in its proper import and connection to prove any proposition, is the testimony of the Holy Spirit to that proposition. And so, in accordance therewith believe that those who are children of God according to the written word of the Spirit, are children of God as witnessed by the Holy Spirit itself.

Allow me to say, it matters nothing with me which of these be true. I had just as soon believe one as the other, provided I could decide on its truth. Can we not *all* come dispas-

sincerely and reverentially to the Bible and see which of these, if indeed either of them, be the true plan. Let us come prepared to believe whatsoever the Scriptures may teach upon the subject. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Remember the main question now before us is *how* does the Holy Spirit bear witness that any one is a child of God? We all maintain the fact, but how does the Holy Spirit testify, is the question.

Here I desire to call attention to the fact that the Holy Spirit, the same Holy Spirit ("There is one Spirit," says Paul) which testifies who are the children of God has borne witness to various other facts or propositions, besides that of showing who were the children of God, and reference to these we hope will be of great service to us in showing how the Holy Spirit testifies.

The audience is no doubt familiar with the history of Judas Iscariot one of the chosen twelve, who betrayed the Son of God for thirty pieces of silver. By this transgression he fell from his place among the Apostles. This of course left but eleven. Just previous to the memorable day of Pentecost, these eleven, with other disciples of the Lord, were assembled in Jerusalem awaiting the promised power from on high. The Apostle Peter seemed to understand that the number *twelve* apostles should be complete before the New Institution could be inaugurated. The Savior had said, "You shall sit upon *twelve thrones*," this required *twelve Apostles*, hence Peter proceed-

ed to have another chosen to fill the vacancy occasioned by the fall of Judas. Matthias was chosen and "numbered with the eleven Apostles" and thus made the twelfth. What I ask your especial attention to here, is, that *The Holy Spirit had previously testified that Judas would do the work he had done, that he would lose his office and that another should take his place.* Now can we learn how this testimony of the Holy Spirit was given? Turn with me, if you please, to the first chapter of Acts and we read: "In those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples and said, (the number of the names together were about one hundred and twenty) Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas who was guide to them that took Jesus." Here, Peter says the Holy Spirit *spake* something concerning Judas. How? he says, "*By David's mouth.*" But Peter calls that spoken by David's mouth, "*Scripture*" and why? simply because David could and did write down these *words of the Spirit*, they went to record with other statements of the Holy Spirit, and Peter and the rest of the disciples had access to these Scriptures. Though David had been dead and buried a thousand years, still Peter and every living man of faith could say it is written in the Book of Psalms thus, and so, and present the same as the testimony of the Holy Spirit. He does this without the least hesitation and not a dissenting voice was heard in all that company of the disciples as to the propriety of receiving the Scriptures

as the teaching of the Holy Spirit. This is truly significant.

But we wish to show from David that we have rightly understood Peter, and desire that this great prophet shall confirm our position that the testimony of the Holy Spirit was *in the words* of the Holy Spirit. Open your Bible at second Samuel 23rd chapter, 1st and 2nd verses.

"Now these be the last words of David. (Men's *last* words are thought to be as honest as they can be) David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob and the sweet Psalmist of Israel said, *the Spirit of the Lord spake by me and his word was in my tongue.*"

We see plainly that the testimony of the Spirit was in words either spoken or written. Words that David could utter with his mouth and tongue, and words that he could write down and that could be read centuries after his death, and still be regarded as the statements of the Holy Spirit.

It is a consoling thought that God cares for us and decrees that all things shall work together for good to them that love him. In the eleventh chapter of Acts we have an instance of God's providence in behalf of his children. He caused his Holy Spirit to give evidence of an approaching dearth, that his people might be prepared for it. Our object shall be to see how this testimony of the Spirit was given. Let us begin at verse 27, "And in those days came prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch (who were prophets? why men so inspired with the Holy Spirit that they could, like David, foretell what

was coming to pass.) And there stood up one of them named Agabus and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar. Then the disciples every man according to his ability, (that is the way to work yet) determined to send relief to the saints which dwelt in Judea: which also they did and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Paul." Here the indications are clear, that the Spirit's evidence of a coming famine was in the words of the Spirit through Agabus. Suppose the disciples had been called on to consult their feelings, do you think they could have been apprized of the coming dearth? Perhaps at this time peace and plenty were smiling on every hand, and yet the Holy Spirit through Agabus, in no doubtful terms, but with unerring certainty, *speaks* of a dearth to come. The disciples showed their faith in the Spirit's prediction by providing for the relief of their brethren.

Another remarkable instance of the Spirit's witness is on record in 20th chapter of Acts. In this chapter we have an account of Paul's farewell address to the Elders of Ephesus who met him at Miletus. Having given them a review of his labors among them for three years, he turns their attention to his prospects in the future. He says: "And now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem not knowing the things that shall befall me there, save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." Here we find the very expression, "*The Holy*

"*Ghost witnesseth.*" But we inquire how did the Holy Spirit testify that bonds and afflictions awaited Paul at Jerusalem? Paul says it was by "saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." Words must have been used or there could have been no "saying." But again: You notice it does not say the Spirit bore witness to Paul at all times and places; but "*In every city.*" Why was this? Why did not the Holy Spirit bear witness all along the roads, where Paul traveled, between those cities, and out on board the vessel when Paul was making a voyage? It occurs to me that if the Spirit's witness had come through the feelings that in the solitude of Paul's journeys would have been a very favorable time for the Spirit to have borne witness through this channel, but such was not the case, only in the cities did he receive from the Holy Spirit a knowledge of his fate. The reason for this is obvious. There were prophets, it seems, in every church, as the New Testament was then unwritten; they were required. Paul would meet with these prophets in every city and the Spirit through these prophets would bear witness to Paul of his coming afflictions. To show the audience that I am not guessing at this, I beg permission to cite your attention to a statement in the next chapter that will prove it. The vessel in which Paul was travelling "Landed at Tyre for there the ship was to unlade her burden. And finding disciples, we tarried there seven days, who (these disciples) said to Paul through the Spirit that he should not go up to Jerusalem. Evidently the reason

why it is said the Spirit bore witness in every city and not between those cities was because there were prophets in all these cities.

Following Paul in his journey we find him in Cesarea at the house of Philip the evangelist, who had seven daughters who did prophesy. While he was here there came down from Judea, Agabus, he who foretold the dearth. Having joined the company, he took Paul's girdle and with it bound his own hands and feet, and said: "Thus saith the Holy Ghost, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles." Could anything be more plain? "*Thus saith the Holy Ghost.*" In plain words the testimony came. The disciples present did not in the least doubt this to be the testimony of the Holy Ghost. They immediately began to dissuade Paul from going to Jerusalem: but he assured them of his readiness not only to be bound at Jerusalem, but if need be, to die for the name of the Lord, so strong was his faith. We can but admire it, and so ours must be if we are saved.

Let us not forget that all this testimony was in words and we cannot doubt its being the testimony of the Holy Spirit on all the subjects mentioned. This might seem to be sufficient proof, but inasmuch as we consider this the most important matter connected with our subject, I will endeavor to fortify it as strongly as possible.

In Hebrews, 10th chapter, we again have a clear example showing how the testimony of the Holy Spirit was given. In this place the Apostle

was arguing the superiority of the sacrifice of Christ over all those sin-offerings of the previous dispensation. In those there was a remembrance made of sin again every year, hence they were offered every year. But the one sin-offering made by Christ was sufficient to "perfect forever them that are sanctified." To the all-sufficiency of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, he says the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us" and then immediately gave the words of the inspired prophet Jeremiah to prove the Holy Spirit a witness. In this Paul follows the example of Peter. Peter quoted the words of the prophet David as the testimony of the Holy Spirit and Paul those of Jeremiah and calls it the witness of the Spirit. All this testimony was in words.

In the same way the Holy Spirit testified beforehand that some would depart from the faith and give heed to seducing spirits. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter time some shall depart from the faith." (1 Tim. iv : 1.)

The Holy Spirit's direction to the churches was *in words written in a book* and sent to them. When the Lord desired the seven churches in Asia to receive spiritual light, he thus instructed John: "What thou seest write in a book and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia" calling them by name. (Rev. i : 11). Each one of those addresses to those seven churches contained this solemn admonition: "*He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit says unto the churches.*" Seven times is this command in the Book of Revelation. I always did think it meant *these ears with which we can*

hear the sound of each other's voices. I do not see how they could be better employed than by listening to the words of the Holy Spirit.

In this way the Spirit testified in favor of some and *against* others. "Yet many years didst thou forbear them and testifiedst against them by thy Spirit in thy prophets. Yet would they not give ear." (Neh. ix : 30.) Here the Spirit's testimony was *against* the Jews, but it was none the less the Spirit's testimony, and that through the words of the Prophets.

In the days of the apostles and prophets of the New Testament, the Holy Spirit's testimony was either written or oral. Where the testimony had been placed on record, recourse could be had to the record, and when the Spiritual, or inspired men, were present the Spirit's teaching could be learned through them. See 1 Cor. 2: ch. But when the record was completed and these Spiritual men had all passed away from the earth (and they had no successors) then the inspired record was all that could be relied upon for Spiritual light. It contained the teaching of the same Spirit that taught through them. And it teaches through the record exactly the same things that it taught through the Apostles and prophets. The prophets are now all dead. The Holy Apostles have all long since finished their work and gone to their rest. Tongues have ceased, and prophecies have failed as they said they would (1 Cor. 12: 8) "but the word of the Lord endureth forever and this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." This word furnishes the teaching of the Holy

Spirit as surely and authoritatively as the inspired men were all here to tell us by word of mouth. The examples set us by Peter and Paul teach us that while here they esteemed it so themselves and cited without hesitation and with authority the Scriptures as the testimony of the Holy Spirit: and no man then ever called it in question. Holy men of God wrote this book as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. They tell us that they have declared all the counsel of God, that they have kept back nothing that was profitable but have showed us all things. Through this book "divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness" "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." The Bible must be to us what inspired men in the Scriptures were to them. None of us could know anything about the witness of the Spirit without the Bible. We could not know that there was a Holy Spirit without this book. What do people now without the Bible know of Spiritual things? Just nothing at all. They know not God nor his Spirit. This ought to be evidence to all that the Spirit's witness and operation are alone through the word. This is the reason the Gospel must be preached to every creature, is that they may obtain Spiritual aid.

I know some claim now to have been specially called, qualified and sent as were the apostles. But if this be

true, the Bible is false. Paul teaches us that these miraculous endowments should cease. That they belonged to the childhood state of the church, and were to continue till the church came to "a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4: 13.) He who desires or claims new revelations now, has not confidence in the one God has already given.

It is a fact somewhat remarkable too, that the preachers who make loudest claim to special endowment are the very poorest preachers known and admitted so by their own disciples. But when a preacher "gives attendance to reading" and to studying the word as Timothy was required to do, he has no cause to be ashamed. But let all those blush and cover their faces in shame, who, when pretending to be a mouth-piece for Jehovah, give utterance to so many silly and absurd traditions. We have no disposition to be severe, we only "speak that we do know and testify that we have seen." The Bible contains all the spiritual light that it is now possible for us to secure from a divine source. O that all would realize this, it would cure many ills among us, many a mourner would be comforted, thousands of sincere men and would rejoice in being the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, who dare not now express even the hope. May the Lord speed the day when the authority of his word shall be known.

Are we now prepared to understand how the Spirit bears witness that any one is a child of God? In every instance that we can find in the Bible, we see the Spirit's testimony was in-

words, spoken or written. Words that could be read a thousand years after the inspired penman was dead, and still be regarded as the Spirit's teaching by the faithful children of God, and by those too who were themselves inspired. This being true we ought not to be very slow to adopt a theory contrary to this plan, one which necessarily ignores the Bible as the testimony of the Holy Spirit? I have not been able to find one single instance in the Bible where it is taught that the Holy Spirit ever bore witness to any fact through the feelings. In the absence of one such case, how, in reason's name, can any man in his senses bring the Bible to its support? Now when the Holy Spirit bears witness to the fact that certain characters are the children of God, can we suppose that in doing so there was a departure from its accustomed and well known way of testifying? which was through words. Let us now examine this point and see if the Holy Spirit did not testify as usual.

Paul says "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death" (Romans 8: 2) Then, when the Holy Spirit came it must have given a law. I venture to say that we will find it so. You all no doubt remember the Savior said he would send the Holy Spirit when he went away, and that this same Spirit should convince the world of sin, though the world as such could not receive the Spirit. On the day of Pentecost the disciples were filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance. Jerusalem at this time was crowded with

visitors from all parts of the habitable globe. These all ran together to know what this wonderful occurrence meant. The Spirit addressed them through Peter, told them of their condition that they were sinners, and when they "heard this" they were pricked in their hearts and cried out to know what they must do. The Spirit told each one of them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; (Acts 2: 38.) This was the law the Holy Spirit gave, when it came fresh from the counsel Chamber of Jehovah, poor dying sinful men that they might, by obeying it, become the children of God. Repentance and baptism then must be a part of this law. These people had already believed or the Spirit would have told them to believe. The history of the Jailers' case, and of all the cases in Acts will show the law of pardon given by the Spirit to be faith, repentance, confession and baptism. True the Spirit did not make all these known on every occasion, because the condition or advancement of the inquirer was different. Sometimes they were unbelievers, sometimes believers, as were the Pentecostians, sometimes they were believing penitents. The answer given by the Spirit was always adapted to the inquirer. This is the law of pardon for us, the only one that can make us children of God, none other has the Holy Spirit given, none other will it give. We are shut up to this one. I did not place this law here, A. Campbell did not, it was here long before he was in existence. It will be here when you and I are mouldering away

to dust in the silent grave; it will be here when the last trumpet shall sound, when the silent sleepers in the dust must all arise and stand before God. When the books are then opened the book that contains this law will be opened and you and I must give an account to the great Judge of the way we have treated it. Friends, I know its importance, I will never tire proclaiming it. If I had the voice of an angel so that it could be heard on every hill and in every vale I would from the tallest summit of earth proclaim this law which the Spirit gave, that every son and daughter of Adams race might hear, believe and obey, and thus become children of God, and heirs of God. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is yet the power of God unto salvation. We wish now to call attention to the other witness in the case, viz: the Spirit of the individual. Our Spirit has a very important part to perform, and no other spirit but ours can answer in our own case. "What man knoweth the things of man save the spirit of man which in him" (I Cor. 2 : 11.) The Holy Spirit made known the law of pardon; your spirit must testify to you whether you have obeyed this law or not. Mine cannot testify for you. When the Holy Spirit says "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," I may hear you respond, "*I do believe with all my heart.*" I may have full confidence that you are sincere, but cannot say infallibly, because I know you have it in your power to deceive if you chose. Yet there is one that can, and will tell you whether or not you are in earnest, and that is your own Spirit. When the Holy Spirit says

"repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." I may rejoice when I think I see evidence of repentance, I may see you go down into the water to be buried in baptism, I may behold you arise from that liquid grave as I think to walk in a new life, but this may not be the motive that actuates you. I know not, but your own Spirit does. It is not my province to sit in judgment upon the claims of any one to be a child of God, I have not the ability, and if I had, I have no authority for doing so. "Let a man examine himself" is as true of this as of the Lord's Supper.

Your own Spirit must testify to you each step that you make in becoming a child of God that you are honestly obeying from the heart the law of pardon as "preached by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." When you act in this way the Spirit itself bears witness with your spirit that you are a child of God.

This, to me, is tangible and in my judgment, Scriptural. To accept the theory of the Spirit bearing witness through the feelings, would be to accept that which bears upon its very face unmistakable signs of its own weakness; it is itself in its most acceptable form a contradiction.* The best "experience" you ever heard embodied these four points:

"I felt like and for that reason I believed I was the *worst* sinner in the world. I felt like and therefore believed that God could not be just

* This fact is elaborated in "The Gospel Plan of Salvation" Pages 624, 5. A valuable work that should be in the hand of every disciple. G. L.

and pardon so wicked a person as myself. I felt like my day of grace had forever past, and accordingly believed that. Then, I felt like I was pardoned and therefore I believe it."

Suppose we ask the narrator of all this, the question, "Did you ever murder any one?" He will tell you "Nay." "Did you ever rob any body?" "Never in all my life." There are men in the world that have done both these; in reason's name then, this individual cannot be worse than they. So, when his feelings taught him God could not be just and pardon him. Suppose the question be asked him now "Is God just?" "O yes." Well, when his feelings taught him God could not be just and pardon him they again told him a falsehood. Try another. His feelings made him believe his day of favor had passed. Now ask him if this was true, and he will tell "O, no, I am now pardoned." Out of four propositions here are three manifestly false. When a witness tells me three lies in succession, he need not expect me to believe what he may say in the fourth instance.

It is not wonderful then, that those who depend on evidence of this kind should be harassed by doubts, fears, and gloomy forebodings. It is a wonder, however, that the doubtful character of the witness can be made to recommend it, but such is the case.

But when a person relies upon the record of the Spirit for the witness of the Spirit in connection with the testimony of his own Spirit, before such an one can doubt his pardon, he must doubt the testimony of one or the other of these witnesses. As long as he believes the Bible, he

cannot doubt the witness of the Holy Spirit, and as long he has the right exercise of his mind he cannot doubt the testimony of his own Spirit. We must either lose faith in the Bible or the right exercise of our faculties before our confidence can be impaired. This kind of evidence creates an assurance that the other can never give nor take away. It will answer for life, it is strong in death. How different the ancient Christians from many professors now, who go with bowed down heads and drooping hearts most of their lives. Often tortured by gloomy fears, frequent doubts and sometimes despair. Paul says "we are *always* confident, "For we *know* that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." This well grounded faith begat that bright "hope" which was an anchor to their souls *both sure and steadfast*, and which entered into that within the veil. "Rejoice in the Lord *always*, and again I say rejoice." They had cause to rejoice under the most adverse circumstances, and so have Christians now. The evidence is as strong now as it was then.

Furthermore: to establish the theory that the Holy Spirit bears witness through the feelings, would at once open wide the flood gates for every species of error and superstition. This would give a Christian no advantage over the Mormon or Mohammedan. Either could say his feelings testify to him of his acceptance with God as strongly as do ours, and tell the truth. The "orthodoxy" of all errorists could be

established by this kind of evidence. They have the same natural organizations as ours, they walk the same earth, the same sun shines on them, the same moon and stars beam in their heavens, and yet they know nothing of the witness of the Spirit. Why is this if the Spirit bears witness through the emotions without the word? Their emotional natures are as strong and as active as ours. The reason they know not God nor spiritual things is that they have not the Bible. The moment you raise up the Bible in the estimation of the people it makes all the difference between infidelity and Christianity, between heathenism and the religion of Christ.

We have seen how important the Bible is in determining who are the children of God. We must never ignore the Bible, it is our only hope. Only through it can we receive the testimony of the Holy Spirit. I do not say this Book is the Holy Spirit, but I do say without it we would never have known that there was a Holy Spirit. Never could have had the Spirit to bear witness with our Spirits that we are the children of God. Never could have received this comforter into our hearts. I do not say this book is God, but I do say, without this book we never could have known God aright, whom to know aright, Jesus says, is "Eternal life." Neither could we have known "Christ and him crucified," the world's only hope of salvation.

This Book then, is the Book of God, It tells us of our heavenly Father, and all we know concerning

him. It tells us of his great love for our race,

Love, "deep as our helpless miseries are,
And boundless as our sins."

It tells us of his rich mercy and of his inflexible justice. None of his divine attributes of the heavenly Father could we have known without the Bible. It is the book of the Son of God, telling us of his mission to this world to save that which was lost. How he was rich and yet for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich. It tells of his lowly birth, his wonderful life, spent in doing good. Of the shameful death which he endured in his own body upon the tree that he might redeem poor sinful, fallen man from the thralldom of eternal woe. It tells how his form, all mangled and bruised for our iniquities, was laid in the rich man's tomb, how he arose triumphantly from the grave, bringing life and immortality to light, how he ascended to his Father, who invited him to a seat at his own right hand, where he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him. None of these precious truths could we have known without the Bible. We have already shown it to be the book of the Holy Spirit, dictated by the Spirit. This book is the Book of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Contains all we know of each, contains the work and words of each. It is recommended in this way above all production in the wide world. The Bible is the book for man, it tells him who he is, whence he came and whither he is tending. Which of us could have found out our origin without the aid of the Bible? Who could have told us our condition, or

relation to God without the Bible? Who on earth could have apprized us of our destiny as the Bible has done, telling us it must be heaven with all its joys or the dark abyss of eternal woe? The Bible is the book of Heaven, it unfolds to our enraptured gaze that "glorious land where angels and purified Spirits dwell;" the home of God's people, where God himself shall wipe away all our tears. Where there shall be no pain, no sorrow, no death, former things will have passed away. None of us could have known of this blissful place without the Bible. The Bible is the book of time. It tells us of the dawn and the close of time it tells us how important are the actions in time that during time we must prepare for eternity of that eternity. It is the Book of Eternity. What could we have known of that endless and inconceivable state without the Bible? It tells of that eternity past, in which Christ had glory with the Father e'er the foundation of the earth were laid or ever time began. Then coming up to time, in one grand arch, it spans all time and reaches forward into that boundless, never-ending eternity yet before us, into which we must all soon go. The Bible then is a

"Most wondrous book? bright candle of the Lord!

Star of eternity! the only star

By which the bark of man could navigate

The Sea of life, and gain the coast of bliss
Securely! only star which rose on time,

And on its dark and troubled billows still,
As generation, drifting swiftly by,

Succeeded generation threw a ray
Of heaven's own light and the hills of God

The eternal hills pointed the sinners eye

—R. H. L. O. K.

Imposition of Hands.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: I deem it not necessary to discuss longer at present the imposition of hands. I shall have to give you up as a "doubting Thomas," confirmed in your skepticism upon that subject. But I wish to say, while the matter is still upon my mind, some things relative to your last article.

You speak of my attempting to shift responsibilities from my own shoulders, and calling upon you to prove certain things. You say "you are not logically or justly called upon to prove a single thing." Now "the burden of proof lies with him who proposes an alteration"; you propose to change a practice among us; therefore, the burden of proof really rests upon you in the main proposition. Furthermore, if you object, saying I espoused the affirmative, I answer that, while that is true of the main proposition, the "this, that and the other" are minor affirmations, or assumptions of yours which you ought to prove or give up. You assumed that Ananias conferred the Holy Spirit upon Saul; is it not your duty to prove it, or must I take your word for it? You affirm that the gift was conferred upon Timothy by the presbytery, and assume that it was the gift of the *Holy Spirit*. You have admitted that you cannot prove this assumption, then why complain at me because I asked you to prove it? Now do you think that I should turn in and prove that this is some other gift, or not the gift of the Spirit just because you affirm that it is? That would be like a man turning out to prove his character, when a

charge is brought against it, instead of denying the charge simply, putting his opponent to the proof. You affirm things, Bro. Lipscomb, that you do not prove, and when denied affirm them again. You say of Paul, "He says the gift was given by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Now Paul does not say that; but, although I had called your attention to the fact, you state it again. He says WITH the hands of the presbytery; but BY my hands. You insinuate that I deny Paul's language, while you presume to change it.

Finally, when you cannot compass your point by argument, you resort to a stratagem which I consider beneath the dignity of Christian courtesy. You say concerning the work of caring for widows, etc., "We fear our brother has never done much of it, else he would think differently concerning it." Now this is "the most unkindest cut of all." I have always believed you to be a man zealous of good works, and have made mention of the same both in private and in the pulpit. But, Bro. Lipscomb, is this my reward—is this returning good for evil? Rather evil for good, it seems to me. This thing is offensive to me. I know you are bold; but I thought you would not be so rough with a brother's feelings. It is not a pleasant thing that hundreds should read this insinuation without any contradiction, "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." I am not angry, that is not Christian; but I am deeply hurt at this. I shall scarcely give you occasion to use my

name, until you show a willingness to deal more gently with my feelings and reputation.

Yours in Christ,

C. M. WILMETH.

McKinney, Texas, July 16th, 1874.

We regret certainly the wounding of our brother's feelings. We do not think what we said, when properly considered, any ground of offence, whatever, but had we supposed it would have wounded the tenderest sensibilities of our brother, we should not have penned the sentence. We intended no evil, certainly, for good, or evil either. We know of no evil toward ourself from our brother.

What was the case? The apostles had demanded men full of the Holy Ghost to do the work. If the demand was not for inspired men, the men were inspired to enable them to do the work. Some of them at least. Paul demanded the church should send chosen men with Paul and Barnabas to engage in the work of distributing the funds sent to the poor disciples in Judea. He regarded it as too delicate a work for even him and Barnabas, although inspired, to do without chosen, approved men from the contributors to aid them. The apostles thought it a very delicate work, a very important matter. A work that needed spiritual gifts to aid in it. But our brother says it is a little amusing to hear him (Bro. Lipscomb) say, "each must have a spiritual gift of the Spirit to guide him in the work" (of distributing to the poor widows at Jerusalem.) Now here was a wide difference in the views of our Bro. from the Apostle's views. Suggest inexperience as the

ground of our Bro.'s failure to look at this work as did the apostles. And that suggestion wounds him. We do not think it ground for any offence, yet had we thought it would give offence, we never would have made the suggestion.

Inexperience is no crime—especially in a young man. Our brother is a young man. We venture not one in five hundred of our old brethren, even preachers, have a particle of experience in distributing the contributions of the church to the poor. If Bro. W. has, he is a remarkable exception to the rule. But little such work is done. We know of no explanation less offensive, that could be given. But our brother lectures us for returning evil for good. We intended no evil. But now he proposes for our unintended evil to return us evil, not only us, but our readers also. He intimates he intends to deprive us of his writings because we made the unintended wound to him. This is an evil you are proposing to return. We have always been glad to have bro. W. write, we doubt not our readers agree with us. We will regret to be deprived of his communications. We hope he will forgive us and still write. While we think him entirely too sensitive, we will try hereafter, as we are now aware of his sensitiveness, to avoid offending it. We can say we never intended to wound a brother's feelings in anything we have written.

We have in an extreme case or two written things that we know would wound, but it was not done with the purpose of wounding. We regretted on these cases justice and

right could not be done without inflicting the wound. Our roughness was born in us we suppose. It is in the bones and marrow. It will hardly ever be rubbed off. We regret it is there, but it never wounds us to be told of it. Our brethren may thump it and bump it and tell us of it publicly and privately as much as they please, we will never be offended in the least. All we ask is that in return they will bear with it, and be sorry for us as we have to bear it all the time, they occasionally, without becoming offended at us for it.

We intended to have written in the sentence complained of "with the hands of the Presbytery." We had so done in the former article which we were quoting, our case required no other reading. Through an oversight we wrote *by*, instead of *with*. The other matters can go for what they are worth, we make no response.

We would have been glad if bro. Wilmeth had told us whether he still really believes Paul received the gift when Christ appeared to him on the way to Damascus, and if not when?

D. L.

BIG MARTYRS.

It is really amusing to see the meek, patient, forbearing style of some who play "big martyr," in the church. For instance, some brother will get up a fuss among the brethren—give offence to brethren, by some act, and persecute, and prosecute the offended, as long as possible to do so, and then when further persecution is not possible, he falls back in a

pious mood, and all at once becomes very meek, and patient, and so moves upon the hearts of the sympathizing brethren, as to represent to them that he is the persecuted, that he is the saint, and that the other party is very unchristian. &c.

Every one can call up such instances.

Such brethren are hard to deal with. We have known such to do the Church more harm than it could recover from in years, merely to gratify their own worldly lust, and satisfy a desire to be considered a big martyr.

Now none are expected to apply this to themselves, unless it fits. If it fits we do hope they will make the application and try to reform.

Men are deceiving themselves in this age—to a very great extent—by supposing that they can deceive God. That they can plant thorns, and gather grapes—that though their works are sensual—devilish, they may reap a Spiritual—heavenly reward. But God's word says, "as a man sows, so shall he reap."

Every man shall be judged—not according to what he seems to be, or do, but according to what he hath done, whether good or evil, according to the deeds done in the body.

J. T. P.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S: As the brethren are generally interested in Church News and the success of the Gospel, I have determined to write you a few lines under this head. With the assistance of our local evangelists, Bro. Scobey,

Lipscomb, Fulgham, Benton and Luke; all good and true men; at this, and contiguous points, we have had, by baptism, letter and otherwise since my last report, as well as my memory and memoranda serve me, I presume, about 67 additions.

The brethren here are so kind and liberal as to grant me the liberty of going out and evangelizing abroad. Taking advantage of this freedom, I visited the brethren at McMinnville; found them an intelligent, devoted band; had a good hearing, with two confessions, also visited Union, near Christiana station; found kind brethren and sisters there; had nine confessions. Two young colored brethren, Warmuck, held a meeting during the same week, in the same section, resulting in four confessions. They are men of good speaking talent, sustaining good Christian Characters and disciples, I believe, by Bro. Shaw.

I returned home day before yesterday, from Stewart's Creek, where I held quite an interesting meeting, resulting in 18 declaring for the Lord, the best material in the neighborhood. I found the disciples, here kind, and earnest in the work; and I am confident, by a prudent, zealous course on their part, that the whole of this delightful region can be won over to the Lord.

Permit me, my Tennessee brethren and sisters, tho' comparatively a stranger to you, to say to you in meekness and love,—let us all be diligent, zealous, persevering, and the God of hosts will smile upon our efforts, and a great harvest of souls

will be gathered into the granary of heaven.

Fraternally and affectionately,
G. W. ABELL.

Dear Bro. Sewell: Permit me through your columns to speak of the success of the cause in this vicinity. The church at Pocahontas Tenn. is in a prosperous condition. They meet every Lord's day at the house of the Lord to read, sing and pray and attend to the Lord's supper, in this congregation the Bible is held up as the only rule of faith and practice, by a mutual effort they learn and obey the commands of God.

R. P. Meeks is their pastor. He visits them once a month, besides others who make occasional visits, and in Bro. Meeks' hands the Gospel is so clearly presented that many have been led to the truth which has made them free, and now they are in the triumphs of the Gospel grace. This has been the case till the Baptists and Methodists have almost ceased to operate.

We have had 14 additions to the cause this year at Pocahontas: 5 from the Baptist and 9 by immersion, most of the work has been done at the Shady Grove and the Prince School houses, 3, and 7 miles South of Pocahontas. There are many noble people there in that country. The Pocahontas congregation principally consists of the sturdy, faithful farmers, among whom we find the best people of earth, being from the fashions and follies of the day. May the Unseen, who watches over all in the untried paths of time aid us to "fear God and keep his commandments" which Sol-

omon tells us "is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12: 13.

Fraternally Yours,
GEO. P. YOUNG.
Hopkins Station, Tippah Co. Miss.

Brethren L. & S.: Embracing the second Lord's day of June Bro. Thomas J. Shaw held a meeting of nine days at the Big Springs twelve miles east of Murfreesboro, Tenn., resulting in nineteen additions, of these there were 15 Baptists, 1 Methodist, 2 from the world and 1 restored, among these was one Baptist preacher. Bro. Shaw is an able speaker, and is one that proclaims the Gospel in its plainness and simplicity, as did the apostles. He has been a laborer in the glorious cause for several years and understands the Gospel plan of salvation. It is admitted by all who heard him, that he preached the best series of discourses that was ever preached in this part of the country, and did more in breaking up sectarian prejudice, than any one has ever done in this community.

The disciples seem to be much encouraged, and the prospects bid fair of much good being accomplished at this place.

Yours in Christ,
J. P. GRIGG.
*Big Springs, Rutherford Co.,
Tenn., Ju'y 3rd, 1874.*

Bro. D. Lipscomb: Thanks to you for the Advocate; it is truly what its name imports. Since my last to you I have taken three confessions. Bro. Elgan is at this time

conducting a meeting at this place. Thirteen have obeyed the Lord.

Yours in the one hope,
J. C. MATTHEWS.

Donelton, Hunt Co., Texas, July 1874.

Dear Advocate: I send you this report as an item of good news. I held a meeting last week, at Mount Zion, 12 miles south of Murfreesboro, spoke 12 times and baptized 10 persons, both men and women. I closed a meeting at Milton last night. Spoke eleven times and took one confession, a very old man. The audience was very large all the time, and much interest was manifested. Many, who never would hear our brethren before, came out, and hence the result, much prejudice was removed, and a good state of feelings exists here now. Farewell; I will write again.

SMITH J. DENTON.

Murfreesboro, Tenn., July 30, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: Sirs. As you were kind enough to copy a notice of a meeting at Bearwallow, to be; and which pursuant to adjournment, was holden there, the second Lord's-day instant; I have to say that the congregations in this part of the "field," are not ripe for co-operation. I write however, chiefly to express my approbation of the plan, (if plan it may be called,) of our brother J. T. Poe, for the propagation of the Gospel of "God's dear Son," as expressed in his letter to you of June 27th; for the publication of which you have my thanks. I hope your readers will re-peruse it; and that all our congregations may "reach out as far as they can go and return in a day," etc. Bro. E. M. Berry is still laboring

faithfully in out-of-the-way places; and we hope other congregations may be stimulated by the example of Bearwallow, and a few others, to come to the rescue, and still keep bro. B. in the field; his arrangements are made and appointments out, until about the first of January next, after which he will be governed by circumstances.

Your brother in hope,

C. G. MOREHOUSE,

Knob Lick, Ky., July 17, 1874.

P. S. Our brethren would be glad to see an article from the pen of our loved sister, C. Fanning, occasionally, in your valued paper.

C. G. M.

Obituaries.

On the 24th of September 1873, our family was bereft of our dear little John Henrie, aged five months and twenty days. In his infant purity he was transplanted in His bright Celestial Dome, a sweet angel now, as we so often called him here. We loved him so devotedly our frailties as human beings caused us to weep, and how could we withstand such grief, O, Lord, if it was not for the soothing solace given in thy word? May we live better Christians, and be prepared to bring up his only little sister and brother in the fear of the Lord, that we may go and live with little Johnnie when this mortality shall have put on immortality.

L. E. PATE.

Bellwood, Wilson Co., July 3, 1874.

A veteran soldier of the cross has fallen in West Tennessee. Elder James W. Wilmeth died at his residence, in McNairy County Tennessee, on the 13th of May 1874, aged about 63 years. He was born in Rutherford County North Carolina. When very young his father emigrated to Smith Co. Tenn.—where he spent the days of his boyhood. About the year 1829 his Father moved to McNairy Co. Tenn. where he spent the balance of his life, except some four years, that he lived in Smithville Larance County Arkansas, in 1843. He returned to McNairy—he joined the reformation about the year 1838, under the preaching of John H. Dunn, and shortly after commenced preaching the Word.

As a preacher of the ancient Gospel, he was pointed, logical and eloquent. And in exhortation had no superior, being well informed in the word. He used it as a two edged sword, with powerful effect, against the enemies of the great king; no man in this country was ever persecuted so much by sectarians. But his opponents would not meet him in open debate. His memory was remarkably good, his mind quick, powerful and comprehensive; veracity, candor and hospitality are traits that marked his character. He was sick nine days, bore his affliction with Christian fortitude, he talked much on the subject of religion, prayed often, and died in the triumph of a living faith.

Thus fell a veteran of the Cross,

He sleeps with the silent dead,

Who counted all things her but dross

To live with Christ his head.

CLINTON H. MOORE.

Died July 23rd 1874 at the residence of her father, Mary, Elizabeth eldest daughter of R. W. and Nancy B. Kittrell, aged five years and ten months. She was sick only two two days, being taken with congestive chills, on Tuesday about ten o'clock. Lizzie was a beautiful and bright little girl, fond and affectionate in her disposition and idol of her parents. Her last words 'ere her spirit winged its flight to the realms of bliss were oh! my papa, and with these fond words lingering upon her sweet lips her angel Spirit winged its flight from the arms of her earthly papa to the bosom of her Father in heaven.

G. L. H.

Linden Perry County Tenn. July 27, 1874.

From Scribner's Monthly for July.

TAXATION THAT KILLS.

We have before us the report of Mr. Ruffner, Superintendent of the Virginia Board of Public Instruction, for 1873, and we find in it, arrayed in startling figures, a statement of taxation for liquors, drank within the State, which fully accounts for the poverty, not only of Virginia, but of all the Southern States; while it also gives the reason for the straitened circumstances of millions in the North. There are 2,856 retail liquor shops in the State. If these shops sell the average amount of liquor

sold by the liquor shops of the United States, and there is no reason to suppose they do not, the annual amount consumed is \$10,622,888. There are additions to be made to this from wholesale dealers and patent medicines which are bought and consumed for their alcohol, that raise the aggregate to \$12,000,000. There is no doubt that the sum total exceeds these terrific figures, which leave out entirely the alcohol used for mechanical and manufacturing purposes. This sum exceeds the total value of all the farm productions, increase in live stock, and value of improvements, of the year 1870, according to the United States census, in the seven best counties of the State, and by just about the same amount, the value of the productions of forty five smaller counties during the same year. The wheat crop of Virginia, for 1870, was, in round numbers, 8,000,000 bushels. This, at \$1 50 per bushel, which is more than was received, makes exactly \$12,000,000. In brief, Virginia drank up its entire wheat crop to the last gill!

Mr. Ruffner presents other illustrative estimates, but nothing can add to the force of those which we have cited. He then goes on to show that the total taxation for State purposes, including legislation, salaries, courts, institutions for dumb, blind and insane, public schools, and interest on the public debt, only reaches the sum of \$3,500,000, while to add to this sum all the local taxation, would not equal the burden which the people voluntarily lay upon themselves. But this is not all. The injury done to public order, and to private health and enterprise, is to be taken into

account. Mr. Ruffner believes that the time wasted, the injury done to business, and the cost of crime, pauperism, insanity, and litigation resulting from intemperance, would be more costly than the liquor itself. Then the Superintendent, with figures furnished by the distinguished English actuary, Neison, in the interests of Life Insurance, shows how much valuable life is thrown away in the State. Between fifteen and twenty years of age, the number of deaths of temperate and intemperate persons, is as 10 to 18; between twenty-one and thirty, 10 to 51; between thirty and forty, 10 to 40. At twenty years of age a temperate person's chance for life is 44.2 years—intemperate, 15.6; at thirty, the temperate man's chance is for 36.5; intemperate 13.8; at forty years the proportionate chances are 28.8 to 11.6 years. Thus money, health, morality, industry, good order, and life itself, in enormous sums, go into this bottomless chaldron. Is there any return of good for all this expenditure? None. The loss is entire, and irremediable. If the whole had gone over Niagara Falls, something would be picked up, on the shore below, but nothing is left from this waste. A bushel of grain transformed into alcohol, and swallowed as a beverage, is a bushel of grain annihilated. If all that is spent for liquor were put into a huge furnace, and burned, we should have the ashes; but, as it is, we have no ashes except such as, with shame and tears, we are obliged to bury.

We have not displayed these figures for the special purpose of reading a lesson to Virginia, for that State

is no worse than the other States of Union; but one of her faithful officers has brought out the statistics, and the country ought to feel very much obliged to him for them. They give us the facts that account for all our public distress. Our taxation for the legitimate purposes of government and the payment of the public debt is a mere bagatelle by the side of the taxation to which the people voluntarily subject themselves, for that which harms them. We consume, as a nation, 600,000,000 a year in spirituous liquors, a sum which only needs a very few multiplications to pay the whole public debt of the country. If this tax could be entirely abated, the impetus that would be given, not only our prosperity, but our civilization, would soon place us in advance of every other nation under Heaven. Liquor is at the bottom of all our poverty. If the tax for it were lifted, there would not take five years to make them not only prosperous, but rich. There cannot be a more pitiful or contemptible sight, than a man quarreling over, and bemoaning his taxes, while tickling his palate, and burning up his stomach and his substance with glass after glass of whiskey. Men dread the cholera, the yellow fever and the small-pox, and take expensive precautions against it, while the ravages of all of them in a year do not produce the mischief that intemperance does in a month. It is worse than a plague, worse than fire, or inundation or war. Nothing but sickness, death, immorality, crime, pauperism, and a frightful waste of resources come of it. Nothing noble is born of it. Meantime our public men are

timid about, our churches are half indifferent over it, our ministers talk about the Scriptural use of wine, our scientific men dispute about the nutritive properties of alcohol, our politicians utter wise things about personal rights and sumptuary laws, and the people are going to the devil.

DR. J. G. HOLLAND.

The Louisville "Bible School."

This school was continued through ten months the last collegiate year under the efficient management of Prof. P. H. Morse and the local Board in Louisville. There was a class of twelve to fourteen, consisting of pious and industrious colored young men preparing for the Christian ministry. They were instructed in elementary English, spelling, reading, writing, arithmetic, geography and grammar, besides daily studies and recitations in the Bible. In all they made commendable progress, but especially in grammar, geography and the Bible. A few could not read when they went there, and consequently were greatly hindered in their studies. The Board, therefore, have decided not to receive a student until he has learned to read. This any young man can at home soon do if he has enough force in him to make a preacher. The Board will announce in due time, through the *Apostolic Times*, the day of opening the next session.

A much larger class could be educated with the same expense, and young men from other States can get here, if they only have the requisite push in them. One is here from

Virginia and another from Kansas. Quite a number could come from Tennessee as also from Mississippi and elsewhere. They can either work for money to pay their way here, or can work their passage on a steamboat. When they arrive in Louisville let them call on Dr. R. H. Wilson, No. 157 Fifth street. Those not able to pay their boarding can get employment in good families, night and morning, to pay for it. No young colored brother desiring to prepare himself for usefulness, need go without some qualification for it. Indeed the colored race are receiving a little education generally, and no one need expect to be a useful preacher among them that is not somewhat intelligent.

We have been very happy in the selection of a faithful instructor, and also in Louisville as the place for locating the school.

The brethren of that city feel a deep interest in the work, believe in its success, and are at pains to promote its interests in every way they can. Dr. Wilson, Dr. Baily, I. B. Grubbs, pastor of Chestnut Street Church, and Bro. Bartholomew are the Board.

Intelligent religious teachers are the chief want of freedmen, and our missions among them the past year proves that the simple gospel, as our brethren preach it, is just what they need and desire to hear. We need to prepare men by the score to send South. Will the white churches as well as the colored, continue their interest in this school, and make it a blessing to that race. Our other papers please copy.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

—*Apostolic Times*.

Giving Alms.

"A system has been adopted within the last two years in some of the large city churches, which seems to us to touch upon every relation of home or society, and to touch healthfully, too, with a meaning and vitality in it of sound common sense and Christian feeling. We mean the union of all the members or habitual attendants in a church into a club for mutual benefit and aid. It is, primarily, a Beneficiary Society, where each member pays his monthly quota, and each, in case of illness or death (no matter how wealthy he may be), receives a stated allowance. This plan seems to us to contain the idea of Christian brotherhood much more truly than the usual uncertain almsgiving system of most churches, where the man who has fallen upon evil days, is placed upon the pauper list, and receives his dole as a charity. In such a case, as well-to-do people should remember, it is a much easier exercise of Christian feeling to give than to receive. Supplementing this fund for sickness, there is a coal and provision club, a library and reading-room, in which concerts and exhibitions are occasionally given, and an employment bureau, intended to secure situations for men and women. So far the effort has been successful to keep these associations free from that marked religious character which would repel outsiders, and so defeat their object. It is to supplant the grog-shops and low theatres in the eyes of the workman or homeless lad about town that the reading-room or library is intended, and not as a dis-

guised lay church. These clubs, of course, must be modified to suit the needs of each locality, but in any manufacturing town or place where large bodies of workmen or women are unemployed in the evenings, their success has been exceptionally rapid and permanent.

"Coffee and reading-rooms (the idea is English we believe), have proved as fortunate and healthful in their influence. These are not necessarily under a special church influence. One or two energetic men or women, with but a small outlay of time or money, hire a room, where books, magazines and the daily papers are to be found in; the evening with the addition, sometimes, of tea or coffee. The admission to the room is put at a nominal price. The refreshment is furnished at cost, by which the strong and praiseworthy prejudice among the working classes against a charity is avoided.

"It really seems to us, that if our gently-bred women would use some of these rational, practical modes of lifting their less fortunate brothers and sisters nearer to their level of life, their own homes and lives would be sunnier and stronger. Whether successful or not, they would at least bring into both the vitality of a noble purpose."—*Exchange*.

THE history of God's dealings with his people in past ages wears a very different look to us now from what it wore while the scene was still unrolling. When Moses fled into exile and buried his genius and faith and aspirations in the shepherd-life of the desert,—it must have looked to him sometimes as if there were no God

and life had no meaning. Now we see that the solitude and the waiting were building him up in strength of long-suffering patience, by which he was to deliver his people. When the Israelites recoiled from the sea to find the chariots of Pharaoh closing in on their rear, they little knew that a glorious example of God's delivering mercy lay before them, which should stand through the ages as a token of hope to oppressed peoples. And so, when the kingdom of God that had seemed descending upon earth, disappeared in utter night, and Christ lay buried in the tomb, how little the disciples knew what joy of sunrise hung just below the horizon—how little they knew that their sorrow was the brief birth-pang of immortal life to all mankind!

ENLISTING.—As one sensibly remarks: Making a profession of religion is like enlisting in the army. It is very easily done, and is at the most only a promise. Whether the promise is kept depends on how the recruit behaves; whether he endures hardships as a good soldier, and fights bravely, and follows wherever his Captain leads.

Co-Education.

The experiment of co-education is no longer an experiment. In the presence of each other, young women are stimulated to greater intellectual development, and young men are inspired to a rarer gentlemanliness of conduct. Their honorable rivalry in the school room is a motive to broader scholarship and more liberal attainments; and in this scholastic

union they get a proper and ample preparation for their life work. Eminence College has the right to claim much credit for being one of the leaders in the way of testing and proving the value of the co-education of the sexes. For catalogue address W. S. Giltner, President, Eminence, Ky.

Dr. E. G. ROBINSON, President of Brown University, in a recent agricultural address said, what we fear is universally too true, that our farmers suffer more from absurd ideas of life and from bad diet than any other cause. It is so all over the country. He had known large farmers to engage in gigantic operations, and reckon their wheat by the thousands of bushels, who had no more idea of a vegetable garden or the adornment of a table or variety in their food, than if they had just come out of Asia. Salt pork, salt beef, rye or corn bread are their continual diet year after year. A farmer should be a man whose table is furnished with the best products of the best gardening in the world, and if they would pay more attention to such things, they would do something toward taking away the restlessness of their sons.

Look To Your Cellars.

Knowing as I do the danger families are often in from unwholesome cellars, I have a number of times before written a word of warning, and that (as a suggestion) I would now repeat. Any one who has not given attention to the subject would be surprised to know of the fearful

results that often come from ill ventilated and impure cellars. Typhoid fever, dysentery, and other diseases have been traced to them with absolute certainty. Scores of families have been broken up by death from this cause, and scores have been called to suffer long, distressing and dangerous sicknesses because of an invisible poison that has been generated in their own cellar. Any physician of experience will without hesitation testify to the danger that lurks here. While I am writing, five in a family not far away are low with typhoid fever from some local cause, which probably a close attention on their part might have kept away. A damp, wet cellar is always an unhealthy one, especially if it has not free ventilation and is not kept clean. In such cellars nearly always vegetable matter is decaying, and this is a fruitful source of disease. Even a dry and well ventilated cellar should be well looked after, especially as spring opens. All decaying matter should be removed; and some of this can always be found. Attend to the work and do it thoroughly, and then if sickness comes upon yourself or your children, you will not have bitter reflections because of your carelessness. A matter so fruitful of evil, and one that can be attended to in so short a time, and with so little expense, should not be neglected. Attend to it early, before the hurry spring work, but the better way is to be always attending to it as there is need. A clean, sweet cellar is not only healthy, but how much better it is for the milk, and the meat, and for everything kept in it. This will also suggest the importance

of seeing to everything about the house that is likely to produce disease. A few hours work and few dimes spent for disinfectants are as nothing compared with the benefit received.—*Ohio Farmer.*

Open Hearts and Ready Hands.

One day a teacher said to his class: "Boys, you can be useful, if you will. If you cannot do good by great deeds, you can by little ones."

The boys said nothing; but the teacher saw by their looks that they thought he was mistaken. They did not believe that they could be of any use. So he said:

"You think it is not so; but suppose you just try it for one week."

"How shall we try?" asked one of them.

"Just keep your eyes open, and your hands ready to do anything good that comes in your way all this week, and tell me next Sunday if you have not managed to be useful in some way or other," said the teacher.

"Agreed," said the boys; and so they parted.

The next Sunday, those boys gathered round their teacher with smiling lips and eyes so full of light that they fairly twinkled like the stars.

"Ah, boys I see by your looks that you have something to tell me."

"We have sir, we have," they said all together. Then each one told his story.

"I" said one, "thought of going to the well for a pail of water every morning to save my mother trouble and time. She thanked me so much, and was so greatly pleased, that I mean to keep on doing it for her."

"And I," said another boy, "thought of a poor old woman whose eyes were too dim to read. I went to her house every day and read a chapter from the Bible. It seemed to give her a great deal of comfort. I can not tell how she thanked me."

A third boy said: "I was walking along the street, wondering what I could do. A gentleman called me, and asked me to hold his horse. I did so. He gave me five cents. I have brought it to put in the missionary box."

"I was walking with my eyes open and my hands ready, as you told us," said the fourth boy, when I saw a little fellow crying because he had lost some pennies. I found them, and he dried up his tears, and ran on feeling very happy.

A fifth boy said: "I saw my mother was very tired one day. The baby was cross, and mother looked sick and sad. I asked mother to put the baby in my little wagon. She did so, and I gave him a grand ride round the garden. If you could only heard him crow, and seen him clap his hands, teacher, it would have done you good; and O how much brighter mother looked when I took the baby in-doors again!"—*Dr. Newton.*

Not By Chance.

Perhaps in some isolated instances a man may become wealthy through a series of circumstances very much resembling "luck," but, as a rule, those who would enjoy success must work hard for it. Twenty clerks in a store, twenty hands in a printing office, twenty apprentices in a shipyard, twenty young men in a village

—all want to get on in the world, and expect to do so. One of the clerks will become a partner, and make a fortune; one of the composers will own a newspaper, and become an influential citizen; one of the apprentices will become a master builder; one of the young villagers will get a handsome farm, and live like a patriarch—but which one is the lucky individual? Lucky! There is rarely any luck about it. The young fellow who will distance his competitors is he who masters his business, who preserves his integrity, who lives cleanly and purely, who devotes his leisure to the acquisition of knowledge, who gains friends by deserving them, and who saves his spare money. There are some ways to fortune shorter than this old dusty highway; but the staunch men of the community, the men who achieve something really worth having, good fortune, good name, and serene old age, all travel along in this road.

The smallest dew drop that rests on a lily leaf at night holds in itself the image of a shining star, and in the most humble, insignificant person something good and true can always be found.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Witness of the Spirit.....	716
Imposition of hands.....	730
Big Martyrs.....	732
Church News.....	733
Obituaries.....	735
Taxation that kills.....	736
The Louisville "Bible School".....	738
Giving Alms.....	739
Co-Education.....	740
Look to your Cellars.....	740
Open Hearts and Ready Hands.....	741
Not by Chance.....	742

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 32.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, AUGUST 13, 1874.

A SERMON ON REPENTANCE.

PREACHED BY GEO. W. CAMPBELL,
IN GALLATIN, TENN.

TEXT:—Likewise I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of God over one sinner that repenteth. Luke xv: 10.

Many Scripture terms have been so mystified by theologians, as to convey to the minds of the people a very faint, and often, indeed, an idea differing from that intended by the inspired writers.

As illustrations, I will mention *Grace, Regeneration, The Elect*, etc., etc. It is true all these terms are used more intelligently now than they were before the beginning of the Current Reformation. Since we began to plead for a return to Bible expressions for Bible ideas—to the Bible alone as the “Man of our counsel” in things religious—there have been great advances in all quarters toward the purity and simplicity of Apostolic speech. It seems to me that the idea conveyed to the popular mind by the term Repentance is a confused one. Now, to clear that

confusion from the minds of my hearers is the object of this discourse: The nature of Repentance, we can certainly understand from this consideration, viz: that it is classed by Paul, (Heb. vi: 1-2, compare v: 12,) as one of the “first principles” of the “Doctrine of Christ.” The fundamental principles of religion, as well as of science, are easily understood. If the “Doctrine of Christ” is adapted to human wants, certainly, its “first principles may be comprehended without any very great difficulty.”

None in this audience will, perhaps, deny it the place Paul has assigned it in the Christian system, nor reject the presumption established thereby—that it may be easily understood—and yet, if I were to ask this audience, what do you each understand Peter to mean by the word, ‘*repent*’ in the command, “Repent and be baptized?” how many different answers would be given! Should there be a Roman Catholic present, he would render it, “Do penance and be baptized.” Penance with them is self-inflicted punishment for sin. They suppose that

the atonement of Christ was insufficient to meet the demands of justice; and that it must be supplemented by self-inflicted human suffering, to be complete, hence their pilgrimages, fastings and sundry other "corporal works of mercy." Their theory regards God as having divided the punishment due to sin, laying one portion on Christ and the other on the sinner; their theology admits of a place called Purgatory, in which the souls of men expiate such offences committed in this life as do not merit eternal damnation. When purged by the suffering of Purgatory they are admitted into heaven. I, perhaps, need not say to this audience, that there is nothing in suffering to cleanse the soul from sin. Punishment, neither in this world, nor the world to come, was intended to purify the soul. Faith in Jesus purifies the heart. He that dies unjust, shall be unjust still; and the pains of eternity cannot make him righteous. A loving trust in and obedience to Jesus, who paid the penalty for us removes the stain of sin; and hence we sing:

"In my hands no price I bring.
Simply to thy cross I cling."

He is the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Our reliance is all on him. Instead of trying to appease the wrath of a sin-avenging God, by pilgrimages, fastings and self-inflicted flagellations, let all the earth look whither he points—to the bleeding Lamb of Calvary, and be saved.

There is another misconception with regard to the nature of repentance, generally held by Protestant denominations, which makes it to be

sorrow for sin. Out of this false view of this subject sprang the supposed necessity for the "mourner's bench," which is conceived to be the best place for the sinner to go through that series of lamentations and sorrowings, which they think constitute repentance and precede "saving faith." I'll offer a few objections to this theory. First, it is too indefinite. Suppose we put instead of 'repent,' in Peter's answer to the multitude, in Acts ii: 38, "exercise godly sorrow for sin." It would then become a difficult question for the sinner to decide when his sorrow was satisfactory to heaven. There may be degrees of sorrow in the same human soul, and different degrees of capacity for it in different persons. Unless there were some attending circumstances serving to limit the degree and time of continuance of the sorrow, it would be a puzzling question for the sinner to decide when he was ready to be baptized, as the repentance must precede the baptism. Secondly, on the supposition that 'repent' means be sorry, he was commanding them to assume a state of mind, in which, (Luke tells us,) they were already, for he says: "They were pricked in their hearts," which implies that they were then sorry for their sins. Thirdly, sorrow may not lead to repentance. Paul says: "Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance." (2 Cor. vi: 9.) Angels rejoice over one sinner that repents. I imagine that the joy of angels is not over the sigh of anguish that rends the soul struggling under the conviction that it bears a burden in itself, that, unless removed, will

sink it down to hell. Sorrow may work repentance; therefore angels may be expected to watch its workings in the human soul with joyful pity because it is the precursor of repentance. Often have good men shed tears of pity on hearing some old awakened sinner, having come to himself, cry lost! lost! forever lost! while memory ran

"O'er many a year of guilt and strife,
Flew o'er the dark flood of his life,
Nor found one resting place,
Nor brought him back one branch of grace"

When that heart trusts in Christ and says: "I'll arise and go to Jesus," "his commandments obey and his kingdom enter," joy takes the place of anxious pity. Judas bitterly regretted his betrayal of the Savior; in sorrow he went out and hanged himself; but no angel carried the joyful news from earth to heaven—"a sinner turned." Under the preaching of the great revivalists of this century many have wept and prayed for years, then died, not knowing how to repent; others after sorrowing for years concluded themselves of the non-elect, and were swallowed up of overmuch sorrow, having lost their reason, or gone into infidelity. Fourthly, Paul says: "Godly sorrow works repentance" thereby proving, beyond refutation, that the latter is an effect produced through the agency of the former. Peter wept bitterly after denying the Lord; his weeping indicated sorrow; his after-life repentance. We have now found that sorrow is not repentance, but its moving cause—this will aid us in determining its exact nature, after having noticed a third theory in connection therewith. It is thought by many to be reformation of life. In

the "Living Oracles" edited by Alexander Campbell, the word repent is translated reform (in Acts ii: 38,) etc. To this translation I offer some objections: First, Reformation is a gradual process, approximating perfection more and more, but never reaching it. There is moral, as well as physical inertia. It is impossible to leap at one bound from the lowest depths of degradation to the loftiest summit of spirituality. Complete reformation would restore a man to Eden's primitive purity. It would not only correct the outward life; but eradicate from the heart every thought and feeling inharmonious with the impulses of the great Divine Heart. To such perfection humanity never attains. I speak the experience of every Christian present. You well remember how you trembled on the day you first began the Christian life, as you thought of the struggle you would have with old evil habits of action, thought, and speech; you intended to abandon them by God's help, but you found that they did not "down" at your bidding; you had to single out the most glaring habitual sins, and conquer them one at a time; you gained victory after victory over the evil impulses of your own hearts, but as you grew in grace conscience became more acute, and you saw as never before the sinfulness lurking therein; and almost in despair felt that you could re-echo the Apostle's question—"Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Peter, therefore, did not mean that a complete reformation should precede their baptism.

Reformation, as I have shown, is a gradual process; but Repentance

was, in some instances of New Testament conversion, evidently an instantaneous work. After nine o'clock in the morning three thousand persons were convinced that they had murdered the Savior, by a speech of uncertain length, perhaps two hours; repented and were all baptized in the same day. The Savior said to his disciples, "If thy brother trespass against thee seven times in a day and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, 'I repent,' thou shalt forgive him." In Matthew it is recorded that Jesus speaking on the same subject said, that they should forgive seventy times seven. Here, the Savior doubtlessly meant, by the word 'repent,' a sincere determination on the part of the transgressor to resist his inclinations to do evil to his brother in future, and not a complete reformation; since it is a moral impossibility for a man to reform four hundred and ninety times in a day, or even seven times. Secondly: Inspired writers make a distinction between turning, bringing forth fruits meet for repentance, and the *repentance itself*. When the multitude came to John's baptism, he exhorted them "to bring forth fruits meet for repentance." The miserly, money-loving Jew, who had two coats, he commanded to give to him who had none. The publican who was in the habit of extorting unjust tax, he commanded to exact no more than was appointed him. To the soldiers he said, "Do violence to no man; neither accuse any falsely. In each case he singled out the besetting sin, in regard to which, he commanded reformation. This reformation was suited to, consistent with, meet for

repentance; but not repentance itself.

In Peter's sermon, in the iii chap. of Acts, we have this language: "Repent therefore and turn, that your sins may be blotted out." He makes a difference between the repenting and the turning—they don't mean the same thing. Put 'reform,' and turn, instead of repent, and turn, and you have nonsense, if the command is to be obeyed according to the order of its items, as it is impossible to reform without turning. Reformation is a ceasing to do evil and a learning to do well; and this is turning in the metaphorical sense in which it is here used—that being so, we would have the Apostle's saying, "reform and reform that your sins may be blotted out." Again, Paul says, "he showed all, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance" here is the same order: first, repent, second, turn to God, which implies a change of life sufficient to be adopted into God's family, and third, "Do works meet for repentance." We notice that the first must precede the second, since no one can turn to God, without repentance; the third suitably follows the second, since doing good works, or reformation is the legitimate fruit of turning to God. It would not do to say reform, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.

In Rev. ii: 5, the Savior says: "Repent and do thy first works—here, the same distinction is made. The Church at Ephesus had abandoned her primitive activity. She must repent in regard to this defection, and do her first works, or re-

form. I have heretofore discussed the question negatively; have shown what it is not; it now remains for me to show what it is. We have found that it is an effect, of which sorrow is the cause; and that it is suitably followed by good works, or reformation. The original word makes it purely a mental operation—it can have no other idea in it, than one of mentality, except as it gets it by metonymy. I may safely assume, that it is a mental act coming in between sorrow for sin, and the turning from it; and intimately connected with both. It literally signifies a change of mind. Every mental operation, is necessarily, a change of mind; but repentance is distinguished from all other mental operations, by its being produced by sorrow for sin. If we can find a faculty of the mind according to its natural workings changed by sorrow, we establish the presumption that this is the mental change referred to in Repentance. The generic divisions of the human mind are: Intellect, Emotions, and Will. Every change of which we can conceive must be a change of one or more of these faculties. Inform a father, having left home to spend the day, that his child has broken a limb. Your statement changes his intellect, or belief in regard to the condition of his child. This change of faith rouses his emotional nature; and to the extent that paternal tenderness and solicitude are awakened—to that extent will he be impelled to change his will with regard to straying away from the child. Obedient to this impelling power, he changes his will, and determines to hasten home. Let us apply this illustration of the working of the mind to the conversions on Pentecost. Before Peter began to speak, the people thought Jesus an impostor. But he proved to them that He was “both Lord and Christ.” They believed it. Here is a change of intellect, faith. Consequent on this change of faith comes a change of feeling, (i. e) of the emotions. They are sorry they killed Jesus; they are “pricked to the heart;” in anguish they cry, “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” Here is a change of the emotions, sorrow for sin; but no repentance; for Peter afterwards said, “Repent and be baptized.” One faculty yet, remains to be changed. He seeing that they had godly sorrow, which works repentance, gave the above command. Repentance, then, is a change of will, with regard to yielding obedience to Jesus Christ, prompted by sorrow for sin; and resulting in sincere attempts at reformation. An illustration will elucidate the subject: Two brethren have an altercation. In a passion, one who in cooler moments, has the spirit of Christ, did his brother injustice. They separate in anger, and go to their homes; the evening shades come on. “Let not the sun go down upon your wrath,” flits across his mind. Soon night draws her sable curtains around his fireside. Somewhat saddened and penitent over his conduct, he calls his family together, as usual, for prayer. The old family Bible, that has often been his comfort in hours of trouble, is opened. He happens to read from the “sermon on the mount” the following words: “Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there remem-

berest that thy brother has aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." He pauses a moment, then reads it again; memory connecting therewith this saying of John's: "He that hateth his brother is a murderer and you know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." He now sees that his prayers for himself and little ones will never be heard on high, until he obeys this command standing between him and heaven. "Be reconciled to thy brother," thunders in his ears. The Bible is closed, the family dismissed in astonishment; for he is a man who trembles at the word of God. He lays himself on his bed, but not to sleep—conflicting emotions strive for the mastery over his will; pride, and anger, love and duty each says, "hear me." The longer his meditation, the more profound his conviction of sin, and the deeper his regret for what he had done. A tear of contrition dims his eye, as he cries, "Lord give me the victory—help me do thy will." Here is sorrow; but angels are not yet rejoicing. At last in the midnight hour his love to God triumphs. He resolves, "I will go with the morning light and be reconciled to my brother; will confess my sin." Here is a change of *will*; at this period, a sinner repents and angels rejoice. The Scripture, read, changed his intellect. The change of faith brought change of feeling, or sorrow, and "sorrow works repentance." Reformation will be the suitable fruit; the change of will necessarily ends in change of conduct. The

amount of sorrow necessary to repentance is measured by its effect in changing the will. Sorrow cannot atone for sin, and God requires no more of it, than is necessary to make us determine to abandon its destructive paths.

The Savior, in the parable of the "Prodigal Son," gives us a beautifully touching illustration of what he meant by repentance. A certain man had two sons: the younger took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance in riotous living. There arose a mighty famine in that land, and he began to be in want. He joined himself to a citizen of that country, and was sent into the fields to feed swine. Here he would gladly have filled himself with the husks that the swine did eat; and no man gave unto him. And when he came to himself, he began to meditate: "How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough, and to spare, and I perish with hunger!" In my father's house I was happy; I left it amid the tears of a tender father, tearing myself from the affectionate embrace of my mother—what a life I have led! Now "I must feed the unclean swine and fain would fill myself with the husks they eat." "Has it come to this?" I imagine he struggled long, with hunger and poverty before his proud spirit yielded. Often scalding tears rolled down his cheeks as he contemplated his past life and present condition; sorrow brooded like night over his darkened spirit; but angels have not yet sounded the note of joy over a repentant sinner. But when sorrow had done her work, and the soul triumphing in her power to will,

said, "I will arise and go to my father and will say unto him, I have sinned," then was the note of joy caught up by cherubim and seraphim, and sent reverberating through the courts of glory. Sorrow led to the determination, or as Paul says, "worked the repentance." Suitably following this determination was the returning to his father's house—this was a beginning of reformation. "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." How can a person be conscious that he has obeyed that command? If a sorrowing sense of the offensive character of sin, in the sight of God has driven him into a determination to abandon it, and if that determination is being followed by continued, heartfelt attempts at reformation, he may be assured that his repentance is genuine. Now, alien from the Commonwealth of Israel, without hope, and without God in the world, have you mourned over the ruin of sin, and desired to be free from its curse? Let me impress on you, that God "now commands all men everywhere to repent." He is not a cold inaccessible God, but a loving father. Determine in your own heart, "I will arise and go to Jesus;" God is ready to receive you. You may be afar off, but he will come to meet you, in the first step toward a holy life; on the threshold of his kingdom, he will fall on your neck, and adopt you an heir of heaven, put on you a new robe—the robe of Christ's righteousness; and because you are a son, he will seal you with the "Holy Spirit of promise." Why longer delay? Sympathizing angels say, "come," these brethren say "come," "The Spirit and the bride say, come; and

let him that heareth say, 'come,' and let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." May God help you resolve to come!

Waco State Meeting.

State meetings are new things in our State; but I hope, now, that we have them started. No year will pass without a State meeting.

Friday before the 2nd Lord's day in July found a good number of Texas brethren gathered together at Waco. Bro. Wheat of Dallas was our chairman and Bro. Banton assisted by Bro. Williamson our Secretary. Of the details I need not speak as the minutes will be published and circulated. I wish, mainly to speak of the animus of the meeting. A more earnest, God-fearing truth-loving set of brethren, I think never assembled to consult about the interests of our great cause. No hobbies, no crotchets, but an entire ignoring of self seemed to be the Spirit of the occasion. To work we went, two sessions a day and preaching at night until Monday evening found us through with a large amount of business dispatched and in a most harmonious manner. I should have said preaching at 11 o'clock and night.

The Cumberland Presbyterian house was kindly furnished us during the entire session, and a week's preaching afterwards.

On Lord's day all the houses except the Catholic and Episcopal were occupied by our brethren. This was an act of courtesy as commendable as it is unusual.

We all left that meeting feeling

that it was good to be there, and with a higher estimate of our brethren. There we met old familiar faces, whom we have loved since boyhood. There was brother K. who baptized me when a boy of eleven; there sister A. who witnessed my confession in that old church at Palestine, long years ago. And there we met many brethren whom we had learned to love without seeing, and seeing loved them better.

The death of Bro. Banton, judge of the Waco district, and a most zealous, humble, faithful Christian and preacher, cast a shadow over all our joyous hours. He was at Marlin, working hard to get through with court for the meeting, was taken sick and brought home Friday night. Monday night at nine o'clock he died of congestion of the brain. One of the best churches in the State has lost one of the best men in the State. A man more beloved I have never known. An upright and learned Judge, a most affectionate husband and father, a devoted Christian, he has fallen in the prime of manhood and usefulness. A gray haired father in Israel, standing by his cold form said, I would willingly take his place if it could be done. Why the Father takes from the harvest field the most efficient workers, is not for us to know this side of Heaven.

I cannot close without a word for those hospitable brethren and sisters of Waco. More genial, whole-souled, warm hearted Christians, I never met. May their blessings be commensurate with their kindness.

A. CLARK.

Folly and Sin of Fretting.

A SERMON.

BY REV. THOMAS S. HASTINGS, D. D.

Fret kills a great many more people than *fevers* do and spoils more characters, and darkens more lives than do great sorrows or real sufferings. Most men and some women can nerve themselves to endure a trial that is large enough to rally the higher forces of their nature. But the little insect tortures, the fine, petty provocations, the nettle sharpness of common daily friction—these are the things against which no ordinary fortifications of character will serve to protect. It is easy to keep out *wild beasts*; if one breaks in upon civilization men soon hunt it down and destroy it; but mosquitoes and gnats—these defy us; their littleness is *their* protection and *our* peril: So are we most helpless and most exposed, not before the overshadowing magnitude of the great epochs of sorrow, or of tribulation, but rather before the petty annoyances, and stinging provocations which find their way through the joints of all armor, and mock the inadequacy of all ordinary methods of protection. And then we know, or at least *ought* to know, that these inroads of little things are always likely to make a way for the outbreak of great floods of evil; as when through dyke or dam, a few water drops are pereolating, those little drops are precursors of the overwhelming torrents which will sweep forests, houses and villages to destruction. The favorite maxim of

the economist is substantially this—take care of the little things, and the large ones will take care of themselves—and this we may claim as a wise and pertinent maxim in the broadest application to life and character. It should be remembered too, that these little annoyances make and maintain that friction which is necessary to the polish and finish of character; we may not hope to escape them, then, but must rather learn how to bear them. Sand stone, and all coarse-grained stones men hammer into the ruder forms which serve the commoner purposes; but in the granite and the marble, after the hammer has done its rough work then their finer texture invites the appliance of finer tools, and the most careful and continuous friction, which will bring out the hidden beauties of these noble stones, and endow them with a lustre that shall flash and glitter in the sunlight with enduring glory. So in the texture of all human natures there is a fineness of fibre which invites the finer discipline—not merely the hammer-stroke and chisel cut—but the grit and subtle friction which will bring out in display the grain of the soul, and induce that gloss and lustre which will reflect all beauty and image all glory. I say in all human natures, there is this toughness of texture which invites the finer and higher discipline; but I do not mean to ignore the difference in men, some being stronger and more susceptible of finish than others; I only mean to claim that all human natures are of noble material, and have rich possibilities as being divine in the constitution and conditions of their lives. Let us then convince ourselves as thoroughly as we can that the little consequences which are so provoking, and which do so tend to make us fretful, are not *exceptional* things, but *vital*—things which we must expect. And if we can settle this matter with ourselves we shall gain half the battle, and shall come to think, not of the instruments which chafe us, but rather of the *master-hand* that is wielding those instruments with deftest skill, with subtlest manipulation, and with kindest and most confident purpose. If the marble could and should complain of the sculptor's chisels, fine and sharp, that are fretting and torturing it with such continuous attacks, you would say to it: think not of the chisel, but of the glorious purpose of the artist, with which he is bending over you to honor you with his thought, his genius, his life, and to make you share his glory. So, my friend, if God has quarried your soul out of the depths and darkness of selfishness and sin, you had better patiently submit yourself to the carrying out of his full purpose; let Him do His blessed work in His own blessed way.

But it is so easy and so natural to fret. Natural?—yes, but *easy*?—it is anything but that; it is the hardest, most wearing, killing, thing in the world! *Fretfulness is a disturber of the peace and of happiness; it is a demoralization of power; and it is a declension of faith.* Let me speak for a few moments to these three points, before advancing to other considerations. Concerning the first of these points very little need be said. We all know but too well that fretfulness is always a disturbance of peace and happiness.

In the home it makes the atmosphere heavy and dark, and shuts out the sunshine; in the business sphere, it hinders and mars everything. It matters very little *about what you fret*—whether it be about the servants, the children or the clerks; about *temporalities*, or about *spiritualities*; the result is the same; *your own soul is dark and troubled*, and your clouded countenance only fairly represents your clouded heart as it shadows and chills all about you. You become *the servant of your servants, the victim (not the parent) of your children, and the subordinate of your clerks*; and so you are in bondage—galling bondage in every relation of your life. Fretfulness blinds the eyes alike to the beauties of nature and of grace; it dulls the ear to the manifold music with which to the quickened sense, the air is always tremulous; it hardens the heart to the blessed tuition and the affluent consolation alike of human and of Divine ministries. The tendency always is to settle into a chronic condition, in which peevishness, and discontent, and envy and jealousy, and fear will make happiness impossible. One has need to watch most carefully against the first symptoms of fretfulness; for they develop in such a rapid and subtle way. It is better to *force* a smile than to tolerate a frown. How many homes are ruined, not by quarrels and contentions, but by mere fretfulness. Machinists say there is less wear and friction if in the *'bearings'*, axis and socket are of different metals as brass and iron; certainly this is true in morals, if not in mechanics. If there are *different* natures or op-

posite natures in the home, there is less wear and worry than where both are alike—both are brass, or both are iron. But even under most favorable condition much lubricating patience there must be in the fitting and adjusting of characters in the deeper intimacies of life, whether domestic, social or otherwise! And without this patience there can be no peace.

The second point is, that fretfulness is the *demoralization of power*. The heart must be calm if the hand is to be strong. Fever of soul is more weakening than fever in the blood. The machinery of the spirit wears and wastes force in friction, and grinds itself away if it is heated by fretfulness and anxiety. In any commanding or responsible relation there is nothing like fretfulness to undermine authority and dethrone dignity, and destroying all controlling influence. A master must first maintain the poise and calm of *his own soul* before he can sway other souls. No man can do his best except he have all his faculties cool, and clear and confident. Said a great surgeon to his attendants as he deliberately examined his instruments before beginning a critical operation, "We are too much pressed for time to be in haste!" ANY burden of care or of anxiety will hamper and hinder you in the race of life; you must lay aside all such weights to run well. So Herbert wrote:

"Calmness is great advantage; he that lets Another chafe, may warm him at his fire,
Mark all his wanderings and enjoy his frets."

The care of your own soul is too much for you; you must commit it to Christ, so that you can live without anxiety about the infinite

and the eternal. In your family you cannot train up children well unless you trust them; and in cheerful expectancy *shine* upon them, as the sun shines upon the stars, not only to illumine but to sway and save them. Signs of worry and fretfulness on your face contradict alike your teachings and your prayers; and your children believe *what they see*, more than what they hear; the telegraphic records of the soul upon the countenance are more conclusive and controlling than are the most earnest and measured utterance of the lips. Your children will be what they see and feel you expect them to be!

But let us turn to the third point which needs the greatest emphasis. I said that *fretfulness* is a *declension of faith*. This is the most vital point. Fretfulness is not merely an unhappiness and a weakness, it is a *sin—an atheistic sin*. It is a virtual denial of God in so far as it is a questioning of His providence and His grace. Don't flatter yourself that it is only a modest and humble view of your own inadequacy; even at that it would be a presumptuous putting of self instead of God, or *before God*. It is really a denial of His promises, and attempted dethronement of His Providence. But many Christian people seem to think that worry and anxiety and fretfulness are at most only weaknesses which *hurt them*, and have no special personal significance to God. Nothing could be further from the truth. John Wesley said, "*I dare no more fret than to curse and swear*"! That is strong language, but it is careful and intelligent. Profanity that is covert and

subtle may be only the deeper and more guilty. I suppose we have no right to choose among sins and have our favorites; though we cannot help feeling that some are more offensive than others; some kindle a quicker and deeper dislike than others; and it seems to me that worry and fretfulness must be more profane and more displeasing in the sight of God than any mere words *can* be! You may utter the name of God with utmost reverence, and yet if you so disbelieve His promises, and so doubt His care as to dare to fret and worry as though you were orphaned and Godless, then your revered utterances are overbalanced by your profanity of soul. I think it is time that we see this matter in a clearer light. What is it to you if a man merely *speaks your name* with respect, but distrusts your every promise? How would you value such reverence? But there are too many good people who would recoil with horror from the idea of *cursing or swearing* who yet will worry and fret about a thousand everyday matters concerning which they have the un-failing promise of God. I dislike exceedingly to hear an oath—we all agree about that—but to me *the worst sort of swearing is 'Christian fretting!*

Now if I am right about this common evil, and I believe you all will agree with me, it is of great practical interest to every one of us to know how we may best overcome the tendency to heat and impatience, and maintain the poise and calm of our spirits. And here there are minor, or secondary considerations which shall first be noticed, that the place

of emphasis—the *last* place may be kept for that which is most vital. There is a great deal of value in a resolute will—in a settled determination to look at the bright side of everything, and to *cultivate* (I would emphasize that word), and to CULTIVATE a cheerful courage.

* * * * *

And then there is another of these secondary considerations: Some one has quaintly said that it is best always "to take *long views* in life." Well, the awful vista of immortality—so vast in its reach, seems to demand some such maxim. We make too much of that which is immediate or near; the secondary and remote results are generally the lasting, and the more important. You have present troubles which seem to you very grievous and absorbing. Perhaps you are trying to live with too narrow horizon; you are looking at the things which are "seen and temporal," and not at "the things which are unseen and eternal." Let your thought have inspiration of conscious immortality, and it will be clearer and calmer. You have seen in the country how a great drought awakens alarm, and inspires gloom and apprehension in all hearts; it is sad to see the grains and the grasses almost burning up in the hot, relentless sun; it is sad to see the herds pining for lack of refreshing food; that is the *short view*! What is "the *long view*?" That drought is ridding the earth of its surface moisture, only that the sweet air and the sunshine may enter more deeply, and more fully into the laboratory of the soil, with renewing and enriching influences for those hidden calls in

which the roots of other harvests shall revel and grow; so that the drought and desert of one summer is preparing the paradise and plenty of many successive summers! Well, there are more scorching droughts in the city than ever afflict the country; and they are more necessary and beneficent here than there! But we must take "*long views*," and then we shall not fret, but be patient and wait.

Above all other considerations is that of God. We always have him with us; and He is ever calm and confident, and ready to help us. The great remedy for fretfulness is *trust*. That is very simple, and yet, oh! how hard for such hearts as ours. Throughout this psalm—which contains *three times* repeated, the exhortation which is our text to-day, there are such cases of lofty cheer as just meets the case in "hand," "Trust in the Lord and do good." "Rest in the Lord and wait patiently for Him." "Delight thyself also in the Lord and he shall give thee the desires of thy heart." "Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him, and he shall bring it to pass." But you say these little things which perpetually annoy me are too small for Divine notice and regard. Are they? Is that your idea of God: then, believe me, you do not understand His greatness. The night before last I looked through a microscope at the little centre or heart of a verbena blossom; it was scarcely larger than a pin-head, but how marvellous it was! it seemed interlaced all over with graceful and manifold strings of glowing rubies, countless in number, and each one of them perfect in form

and color, and each one the germ of another plant! And while I looked, a moth alighted on the table; my friend caught it and rubbing a little of the down from its wing let me look at the tiny particles through the powerful instrument. Each particle was a perfect and exquisite feather; too perfect by far for the microscope to resolve and reveal all the details of its beauty. Now my friend, the God who strung those countless rubies for the bosom of the tiny blossom—the God who set those marvellous feathers like dust upon the wing of the moth,—do you, *can* you think that He will ever regard with indifference *even the least microscopic thing* which concerns one of His own children, made in His image, and redeemed by the blood of His dear Son? If you *can* think so, then your God is very different from mine.

Nothing is small that has to do with our peace and progress. If only we would open our hearts to Him—if “in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving” we would “make our requests known unto God,” and then the “peace which passeth all understanding” would “keep our hearts and minds by Christ Jesus.”

And oh! my friends, He who spake to the Gennessareth waves and calmed their tumult, will come to you over the troubled waters of your life, if only you will invite and welcome His coming, and He will give this Divine peace which the world can neither give nor take.—*N. Y. Observer.*

The A. & S. Business.

Once, in the earliest days of Chris-

tianity, the Almighty interposed by miracle and struck two persons dead, the only two from among the people of God, of whom we have any account since the dispensation of Law gave place to that of Grace.

These persons were among the earliest adherents of Christianity, and were interested in the great work that was introduced by the Pentecostal baptism of the Spirit. They had zeal, and were disposed to make sacrifices “for the cause.” They were persons of some means, and were not like many Christians now-a-days, who keep buying more property, and so are always poor, always in debt, and always unable to give more than a mere pittance for the work of God and the necessities of his people. So far from this, they were ready to *sell property*, that they might have money to give away; and they were probably nearer the gospel standard in this respect, than nine tenths of the Christian professors are to-day. They sold a possession, and brought a certain part—doubtless a liberal portion,—and laid it at the apostle’s feet. But they died. The curse of God smote them, and they were carried out from that place to their graves; and their names are left, clothed with infamy, as a warning to the church in all subsequent ages.

What did they do? They sold property, they gave money, but they *wanted more reputation than belonged to them*, and to gain it they gave part of the money, and told part of the truth; just that part that would *flatter their own reputation*; concealed the rest; and tried to put a smooth outside over a sinful heart. Peter said they *lied*, and *lied*, not to men,

but to God. But Peter had a very blunt way of speaking out. Now-a-days, men would say, "There was a slight discrepancy between the statements made by Ananias and Sapphira and the facts in the case."

The Ananias and Sapphira business flourishes still. God does not kill liars now as he did then, and men take courage and tell their smooth stories. Peter is dead, and no one corners them up, and so they keep at it.

Editors who publish just as much truth as will help their reputation and their party, and refuse to correct the falsehoods they have circulated and the misrepresentations they have made; biographers who paint such immaculate saints that their subjects would not know their own lives if they should rise from the dead and read them; preachers who blow their own trumpets, and magnify their great revivals which never happened, or which candid Christian people cannot find; swindlers who fail in business and put their property out of their hands, and pretend that they cannot pay their debts; members of religious societies who transact their affairs by craft and deception; leaders of associations who cloak the villanies of their friends and supporters; rich men who invest their own money where it will draw good interest, and then beg funds of the poor to pay their own salaries and sustain the cause of God; people who say peace, peace when there is no peace, and who compromise truth and endorse hypocrites and rascals who should be rebuked and exposed; these and a thousand others of their kith and kin, who suppose that they

are doing God service, and think themselves exceedingly shrewd,—are they not getting into the Ananias and Sapphira business?

The business seems safer now than it did in Peter's time; so much so that if a man has truth in the inward parts, and tells it out to the world or to the church, he is at once liable to be denounced and set aside as a troubler of Israel, and is, like his Master, "despised and rejected of men." But possibly this seeming security is a delusion and a snare. There is a God of truth, and there is a day of judgment. "And all liars,"—those that make lies, and those that love lies, and would make them if they dared to, and even those who lie by keeping back part of the truth—"shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."

Good friends, if you are going into the Ananias & Sapphira business, please add into your reckoning not only the present profits, but also the "lake of fire," and then ask, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"—*Selected.*

Co operation—Concluded.

Elder D. Lipscomb: My dear Brother: Permit me the favor of a little space on the pages of the *ADVOCATE* to conclude my response to your review of my proposition to the brotherhood of Tennessee, to assemble in convention and consult together in reference to having the gospel proclaimed throughout the three divisions of Tennessee, East, West, Middle, as also, the State as a whole. Now observe distinctly this is defi-

nately my proposition. After speaking of the necessity and importance of this work, GOSPEL ADVOCATE, No. 20. p. 469, 70, my proposition is couched in the following terms: 'I therefore respectfully, and deferentially move, God willing, that we call a convention of the brotherhood of the whole State, looking to such a co operative effect.'" And tho' my good brother Lipscomb has arraigned and vigorously persecuted me, before the readers of the Advocate for introducing, 'formulating, unscriptural plans and themes,' embodying 'high sounding titles, functions, dignitaries, unknown to God's word;' and tho' his arguments have been full, long, elaborate, on these points; yet, he has only been 'beating the air;' fighting a man of his own imagination; for he is so awfully alarmed at 'plans' that he finds their ghosts in every avenue he travels; at every corner he turns. They haunt him by day, and at night, like a frightful 'night mare,' they press heavily upon him. I re-assert, his 'plans,' 'schemes,' 'functions,' 'high sounding titles' and dignitaries, are not found in my proposition, either expressed or implied; and I may add, nor were they in my head or heart when I penned it. And when my good, charitable brother was urged to produce the evidence of their existence, the nearest he could approximate the proof, was, to tell us, that unlike the first essays of a little girl to draw the picture of a horse, fearing it would not be known what she intended, she wrote under it, 'This is a horse;' my brother thinks, I drew my picture so skilfully, that unlike the little girl, I did not have to insert underneath it,

'This is a plan, all pregnant with high sounding titles, functions, dignitaries, all of Babylonish extract; possessing the wonderful merit of inducing some preachers, to high places of honor, and a sure passport to others to starvation and the poor houses.' Surely this must be the bull with ten, if not a hundred horns. I am not surprised that his warning voice should be raised in trumpet tones against him. I again assert, there is no such plan against which my brother is so bravely battling, contained in my proposition, expressed or implied; nor was there in my mind when I indited it. I hope this will satisfy him, unless perchance, he is more incredulous than Thomas, surnamed Dydimus. My purpose was as expressed by the proposition, that the brethren should come together, consult together, co-operate together, to have the gospel more effectually preached, not only in the three divisions of the State, but throughout the whole State. And if I did not fear my good brother would wax warm, and say that I was insinuating that he and his Tennessee brethren were opposed to this,—I would again say, this is the issue fairly and squarely made out, by my proposition; and that is what I am discussing; and not some of my brother's imaginary propositions. And I would, gain, in all respect and kindness, ask my Tennessee brotherhood, Is it right or is it wrong? If wrong, let it be 'still-born,' and find an early tomb. But if right and you are convinced of it, then like one man, come up to Murfreesboro, Friday, before the second Sunday, October next, and with the fear of God before us, and guided by the

light of his divine word, in love, peace and harmony, let us consult like brethren in the Lord, in regard to the interest of the Master's cause, in and out of our State.

But my brother has acknowledged and endorsed all that is expressed or implied in my proposition, and all for which I have contended; and that is, that we should all co-operate together, in sending out the glad tidings of salvation. It is true, he applies to me the critic's lash; and he is mighty on criticism; in regard to the Scriptures I quoted, Rom. x. and ii. Cor. vi., to sustain myself, in my position. On Rom. x. he says it refers to God calling and sending the Apostles; and if I will read it in the original, I will never quote it in such connection again. I have read it in the original, and find nothing there; nothing in its connection; nothing in the apostle's design, to justify him in his restriction. "How shall they hear without a preacher;" *kossassoontooa a kerux*; a proclaimer; not an *apostolos*; an apostle. I quoted it as divine authority, for sending out heralds to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation. Nor did I deny that ii. Cor. vi. referred to the Apostles. I quoted it to show co-operation was likewise endorsed by God's word.

I would ask my brother, are there any apostles now alive to send out? any to co-operate in this work? Then who is to be sent out, but the preachers? Who is to co-operate in this work but the disciples; the churches? But as he admits all this, what need have we of further testimony?

There are some other matters of

smaller moment, that might be attended to, if your readers had not already had a sufficiency; for instance, when I corrected a little mistake into which he chanced to fall, when he spoke of Bro. Cutler being my successor in office; and in regard to which he charged me, with 'quibbling,' "To quibble about these names, seems to us the veriest trifling." If my charitable brother, will compare the State Board of Virginia for 1873 and 1874, he will find Bro. Cutler occupying the same position for both years, that of corresponding Secretary: the only difference in the constitution of the board being, my name is there, as State evangelist for 1873, which position I had occupied for about 25 years; but is not there for 1874. Pray, how does that make Bro. Cutler my successor in office? and where is the ground for my kind brother charging me with 'quibbling in the veriest trifling.' It might be well for him to reflect upon the Roman maxim, '*Suarito in modo; fortitu in re,*' both in this as well as a few other points of his review, *verbum sapienti satis est.*

But in conclusion:—while my brother has utterly failed to show any plan, expressed or implied in my proposition; and while he has fully endorsed all contained in it, (and why oppose it?) yet, (if my brother will not wax warm when I say it,) he is even ahead of me on the 'plan question'; he has a plan; he has expressed it more than once, and that in such clear characters, it would have truly been a work of supererogation, like his little juvenile painter, to have underscored it with 'This is the Horse.' But to the proof. Gospel Advocate, No. 29, p. 679.

"We repeat" (and he had given it before) "if there is a brother in the State or out of it, whose heart is in the work, and his own and the congregations who know him judge him suited for the work, who is so earnest as to improve what opportunities he has for doing good, but is debarred for lack of sustenance, the privilege of telling sinners the way of truth and life, we are certainly willing to do all in our power to enable him to go to the poor and humble and sinful to teach them the way of salvation. If he is a member of a congregation able to assist him, we will try to induce them to do it. We will not wrong them nor violate the relationships of God's family by taking him out of his proper connection with that church, and assigning him a position unknown to the church of God. If his own congregation is unable to render him proper assistance, let others who know him, and who are naturally connected with him, and them by proximity and spiritual relations, arising from labors in their midst, assist. This is Scriptural, it is sensible, it is practical. It creates no new office or function. Farther than Bible authority we dare not go." Now, with no 'quibbling' but in all godly sincerity, I ask brother Lipscomb; I ask the readers of the Advocate, is it necessary to write under this, 'This is a plan'? And as brother Lipscomb is the author of it, is it quibbling to christen it, 'Brother Lipscomb's plan,' formulated by himself and pronounced 'scriptural, sensible, practical:' and what more, or better could we ask?

Affectionately and fraternally,

G. W. ABELL.

Kosassontooos means a first or original proclaimer or announcer of a truth. It does not refer to a teacher of a truth that has once been proclaimed or announced. A different word is used when that character is presented. This preacher of Paul must be him who bears the testimony on which faith rests. Of what preacher of the present day, can this be said? No one could believe without God's preacher as here referred to. No preacher of the present day is essential to faith. The preacher spoken of by Paul came with credentials from Almighty God on which he demanded faith. He was sent directly by God. None at this day can assume such character without sacrilege. There is no reference in the connection to the church sending. To apply Scriptures as God did not apply them is to introduce and give license to the loose handling of Scripture, that has wrought so great confusion in the religious world. It is wrong to misapply a Scripture even to maintain a truth.

It matters not what the office was called. A State Secretary is just as Scriptural as a State Evangelist. The names, the number, the character of these unscriptural functionaries are nothing. The right to make any is the wrong. It is trifling to stop in the investigation of a question of this kind to engage in mere quibbles (I know of no other word that expresses) about whether it is an office of precisely the same name or work or not. We care nothing as to what you call the office or what it is for. It is the authority or right to establish any office, that we deny.

If Bro. Abel will look and see that

the churches sent messengers, sent Paul and Barnabas, as the Spirit directed, sounded out the word of God, and the church at Philippi and others which Paul had planted, and taught, he will find that the manner of work suggested does not rest on Bro. Lipscomb for authority, was not formulated by him, and hence should not be called Bro. Lipscomb's Plan. It is a way in which the Gospel was taught in Paul's day. Bro. Abel's is still a plan that has no Divine warrant. It involves a delegated body such as is unknown to the Scriptures, and functions and functionaries not provided for in the kingdom of God. It is not necessary to spread the truth.

D. L.

Marriage with Unbelievers.

Brethren L. & S.: On page 450 of the *ADVOCATE*, present volume, in answer to a query by "A Christian" on 1st Cor. vii: 39, you say, "We can see no reason in the world why it does not embrace unmarried women, just the same as widows. We think also, that the same principle applies to widowers and young men. Christians, in our judgment, should always marry Christians when they marry at all. This is certainly the principle taught by Paul in the above passage." Again, on page 472, in answer to E. J. Hinely, you say plainly, "Christians are certainly not permitted to marry unbelievers."

While we think it generally advisable that Christians should not marry unbelievers, and especially under such circumstances as surrounded these Corinthian brethren when Paul

wrote to them, (see the entire chapter.) still we are not quite ready to receive your statement, that they are never permitted to marry unbelievers. But you have set us to thinking about it, and we wish to hear a little more.

1. If your conclusion be true, does it not follow that the marriage of Christians is an institution of the church, distinct from that of the human family in general, which God established in the beginning? If so, give chapter and verse where the Savior or his Apostles instituted it.

2. If so, should Christians go to the civil authorities to obtain license to marry any more than they should to obtain permission to preach, to eat the Lord's supper, or to do any other work of the church?

3. I once had a conversation with a brother who contended that a Christian should have nothing whatever to do with civil governments. He said he would not solemnize the rites of matrimony between two unbelievers. The thought never entered his head, that to follow out the principle, only the church could issue marriage license to believers. I thought him far on the extreme; but, according to your idea, was he not about right?

4. If Christians are never permitted to marry unbelievers, are not all such cases, (and there have been thousands of them since Paul wrote,) simply cases of adultery?

Your brother in search of truth,

L. C. WELLS.

Richmond, Ky., July 27, 1874.

Marriage is a relationship which God ordained at the beginning, and is the same yet, that it was then, and

is still divine, and should be regulated by the word of God. He has regulated this matter by his word, in every dispensation. Marriage is no human institution. Human governments have enacted many laws regarding its regulation, some in harmony with the laws of God, and some not. The government under which we live, requires that those who marry, take out license, and that some one that they recognize shall execute the same. And we think that as Christians, we are under obligations to submit to these ordinances of man, as they in nowise, that we can see, conflict with the laws of God on the subject. But the procuring of license, and having a ceremony performed over them, is a mere form of human arrangement, that did not belong to the institution originally. A simple agreement on the part of those to be married, and their parents, and then a sort of public wedding feast, was the general order among the Jews. And as to the truth that the recognized people of God should always marry together, we have abundant evidence in the Bible. First: Adam and Eve were the children of God by direct creation. Secondly; when God called and separated the Jewish people from all other nations, he forbade them to intermarry with any other people. And whenever they did so, it was a transgression of his law. So also we are satisfied that when Christians marry, they are under obligations to marry Christians. This obligation is certainly as sacred under Christianity, as it was under the law of Moses. When the Jews had been off in captivity for some time, and

had married strange wives, they were required to put them away when they returned to their own land again. All this shows how sacredly the laws of God were held on this subject in those days. See Ezra. And the apostle has certainly expressed the matter in very strong terms, when he says of the widow, "she is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord." It is therefore according to the Bible for Christians to marry Christians. And besides being the law of God that we should do this, it is necessary in order to a full enjoyment of the religion of Jesus as companions together in life. We do not pretend to say that Christians commit an unpardonable sin in marrying unbelievers; but that they violate a command of God in so doing, we think admits not of a doubt. Nor do we claim that such marriages vitiate the marriage bond, so as to make those who do thus, adulterers. Not at all. But we do claim that those who marry unbelievers, go contrary to the word of God, and that they often destroy their religious enjoyment thereby. And it should be the earnest effort and aim of Christians, to see how near they can come doing all the commands of God, and not try to see how far they can depart from them, and not be condemned for it. All unrighteousness is sin, but not every sin is unpardonable. But Christians should ever strive to see how far they can keep from the entanglements of sin in every possible shape and form.

E. G. S.

Church News.

Embracing the fourth Lords day of July, a meeting was held with the congregation at Owens Chapel, Williamson County, Tenn. The meeting was begun by brother James E. Soobey, of Murfreesboro, and the preaching done by him till Lord's day night, much to the satisfaction and edification of the brethren, and the instruction of friends. We began preaching Monday, and continued the meeting until Thursday night. Bro. J. D. Eichbaum was present all the time, aiding by his presence, his earnest and devotional prayers, and by exhortation in public and in private. The immediate results of the meeting, were thirteen additions; twelve by confession and baptism, and one who had been immersed by the Baptists. The brethren were much encouraged, and the best hearing from the surrounding community that we have ever met with at that place; and we are satisfied that much good was done beyond the number of additions. We lived with this congregation some eight or ten years, and we were much rejoiced atso pleasant and interesting interview with those brethren, and in receiving our old friends and neighbors into the congregation with the children of God at that place. We hope those brethren will still labor earnestly for the advancement of their Master's cause.

Embracing the first Lord's day of August we held a meeting of a few days at Woodburn Ky. and were aided and encouraged by the presence of many of the brethren and sisters from Franklin, who rendered

much aid in singing, and also by the brethren and sisters from Locust Grove, who seem fully alive to the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom; and also by the presence and prayers of Bro. B. F. Rogers, of Rich Pond. The meeting was truly a pleasant one, and four of the good citizens of that community were immersed, as the immediate results of the meeting. We think that whole section of Southern Kentucky a good field for evangelical labor. But more laborers who understand and love the truth are needed there.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S.: Yours of the 10th inst. containing money order for forty-six dollars was received by my family several days since, and should have been acknowledged sooner, but for my absence from home. I am truly grateful for the timely assistance it will afford me, and I hope it may be the means of accomplishing something for the Masters cause. It will enable me to devote much more time to preaching this fall than I could have done otherwise. I can now hire labor in my farm, and go and preach Christ to the people. I have just returned from a meeting at Pine Apple, where I went to assist Bro. Adams. Bro. T. B. Lawson of Marion, Ala. was with us in the meeting and did noble service for our King. The result up to Thursday morning when I was compelled to leave, was seventeen added to the faithful. I left Bro. Lawson still at work and hopeful of accom-

plisking still more in the glorious cause.

Again assuring you of my gratitude, I remain,

Yours in hope of eternal life,

N. B. SHAW.

*Bell's Landing, Monroe Co. Ala.
July 31st. 1874.*

Brethoen L. & S.: We have just closed quite an interesting meeting at this place, held by our young and devoted bro. George A. Reynolds from Colliersville. The meeting commenced on the 4th Lord's day ult., and continued one week with increasing interest to the close. The result is twelve accessions to the congregation among whom were two from the Cumberland Presbyterians and one from the Baptist. Bro. R. bids fair to become a very successful laborer in the 'field Evangelical.' In discourse his stand-points are well-selected and his arguments drawn with a force and clearness that carries conviction to the minds of his hearers. May he long live to bear the message of salvation to the lost.

In faith, hope and love,

W. LEE TOMSON.

*New Hope, Hardeman Co., Tenn.,
August 4th, 1874.*

Lines to the Memory of Eld. T. Fanning.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: You perhaps remember Margaret S. Fanning (widow.) I came to Franklin College in 1850, bringing my four orphan children for the purpose of educating them, under the care of their uncle, T. Fanning. For some five years, we enjoyed the kind and fatherly protection of my more than brother. To say that his honored name is enshri

ned in our hearts, as a grateful and ever-living memory, is but a true expression of our feelings. The news of his departure fell heavily upon us.

A deep, and saddening sound awoke,
The slumbering midnight air,
Through forest depths, the echo broke,
And mourning deep is there—
A mighty Oak, is lying low,
The forest trembles, 'neath the blow.

A vacant post on Zion's wall,
No other form may fill
A watch-man gone, whose warning voice
Was heard from hill to hill,
A soldier, tried and true, and brave
Now sleeps, but fills a victor's grave!

Dear Zion mourns, a leader gone,
A chieftain, faithful, true,
A vigilant, whose watchful eye
Kept every post in view,
The wily foe,—the danger nigh,
Still met his ever sleepless eye.

He fought, still near his captains side,
And kept his armor bright,
And firmly held the "blood-stained" flag
Amidst the thickest fight,
His clarion voice, with trumpet tone,
Still sounded, "Honor God Alone."

No title'd honors, did he boast.
His power, was, "Truth Divine"
The "two-edged sword" his conquering host
The "Cross" his only shrine—
His victory's banner floating wide,
Be re only this, "the crucified."

The trembling hosts of Babel fled,
Before the "two-edged blade"
As on, and onward still he sped,
And all its power display'd
The Law of Heaven, his battle cry,
On, soldiers on, to victory!

While loving-laurels, wreath'd his brow,
And shouts of victory came,
He calmly laid his armor by,
And bless'd his captain's name—
That name, so dear in life, in death
He honored with his dying breath.

Now folded on his peaceful breast,
Those active hands lie still,
And weeping friends are waiting now,
Sad duties to fulfil,
One true, deep mourner, lingers there,
No other heart, her grief may share.

We bow, and bless, thy cherished name
O, dear departed one!

And gratefully remember all
Thy loving heart has done,
The orphans tears, for thee shall flow
Their dearest, truest friend below,

But never, never shall we hear
Thy blessed voice again,
To higher notes, in brighter sphere,
'Twill strike a loftier strain,
And still thy works will follow thee
And ages tell of victory,

Our mourning hearts would say Farewell,
And drop a grateful tear,
Eternity alone may tell
Thy glorious record here,
Thy crown, in that bright land afar,
Shall shine, with many a brilliant star.

MRS. M. S. FANNING.

LONE STAR, TEXAS.

Obituaries.

Death has borne from the midst of his devoted and weeping family another John Driskill. He died in the triumphs of faith, of Bronchitis on the 23rd of July, 1874, in the 66th year of his age. Early in life he united with the disciples of Christ in Union Co., was immersed by Bro. Scarbaugh and removed to Grimes Co. Texas, where he lived a consistent Christian up to the time of his death. He leaves a wife and large family of children, that sensibly feel their loss. Weep not dear sister, and children, as those who have no hope, the Lord will take his people home.

J. M.

Prairie Plains Texas.

Died of Consumption, June 23rd 1874, in the 29th year of her age, Sister N. E. Hill, sister in the flesh and in the Lord, at her home in Wilson County Tenn.

She was the daughter of John G. and Elizabeth Ligon, and consort of T. A. Hill. She has gone to meet with three little babes father and sister who preceded but a few years, her babe having died some five or six months before her. In her death she has said that the "Christian religion will do to die with" a thing doubted by some. She was a member of the Silver Spring Congregation, from her conversion to her death. She was perfectly aware of the approach of death, and rejoiced to meet his embrace. I shall never forget the exhortations of her last hours, so full of love and so earnest, that fell from that broken harpstring "Glory."

Quietly she sleeps in the narrow Tomb
Her Spirit in the Glory land,
She is now free from all sorrow and gloom
United with the heavenly band.

W. F. T.

CARE OF NEW JONVERTS.

BY THE REV. L. F. VANCLAVE.

When a person has become a member of the church, whose former life had been given to vice and indifference, he is like an emigrant to a strange country. It might be comparatively easy to persuade a multitude to embark for a more fertile land and salubrious climate, under a model government, by such glowing descriptions as should be just and truthful. But the debrakation would make them sensible in a moment that they were strangers, and needed a guiding and friendly hand, for the lack of which they would be left to become a prey to discouragement and to dishonest and selfish people, until they would be tempted to return to the familiar poverty and hardships of their former estate. To protect and instruct them in the duties and opportunities of their new home would be as great a favor as that which acquainted them with its existence and its great advantages. Not less important is it to train the newly-converted Christian in the peculiar duties and privileges of his new spiritual home. He must be fully impressed with the fact that due and appropriate work is absolutely necessary if he would secure the coveted harvest. He has entered upon a life of activeness, perhaps hardships and self-denial, and not upon the drowsy repose of an idler. As the foreigner assimilates into the organic unity of his adopted country, so should the new convert hasten to become essentially and completely an integral part of the Church of Christ

not only to its benefits, but to bear its burdens and perform its work. A "young convert's prayer-meeting" may be well for a time, but it should soon merge into the whole church, and every such distinction be speedily broken down and forgotten; and prayer meetings ought to be held even more strictly amenable to this rule. Contributions for current expenses and for benevolent objects should not be neglected any more than the Government excuses the immigrant from his just tax for its support. The stability of newly-converted persons depends very greatly upon the guidance given their newly-consecrated powers by pastors, leaders, and others. It is always unfortunate when the preacher under whose ministry many persons are added to the church, finds it necessary to take a short vacation after his revival meetings close, and little less than disastrous for him to be too soon removed.

It is for this reason that special evangelists or revivalists often leave behind them such a paucity of permanent benefits, and why so many do not remain steadfast and become useful and reliable members of the church. Their temptations are often quite new and unexpected; they go about their tasks awkwardly—feel chagrined at their failures, and perish for lack of some guiding hand that they feel willing to trust. The books and periodicals of the church should be put in their hands; they should be introduced to the class-meeting, prayer-meeting, Sabbath-school, and to the social sympathy and society of both pastor and people. The large per cent. of our probation-

ers who are not received into full connection, and the many who are, and should not be, could be very materially lessened if pastors, leaders, and members would give themselves conscientiously to the proper care of the young converts. The large gatherings of the past winter have laid a very heavy and interesting burden upon the Church, which it will be as glorious to bear properly as it was to assume at first.

Let the lessons on doctrine be practical, and those on duty doctrinal and in every instance avoid questions and controversies; for even the most experienced and learned have inflamed their logic by borrowing from the fires that warmed their love.
—*Methodist.*

No Success Without Industry.

I really believe, young friends, that idleness is the ground of most vice. I am acquainted with certain young men who are are running about the streets, whom I see stepping out of drinking saloons. Some of them are sons of reputable parents. I remember last summer meeting a young man, one of the best dressed in the city—a young man whom I met in the omnibus frequently riding up and down, and I had seen him so often and always with such a leisure air, that I said one day, calling him by name,

"What are you doing?"

"I havn't any particular business," said he.

"Well, havn't you anything to do?"

"Nothing in particular," he answered.

It was somewhat impertinent, but I said,

"Well, I suppose now you are out of school, you mean to get into something pretty soon?"

"Well, I have not anything just now in view," he replied.

To make a long story short, the poor fellow has not anything in view, never did have much of anything in view, and never will have much of anything in view. Drifting, drifting, drifting! Down, down, down! He is not the boy he was when I conversed with him last summer. There is nothing truer, though trite, than the adage, "An idle brain is the devil's workshop." Unless there is an aim, a plan, a purpose in a man, there is depravity, an appetite, and lust and passion. It is idleness that fills our jails and our prisons. It is idleness that rolls up millions and millions of dollars for spirituous liquors every year.

Industry, my young friends, is the law of success. Some one asked a man who was counted a great genius, to define genius, and he said, "Genius is industry." Things never come about of themselves. The man who writes a great book, never wrote it in a day or a week. The man who has reported a great invention did not combine wheel and piston in an hour, or a month. but it was the industry of inquiry, the industry of application. Industry is the first law of success.—*Chicago Post.*

Christ the Great Need

What dying men need, is a Divine Savior. The doctrine of the atonement is only of value as it exhibits

the Divine Atoner. It is not the doctrine which saves, but the omnipotent and loving Being who laid down His life for us. Thousands believe in the doctrine, who never believe on the Redeemer. The most splendid preaching is a splendid failure if it fails to point and to press every guilty, hungry, suffering soul right up to the Lamb of God as a personal Savior. That pulpit, that Sabbath-school teacher, and that volume, which God will honor with richest success, is the pulpit, the teacher, or the book which presents "no man save Jesus only."

Here is a clue to the best method of dealing with awakened hearts. We are too prone to direct an inquirer to attend a prayer-meeting, or to read some pungent book or tract, or to go and listen to some arousing preacher. All this is but offering a thirsty man a silver cup when he is dying for the water itself.—*Dr. Cuyler.*

Every true minister should preach as if he felt that, although the congregation own the meeting house, and have bought the pews, they have not, and can not, buy him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

A Sermon on Repentance.....	743
Waco State Meeting.....	749
Folly and Sin of Fretting.....	750
The A. & S. Business.....	755
Co-operation--Concluded	753
Marriage with Unbelievers.....	760
Church News.....	762
Line to the Memory of Eld. T. Fanning	763
Obituaries.....	764
Care of New Converts.....	664
No Success without Industry.....	765
Christ the Great Need.....	766

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 33.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, AUGUST 20, 1874.

A Trip to West Tennessee.

On the last day of July we left home for a visit with the congregation at Roan's Creek, in Huntingdon County, West Tenn. The meeting house of this congregation is near Clarksburg, and about twelve miles south of Huntingdon, the county seat of Carroll County. This is one of the oldest churches in West Tenn. It is also one of the most numerous in membership. It numbers over 250 members; if I remember right.

It is a good congregation in many respects. We heard a sister say, she had been a member of the church for twenty-five years, and they had never had a difficulty in the church that gave them any serious trouble. This is doubtless owing greatly to two causes. The people generally are a simple, unpretending class of people, without much worldly pride or ambition. They have never been corrupted by a great amount of wealth, nor has it suffered with extreme poverty. These two, great wealth in some, and extreme poverty, in others, usually go

hand in hand. Both are curses to a community. This genders discontent, envy, bitterness, begets a feeling of despair, and ends often in a reckless surrender of self-respect and regard for right. The other often begets pride, self-will, haughtiness, an overbearing, self-willed disposition, that creates disturbance and ill-will in a community. It leads to a desire of display, false, gaudy show, a copying after foolish and corrupting fashions of dress and living. These corruptions not only effect the wealthy and their families, but they are contagious. They affect the poorer classes. They inspire them with a love of display and anxiety to appear like the rich. The poor abuse the rich for their pride, and try to do just like them. This affectation of riches, this effort to dress like the rich, to dress in the fashion, and make the display of the rich is a much greater sin in the poor than in the rich.

It corrupts the hearts of the rich by its subtle and seductive influences, fills their hearts with pride and ambition, a selfish love of admiration that drives out all love for God and man.

But there is more than a double crime with those without greater wealth, attempting these things. The same corrupting influence come from the indulgence in the love of fashion and display. Then come the struggles, the strains to obtain the means, the going in debt, harassment and troubles and temptations of debt, often ending in dishonesty and want. We often see families deny themselves the ordinary comforts of life, live hard and pinched at home, for the sake of a few empty gewgaws with which to make a false and hypocritical show in the world. This is a great folly and crime. The rich sin in their display. The poor sin doubly in trying to ape the rich, and appear rich when they are not. They make themselves hypocrites and bring other untold evils. Happy is the community which is cursed with neither the rich nor the extreme poor.

This neighborhood was the birthplace, and this church the nursing-mother, of brother James Holmes who did more in spreading the truth and in building up the Church of God in West Tenn. than any other man. It always does us good to hear what a kindly remembrance all cherish of him. He was a good man certainly. The remembrance of him lives long and kindly in the hearts of those who knew him. He was not a man of uncommon talents, he had no learning, other than he caught in the commonest of common schools, at intervals of attendance, spared from labors which a lack of wealth imposed. Yet he worked earnestly and faithfully, God blessed his labors, they live in strength and vigor after him, and will survive with increasing power

when his name is forgotten on earth. The remembrance will be kept above. This ought to encourage all to work. The man that will not work, that is waiting and complaining because he has not the school advantage of others is not half in earnest. He needs to have his soul and heart stirred with the love and fear of God and a true fellowship for man in his sufferings and his woes. He needs heart and soul culture much more than scholastic education.

We heard while in his neighborhood, of the death of one of the intimate associates of his youth who had given himself to the making of money and managing it. He had succeeded, had amassed great wealth. Knew the advantages, the trials, the troubles of great wealth. Before he died, he is reported as contrasting his life with Holmes. Holmes had never acquired wealth, lived comfortably with little property, enjoyed life, did good to his fellowmen, and honored his God here. He died loved and respected by all who knew him, and enjoyed bright prospects of a happy home beyond the grave.

This man of wealth and worldly goods, bore testimony to the better choice of Bro. Holmes, stated that he had lived a happier man here, and had much better hope of happiness hereafter. He regretted his choice, for he proved how empty are wealth and position, and worldly honor and fame, of true happiness. The community and church at Roan's Creek are blessed in a freedom from a great number of very rich persons and we hope in an exemption from a very great anxiety for wealth. Great anxiety for wealth is as corrupting as the possession.

The church at Roan's Creek is watched over by Bros. Wilson and Fourt. They both have passed their threescore and ten, but are fine specimens of kindly hearted, hopeful, joyful Christians, looking cheerily forward to the change that must speedily come to all the living.

Bro. T. E. Scott, a young man, but with several years experience as a teacher, prudent, cautious, faithful with confidence in God, in his word and the appointments of that word, is located here. He labors with the brethren here, and in the surrounding country and is doing good. We were sorry to find him suffering intensely from dyspepsia.

Bro. John Johnson, a modest, unassuming brother, of good report of all, and of fine promise, lives here, and is now laboring here, and in the surrounding country, in word and doctrine. We hope much of good from the labors of these brethren.

The Roan's Creek Church not only has a large membership now, but she has sent out many colonies, some around her, at Christ an Chapel and Huntingdon and other points not now remembered, others further West. The congregations here were large, too large. Even during the week, they were larger than we liked to address. It required too much of a strain upon the voice.

The brethren here adopt the sensible plan for country churches of having no night meetings. They carry food upon the ground, have two discourses with refreshment between. Up to the war they held a Camp-meeting yearly.

We have spoken of the good things of the community and it is just to

speaking of the evils. The evils of the church, as we could learn them were the lack of appreciation of the worship, both at home and in the weekly meeting. The members are not prompt as they should be in attending the Lord's day worship. When they come to it, too few of them take part openly in the worship. The worship is left too much to be done by the elders.

In the public congregations, the people are not as orderly as they should be. There is too much restless stirring about. As far as we observed, this was worse among the women than the men. We do not refer to the necessary disturbance made by the babies. This will occur. We had much rather bear the disturbance that these cause than that the mothers should be absent from the meeting. We wish to see the mothers there with their babies and little children too. If they cry a little, we will all bear with it for the mother's sake. But we observed, the young women and girls were disposed to run out and in, to frequently go for a drink of water &c. This is all unnecessary, and is the result simply of habits and bad training. Any one in good health can sit quietly during the length of even a long discourse without suffering if they just get in the habit of it. The restless fidgetiness that prevents is the result of bad training. It is an indication of ill breeding.

On our return we found Bro. W. E. Hall at Huntingdon. He is an earnest, active zealous brother. The congregation at Huntingdon is small. The great majority of the members are poor. They have com-

menced the foundation of a good-sized brick house for worship. They are involving themselves in debt very considerably. We believe this is wrong. It often works untold evil to a congregation. We had better live in simple houses, pay our debts and owe no man anything but love. We think it still more important that the churches do the same things. A church owing money to the world, or any portion of the world and failing to pay it, is not in condition to reprove the world for sin or benefit the world. It destroys its power for good with the world.

Bro. Hall tells us he is the author of the extract we made from the *Christian Examiner* concerning the Jackson meeting, in which was reference to the Nashville and Louisville Plan. He disavows any intention of intimating or insinuating that we had a plan at Nashville, or that there is anything properly called a Nashville Plan. But only intended to say there was no discussion of plans of any kind. He thinks we did him injustice in attributing to him a design of that kind, and in so criticising it. We are certain that others interpreted it just as we did. The chief object in its being noticed in the two papers in which we saw a notice of it, was to show a large body of brethren in Tenn., thought we at Nashville had a plan formulated by ourselves as the Louisville Plan was, by the brethren who met at Louisville to adopt it, and they stand upon the same footing. While we think that style of speaking of the matter does us a grievous wrong, we certainly accept Bro. Hall's explanations and gladly acquit him of all intentional blame

in the matter. And of course would apply to him none of the expressions of blame made against the author of the article in our review of it. We have never yet seen a report of the proceedings of the Jackson meeting.

Bro. Hall is succeeding in building up the cause in Huntingdon, Trezevant and other places. He had closed a meeting at Trezevant, the week before we saw him, with 25 or 30 additions to the church.

We found the drouth that is so heavily resting upon our section of country extending to the country we visited, with small exceptions. In the neighborhood of Clarksburg the crops looked well. Elsewhere that we saw, and as we learned lower down in West Tenn., it was much as it is with us. We have hitherto not soken of the drouth that oppressively hangs over us here. The prospect for food for man and beast is more gloomy than we ever saw in this country. Since the 1st Sunday in May, excepting once and it a light shower, enough rain has not fallen at once to wet a man in his shirt sleeves at our residence eight miles west of Nashville. The cracks in the ground have not been closed or filled since first coming. We have scarcely had a mess of vegetables except a few early potatoes during the season. The hay crops were parched up and scarcely paid for mowing. Many were not mowed. Much of the corn planted will not mature a bushel to the acre. Some deep soils well broken, and well cultivated, surprise every one with the amount produced. Our wheat crops were good. This we think is the

condition of much of Middle Tenn. It is now, Aug. 11th, dry and hot, with hot, sultry, parching wind, that prevents the sowing of Turnips, or the growth of grass for stock. The pastures are as bare as midwinter and stock need feed. Greater or less of suffering must come in this the most fruitful and productive country we know. We have often thought it possessed more resources of supply and recuperation than any country we ever saw. But now it needs thoughtful economy and a kindly liberal dealing on the part of those possessing goods to prevent much of suffering among the indigent and thriftless. Persons too often become discouraged and distrustful of providence and hoard more than is proper lest they should suffer in times like these. A wise economy and trustful faith in God's mercy, together with a well directed liberality and sympathy for others in giving employment to the needy will help and bless all.

D. L.

(From the New York Observer.)

LESSON FOR THE DAY.

SUGGESTED BY THE TOPIC OF THE HOUR.

It is doubtless known to the most distant and secluded of our American readers that the religious and irreligious community in New York and Brooklyn, and the country generally, is just now agitated by an inquiry into the moral character of the most conspicuous preacher of the age. Reserving all expression of opinion on the merits of the case for another time, we have a serious sermon to

deliver, at least a great inference to draw, in the midst of the melancholy proceedings.

The relations into which a pastor is brought with members of his flock, and the power he possesses when he has inspired them with strong personal affection for him as a man, place him in circumstances demanding the utmost circumspection and discretion. The Romish confessional is a sink of iniquity; the proposal to introduce an imitation of it into a branch of the Christian church is an abomination, and the establishment of such relations between a pastor and his flock as shall secure for him that intimacy which ought to exist only in the domestic circle, is an evil of fearful tendency and unspeakable danger. Ministers are censurable in a high degree who encourage their people, men or women, to come to them with family matters or secret sores. Some men are themselves gossips, and delight to get and give all they can of social news, and the more secret, the richer the prize. They encourage revelations when their ears should be deaf to everything approaching to scandal. All judicious pastors discourage familiarity on the part of their people, especially of the female denomination.

For this way lies the danger. A silly woman, pious perhaps, but very soft and shallow, hears the stirring words of her eloquent pastor; is roused, warmed, scathed, exalted—she thinks *edified*—and straightway she believes him to be the man sent to do her good. She goes to his study to tell him so; how much enjoyment she finds in his words; or she writes him a letter and pours out

her little soul-full of twaddle about her gratitude for what her dear pastor has done for her; how she "is lifted up" by his instructions; how she loves him as a friend given to be her guide and comfort, and so on, and so on, more and worse, running into a rawkish sentimentality, a sickening man-worship, disgusting to every sensible person, but very nectar to a vain, worldly preacher, who seeks only to make his hearers "feel good." Such people never go to their pastor to ask "what they must do to be saved?" It is to tell him how good they feel; how he is "exalting" them, "filling them with joy, peace and love." We cannot go into particulars without offending the tastes of every reader. We make our meaning plain. We wish to be understood as saying that what worldly preachers and sentimental women call "communion of soul" and "kindred spirits," "mutual help" and "holy sympathy," and words in the same strain, is not religion—it is not even religious. It is of the earth, earthy. It is "carnal conceived in sin." It is simply the lower nature, the human passion of one creature toward another. God is not in it. God never led a man or a woman to desire forbidden fruit. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; every man, when he is tempted, is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then lust, when it hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." It is in immediate connection with these divine teachings that the inspired writer goes on to say: "Wherefore lay aside all filthiness and superfluity

of naughtiness and receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save your souls."

These are the truths that underlie all moral character. They condemn everything that is earthly and sensual, and forbid the delusion that sinful passion has a divine origin. It is a travesty of the gospel to hold that this "yearning after an affinity" which sacrifices the obligation of society, family and honor, is anything even akin to love. It is an insult to every pure emotion that human or divine nature ever feels, to call this guilty passion by the sacred name of *love*. Lust is not love. Desire is not love. Love is of God. God is love. Love is to be gratified, for all it wants is lovely, pure, and right. It never seeks anything else. It binds the family and society and all the good in golden chains of pure affection. But it never inspired a sinful desire in a human breast. No woman is drawn to another woman's husband by *love*.

A man who is "drawn" toward a woman whom he has no right to love, a woman "drawn" to a man she has no right to love, may be more sure than if they heard a voice out of the skies telling them so, that they are not "drawn" by divine grace, or a holy purpose, or any good motive whatsoever. The devil has hold of the rope that draws.

Religion is not a passion. It is a principle. Religion does not consist in feeling. Religion is the intelligent belief of truth that leads to right doing; the very meaning of the word is "binding or drawing back" to God: receiving such views as constrain the soul to obey God. He who adopts.

views or has feelings which lead him to do wrong, to covet another man's house or his wife or anything that is his, is not a religious man. He may be a priest at the altar, but he is not religious. And a woman whose "heart goes out" after another, and turns away from her husband to find "sympathy" and "support" in the society of her "beloved pastor," and writes him sickly notes and letters revealing her thoughts and trials, and declaring her "ardent attachment" to him as the friend whose words are such "a precious revelation to her thirsty soul"—such a woman is on the verge of ruin. There is not a thought in her heart that God loves.

A very large part of the fiction of our day encourages this morbid sentiment. In many modern novels a story of impossible "love" is the ground work. Parties who cannot be lawfully joined in marriage are made the lovers of the book. The intrigues, crimes, soul-sufferings, and ultimate happiness of the guilty are wrought up in the exciting pages of the novel. Women read these books more ravenously than men. They feed upon them. Their effect is evil and only evil, and that continually. They stimulate passion till it overrides reason, and conscience and discretion, sets latent lust on fire, and makes the human heart a pit with exhalations of foul desires offensive to purity and heaven, as Byron's hell

*"Whose every wave breaks on a living shore
Heaped with the damned like pebbles."*

The number of ministers who have brought disgrace upon the pulpit and religion by vice fostered in the

pages of fiction which weak women and young people devour with a morbid appetite insatiable as the grave, is the evidence of an enormous evil that demands the best wisdom of philosophy and the highest virtue of religion to arrest and remedy. But if there were not a novel in the world, though the evil would be less, it would not cease. Human nature would be what it is. And given the same circumstances, similar consequences will result. The warning is to ministers and their admiring parishioners. There is a line, clear as a sunbeam, between right and wrong. In a Christian community there is no ignorance so blind as not to see it. Conscience and common sense reveal it. Experience shows its value. History ancient and modern, sacred and profane, is full of illustrations. On one side of that line is love, usefulness, honor, peace and life immortal. On the other side is secret pleasure, remorse, shame, blasted households, tears that God never wipes away, and damnation just and eternal.

Church News.

Brethren Lipscomb & Sewell: Permit us to give you some items from this part of the State. We have a few brethren scattered about through this country but they are quite cold and lukewarm. We are trying to preach in our feeble manner on each Lord's day, somewhere near our home. We attended one of our appointments on fourth Lord's day in last month, but when we got there we were supplanted by our Methodist friends who had been holding a

meeting for about ten days. Some of our brethren informed us, that they had assured them we should preach at the hour of our appointment, but they gave us no invitation. Our sectarians seem jealous of us, and yet they say we are Christians; they accuse us of being uncharitable, and will manifest an uncharitable and discourteous spirit. Consistency is a jewel.

We attended the appointment of one of our Advent friends at "Rocky Comfort" on last Lord's day, and heard a very interesting discourse, from the language of John the Revelator, "be faithful until death and I will give you a crown of life." In the main we were well pleased, yet the speaker indulged in speculation at intervals. He portrayed the work of the church in its true light, declaring that the church had departed in many things from its primitive purity. But he must speculate some on the Advent of Christ, and his *future kingdom*. Why is it, that our friends will preach their *opinions* to us, based on the merest inference? The Scriptures inform us that "one day with the Lord, is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day." We might infer from this, that the seventh thousandth year of the world would be the Lord's *Sabbath*, and that in twenty-five years from this date, Christ would come to "reign in righteousness," but this would be only an opinion founded on inference. So our Advent friends say the darkening of the sun and falling of the stars spoken of by the Savior occurred in 1787 and 1833. Now this is nothing more than mere inference, for this darkening of the sun and

falling meteors (not stars) may be attributed to natural causes, and our friends ought to know that, if their theory be true, it was foolish for those who lived prior to the date of those events, to be looking for Christ, and yet he admonished them "to watch, for at such an hour as ye think not, shall the Son of Man come."

We have not been able to learn yet, that we should 'preach that the Son of Man will come at any specified time, yet we should admonish our fellow-travellers to "watch" to keep oil in their lamps, to always be ready, and to be sure to preach the gospel which is God's power to save.

We need much preaching in this country; infidelity, skepticism, and sectarianism are rampant, the church is torpid and ineffectual for good. Shall the servants of the Lord leave the field? Shall our foes triumph? the Lord forbid. We sincerely pray the Lord to send more laborers into the field. Brethren cannot some of you, that are good and true come to our aid? could not one of you brother editors of the Gospel Advocate visit our State this fall, and make a preaching tour among us? we think you could do much good. Let us hear from you.

Fraternally yours,

THOS. EVANS.

Steelville, Crawford Co., Mo.

Bros L & S: Thinking that you and the brethren in general would be pleased to hear from this part of the country in regard to the advancement of our Savior's kingdom, I have concluded to pen you a few lines.

Castorville is situated on Castor river, about ten miles North-west of

Bloomfield, the county-seat of Stoddard County, Missouri. It is quite a small village of about one hundred inhabitants, one store, one grocery, one Drug-store, one grist and saw-mill, and has had the name of being a very lawless and reckless place.

I, in connection with Bro. S. A. Blocker, commenced preaching there on Monday night following the third-Lords-day in July, and on Friday evening Bro. Jno. Dotson joined us. The meeting lasted eleven days, and the result was, Forty three were added to the family of the Lord; 27 by confession and baptism; 8 from the Baptists; one from the Methodists; 7 reclaimed by relation. We closed with a good impression, and I think that many more will unite soon. The brethren were greatly strengthened, and the prospects are good for a great and glorious harvest.

To God, the Father, be all the praise. Brethren, let us labor on in our Master's vineyard, for truly the harvest is great but the laborers are few.

Yours in the One Hope,

J. T. CROW.

The congregation here at Bethlehem is one of the oldest congregations in this county. God's will as it is revealed in the Bible has been preached here for about forty years, yet it has not lost its power unto salvation. While the institutions of men are decaying around us Christ's kingdom continues to thrive like a green bay tree and spread its protecting arms over the defenceless heads of Adam's fallen race. Bro. Huffman of Enon College, Bro. Eichbaum of Nashville and Bro. Scobey of Mufreesboro

commenced a meeting here on the first Lord's day in August with the largest audience I ever saw at the place. The meeting was a success from beginning to end, and there is no telling how much more good could have been done if it could have been continued. Other appointments however called away our preaching brethren and the meeting was brought to a close on the night of the second Lord's day with three confessions that night. These were baptized the next morning and a song of exhortation was sung when still another came forward and confessed that Jesus is the Christ and was buried with him in baptism. This one made fourteen who purified their hearts by faith and their souls by obeying the truth during the meeting. Bro. Huffman most earnestly exhorted the newly born to feed upon the sincere milk of the word and not to crucify the Lord again, nor be like the sow, which, when she was washed, turned again to her wallowing in the mire. He did not want to see them slip into the Lord's house and take a seat behind the door, but come to the front seat with the older brethren, procure a hymn book and join in singing praise to God. He also wanted the older members to lend a helping hand to steady those who have just commenced to walk the narrow way which leads to life eternal. These exhortations have an importance of which I fear some never think. The last condition of the man who falls away is worse than the one before he obeyed the truth. Then, dear friends, make your calling and your election sure; then, dear preacher, let sinners alone, unless

you teach them to observe all things commanded of the Lord.

J. G. NIX.

Tucker's X Roads, Wilson Co., Tenn.

Brethren L. & S.: I have just returned from Montgomery, Texas, where we had four additions to the Church of Christ. Preached three days. The brethren at Montgomery had been divided for nearly eighteen months, and the Church, as might naturally be supposed—well nigh ruined, I am happy to say, that in the Spirit of the Divine Master, all things were happily, and we hope permanently settled. Again there is unity, and peace. The brethren are happy, and we hope the sad experience of the past will cause them to strive to maintain the Spirit in the bond of peace.

J. T. POW.

Huntsville, Tex. Aug. 5, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: Please send the Advocate to Prof. I. B. Bradley, Liberty, Clay Co. Mo. He has read some of my numbers—is much pleased with the paper, and I think will become a regular subscriber. Indeed no one who loves the Lord and his holy word as taught by our great and good men thirty or forty years ago can fail to love both the ADVOCATE, and those who conduct it. My heart rejoices when I remember, that in this wicked and perverse generation, you at least stand firmly upon the basis of this reformation, (Jesus the Christ) and the all sufficiency of his word. May the Lord give you strength to stand firmly where you do, come what will.

Sorry am I, to know that a few (some of them prominent) of our brethren have become ashamed, & tired of the simplicity of the Gospel of Christ. Oh, how my heart sickens when I read or hear from one of our preachers as I did a few evening ago, (an editor of a political paper however) say in the pulpit, "you cannot prove your religion from the Bible alone, this book," striking it with his hand, "is not sufficient for my faith," and much more of the same kind of Beecher and infidel talk. When men depart in the slightest degree from the Gospel of Christ, who can tell where they will go?

Most truly yours in hope of a better world than this,

S. T. MENG.

Dover, Mo. July 30th 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: Believing the readers of the Advocate would love to hear of the power of the Gospel, without anything tacked on, I write you. Embracing the fourth Lord's day in July, we held a meeting at Boston, Williamson County, which resulted in seven additions to the Lord's cause. From thence we went to Antioch, Maury Co. Embracing the first Lord's day in this month, with 38 added to the Lord's host, I am now preaching at Knob Creek, had two additions last night.

Let us all praise the Lord for his truth's sake. I will write you again dear Brethren soon.

Your fellow-laborer in the Lord,

J. M. F. SMITHSON.

Rivers Station, Aug. 10th. 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: We commenced a protracted meeting at County line Church (Brothers Fears, Hicks and

iffin the Chief speakers) embracing
e first Lord's day in this month,
d continued for three days. The im-
mediate results were eleven immersed.
e reclaimed, two from the Baptists
d one from the Methodists and I
ink the good seed sown, fell in
me honest hearts that will yet
ing forth fruit to the honor and
ory of God. The truth was presented
love, and I think much prejudice
moved—may the good Lord help
all to be faithful workers in his
neyard is the prayer of your Bro.
Christ.

JOHN TILLERY.

*Brook's Station, Fayette Co. Ga.
Aug 6th. 1874.*

The pupils of Mars Hill Academy,
pecially those of them who preach
"the word" so faithfully in the
ighborhood of the Academy last
ession, will be pleased to learn, that
ur meetings have just closed at
ony Point and Hopewell, with 15
essions at the former, and 7 at the
tter place.

The congregations are anxious to
e the young brethren who have
ored so faithfully with their back
ain, at the beginning of next ses-
on, which begins on the first Mon-
y in January, 1875.

By the blessing of our Father, we
nfidently expect our school to con-
ue its onward and upward course
r many years to come.

Fraternally,

T. B. LARIMORE.

Aug. 8th, 1874.

Brethren L. & S: It has been a
ng while since I have written any-
ing for the GOSPEL ADVOCATE, but

as there is so much of interest to the
brotherhood transpiring in this
County just at this time, I have con-
cluded to let you learn of it from me,
and the brotherhood also through
the Advocate if you think it of suffi-
cient interest to publish it or any
part of it.

Jacob Ditzler, like a "roaring lion"
is canvassing this whole country
lecturing on "Campbellism." His
chief arguments are based upon the
report which brother Pickens has
given of the Debate last October, on
the Lexington Kentucky difficulty,
viewed altogether from the Bowman
side, and the crying of "simple heart-
ed David Lipscomb" at Franklin
Tennessee at the debate with Dr.
Bretns.

He accused Brother Lard of swear-
ing a fashood (willingly) to exclude
Brethren from the church. Dr. Hop-
son of about the same or worse, accuses
brother Pickens of wilful falsehood,
also some friends who have given
bro. Pickens certificates as to the
correctness of his report of the debate
three of whom were moderators, and
only one of them (the three) a
brother. And he also accuses you,
(Bro. L.) especially of the same with
regard to your report of (I believe)
the Fayetteville debate. In short,
he is full of accusations, and bold
assertions, and altogether the most
arrogant bigot I ever saw.

Bro. Pickens in his quiet, logical,
and prudent manner is reviewing him
as fast as duties otherwise will per-
mit, I have heard him twice: once
at Apple Grove and once at Sum-
merville, both in this County. He
dealt in none of Ditzler's mean in-
dignities, or vile vituperations, nor

did he indulge in any wicked insinuations, as Ditzler does with regard to an unfortunate scar on Bro. Pickens' neck caused by a scar or burn; but he dealt in facts, in Ditzler's contradicting statements, which are published and cannot be denied. Such as Bro. Sweeney's exposition of his different positions as to the river Jordan. His contradictory positions as to the way or manner in which the children of Israel were baptized in the Red Sea. This denial of Bro. P.'s calling in question his rendering of the latin phrase "*go frequentios*" although Bro. P. has several certificates from those who heard the debate, and remember even Bro. P.'s argument, and his denial of bro. P. asking him for certain lexicons which he had quoted. Though he is not satisfied as to what position he will finally take on this question, sometimes he admits that Bro. P. did ask him for one book, and then denies that he asked him for any of those in dispute.

In short brother Pickens honestly and fairly, makes out the strongest case against him that I have ever heard. Sufficient to hang any man in the world in any criminal court. It will all be published in due time in the *Weekly*.

Fraternally &c.,

A. C. HENRY.

Falkville, Morgan Co. Ala. Aug. 7th. 1874.

"STRANGE THINGS."

Bro Lipscomb : Under the above caption you make an attack upon Bro. Walling, which I take as a confession that Bro. Ramsey's replication

is unsatisfactory; and, as it is hardly fair for one to contend against two, I propose, by your permission, to entertain you while brethren Ramsey and Walling manage their contest in their own way. And, as you are peculiarly fond of the "reductio ad absurdum" process of reasoning, you, of course, can not object to feeling its force in some slight degree, especially when assured that nothing shall be said in a personally disrespectful or irreverent manner. Let us then lay "judgment to the line and righteousness to the plummet."

"Brother Walling says, 'Government once punished good men—now it punishes bad men.' Neither of these propositions is true. It never persecuted good men simply because they were good, unless that goodness led them into opposition to the interests of the government. It does not punish men to-day because they are bad."

Now my brother, I wish to know whether you mean to embrace the present time by the phrase, "It (government) never persecuted men simply because they are good." If so, your next proposition, "It does not punish men to-day because they are bad," makes you to say that government does not punish because men are either *good* or *bad*. Then, as the two classes *good* and *bad* embrace the whole human family, and as no one is punished for being either good or bad, please inform us for what government does punish. "They still punish those who refuse submission to their bidding good or bad." Now my dear brother, do you intend us to infer that there is no morality attached to obedience or disobedi-

ence? To refuse to obey must be either a good or a bad act. If good, the obedient are good. If bad, the disobedient are bad. Now, as you say government punishes for disobedience it must be because men are bad. Then away goes your sweeping proposition. But you say, "It does not punish men to-day because they are bad." Then it must be because they are good, for men are one or the other, *good* or *bad*. But you insist it is for neither quality; then let us draw a picture.

Judge upon the bench.—Verdict of jury, *guilty of murder in the first degree*. The Court to the criminal, "In passing sentence of death upon you, you will remember that government does not punish you because you are either good or bad, because there is not any moral evil in taking the life of a human being—but simply because you "refuse submission" do I order the Sheriff to hang you till you are dead!" Again; Judge Hickerson to Bro. Ramsey—"You will bear in mind Mr. Ramsey, that in imposing a fine upon you, the Court does so, not because you are either good or bad, not because your action is right or wrong, but because government punishes you for refusing submission to its bidding, and especially, because in thus fining you I find 'all the elements of persecution for conscience sake,' and since I am a 'sternly upright man' you cannot blame me for thus inflicting 'punishment for refusing to obey the laws, when they conflict with a man's convictions of duty to his Maker.'" What a picture! Yet is a true photograph of Bro. L.'s positions.

But Bro. L. may still insist that

government punishes men neither because good or bad. Then what becomes of the idea of *persecution* which Bro. L. says attaches to Bro. R.'s case? Bro. R. was not punished because he was good. To be persecuted it must have been because he was a Christian. Now will Bro. L. draw the distinction between the *good* of Bro. R. that was not punished and the *Christian* that was punished? If *Christian* is not *good* what is it! If not *good* it must be *bad*. But Bro. L. says the *bad* is not punished, therefore the *christian* was not punished. But since neither the *good* nor the *bad* was punished and the *christian* was, then it follows that the *christian* is neither good nor bad!! But more of this anon.

My good brother, on page 549 says, "They (governments) still punish those who refuse submission to their bidding good or bad," but on page 550, (after showing that, "The punishments inflicted by human governments, are fines, forfeitures, imprisonments, disfranchisement, banishment, attainure and death") he says, "These all stand as different degrees of punishment for refusing to obey the laws, when they conflict with a man's convictions of duty to his Maker." "When they conflict!" Surely my brother did not weigh this sentence. The first of these propositions is untenable much less the proposition that all punishments are to be inflicted only when the laws conflict with a man's convictions of duty to his Maker. Bro. L. may not have meant all this but it is the logical sequence of what he says. Let him avow or explain. Or think of a government that has no penalties

for the *good* nor the *bad* but only for those who think the laws conflict with their duties to their Maker!! And yet we are commanded to be subject to these very powers! Now Bro. L. please give Article and Section, either of the Constitution and Laws of the United States or of the State of Tennessee that affirms or squints at such a proposition.

We now return to the persecution item. "The Roman government with Nero at its head, punished Christians not because they were Christians simply, but because they refused obedience and service to the government in its demands for civil and military service, and obedience to *other laws* of the empire. (What *other laws* besides civil and military could there be?) The persecution commenced with punishing single individuals, and extended to the masses because they as a body refused these services and encouraged their members to refuse. This is true of the regular persecutions by the government as distinguished from the uprising of the mob, inflamed by passion." What an apology for Rome! In Bro. L.'s zeal to class Bro. R. among the persecuted, he first affirms that all the elements of persecution are in his case and then that Rome with Nero, the embodiment of vileness, at its head only punished for some alleged offense and not because of Christianity! What an association! Nero, fiddling while Rome is in flames and killing Christians upon his own lie is scarcely worthy as high a position as a persecutor, as the "sternly upright" Hickerson fining brother Ramsey!

Will my brother allow me to ask how he can be so blinded by an over-zeal against world powers? Will he be patient while we return to him the same scathing logic under which we have groaned (and may yet groan) for long years past? Will he bear in mind that it is not from hate but from love the physician uses his scalpel?

But is it logical to say that government punishes not because of Christianity but because of a refusal to obey when Christianity caused the refusal? You know those laws which Christians disobeyed were enacted as a test based upon their Christianity which made the issue clear, will you obey God or man? In such a case even Bro. Walling says obey God. It does not appear that Bro. R.'s was just such a case.

You say "This is true of the regular persecutions by the government." Historians tell us there were ten regular persecutions under the Roman Empire. Let us see the character of some of them.

Tacitus says of the first persecution by Nero that, "To divert suspicion from himself, he substitutes fictitious criminals, and with that view inflicted the most exquisite tortures on these men, who under the vulgar appellation of Christians, were already branded with deserved infamy * * * * and they were all convicted not so much for the crime of setting fire to the city, as for their hatred of human kind. * * * The guilt of the Christians deserved indeed the most exemplary punishment; but the public abhorrence was changed into commiseration from the opinion that these unhappy wretches were sacri-

ficed, not so much to the rigor of justice as to the cruelty of the jealous tyrant." Jones Church History pp 97, 98.

The second persecution under Domitian was marked by a law "that no Christian, once brought before the tribunal, should be exempted from punishment without renouncing his religion." Hist. Martyrs p. 13.

During the third, Pliny writes to the Emperor Trajan; "In the mean time, the method I have hitherto observed with the Christians who have been accused *as such*, has been as follows. I interrogated them—Are you Christians? If they avowed it I put the same question a second and a third time, threatening them with the punishment decreed by the law; if they still persisted, I ordered them to be immediately executed: for of this I had no doubt, whatever was the nature of their religion, that such perverseness and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved punishment." Jones's History p. 118.

The cry against Polycarp was, "This is the doctor of Asia, the father of the Christians, the subverter of our Gods, who teaches many that they must not perform the sacred rites nor worship our deities—Away with these Atheists." Phid. p. 128.

Ptolemaeus, Lucius and Ptolemy for answering the question—"Are you a Christian?" in the affirmative were put to death. Ibid. p. 130.

Marcus Aurelius ordered, "that the confessors of Christ should be put to death." Ibid. p. 135.

Why add proof? Bro. Lipscomb knows, as every historian knows, that Christianity was at the bottom of

every persecution, "regular" or irregular. Why then shall we attempt to distort history or evade the logic of facts in order to maintain a pet theory?

We come now to the broad and sweeping proposition, "That act of fining Bro. Ramsey contains all the elements of persecution." Is this true? What is persecution? And what are its elements? "PERSECUTION, *n.* The act or practice of persecuting; the infliction of pain, punishment, or death, upon others unjustly, particularly for adhering to a religious creed or mode of worship, either by way of penalty, or for compelling them to renounce their principles."—Webster.

In this definition we find there must be first—punishment—Bro. R. was punished.

1. The punishment must be inflicted unjustly—unjust means, not justly—justly means "in conformity to law," Webster. Bro. L. says the Judge was sternly upright," if so he must have acted *according to law*—hence Bro. R. was not unjustly punished.

3. The punishment must be inflicted, "particularly for adhering to a religious creed"—the law in this case has no reference to the fact whether a man has a creed or has none, hence this feature is wanting in Bro. R.'s case.

4. It must be by way of penalty for religion, which is not true in Bro. R.'s case—or

5. And, lastly, "for compelling them to renounce their principles"—This intention is wanting in both the law and the Judge.

Hence, as four of the five essential

elements of persecution are wanting in Bro. R.'s case he was not persecuted and Bro. L.'s sweeping assertion falls to the ground, I hope never to rise again.

But if Bro. L. is not yet satisfied, I retort upon him a paraphrase of "The government of Rome with Nero at its head," etc. The State government, with Judge Hickerson on the bench, did not punish Bro. R. because he was a Christian simply, but because he refused obedience and service to the government. No persecution here Bro. L.

Bro. Lipscomb says, "We have not intended to call in question the propriety of civil government punishing offenders against its laws. * * * But to show the glaring absurdity to which the idea of Christians becoming the executioners of civil law leads." Let us try our hand at "glaring absurdities."

Bro. L. does not question the propriety of civil governments punishing offenders—Bro. Ramsey was an offender against the law—therefore Bro. L. sees no impropriety in the fine! But as this fining contained all the elements of persecution, Bro. L. can see no impropriety in persecution!!

Bro. L. says it is wrong for Christians to become executioners of the law,—it is right that the law be executed, therefore it is wrong for Christians to do that which is right!!!

Paul says, "Let every soul be subject the higher powers"—Bro. L. says you shall not be subject so far as to act as juror. Bro. R. obeyed Bro. L. therefore he did right!

Paul says, "Whosoever resisteth

the power, resisteth the ordinance of God" Bro. L. says, resist—bro. R. resisted, therefore he did right?

Paul says, "and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation"—Bro. L. says you must resist or it will be a glaring absurdity, bro. R. resisted and is therefore free from Paul's threat of damnation.

Paul says, "for he is the minister God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil—Bro. L. says, "The government does anything else than punish bad men because they are bad." Therefore Paul was mistaken!

Paul says, "For he is a minister of God to them for good" Bro. L. "It is just as ready to punish good men who refuse to obey" therefore Paul was again in error?

Paul says, "Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake." Bro. L. says I have shown the "glaring absurdity" of defiling your conscience with world power—Poor Paul.

Peter says, "submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake [Bro. L. says for the Lord's sake don't!]: whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well [Bro. L. I have shown it is not this way] For so is the will of God, [Bro. L. Peter don't know,] that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" Bro. L. It is not well-doing to serve as a juror or vote, or hold office, or be executioners of the law"!! I wont be "put to silence"—I have talked it for

years and I'll continue to talk it forever!!!

Now my brother, I know that I have taxed your patience and forbearance to the utmost, yet, when you reflect that you have, for long years, endwise, followed in the path of your illustrious editorial predecessor, thrust, pressed and urged, this yet unsettled question, in most glowing and dogmatical terms upon the readers of the *ADVOCATE*, you will certainly allow a rehurting of the darts you and others have thrown. I think you can see in my sharpness no thrust at Bro. L. personally—I assure you there has been no such intention. But I have aimed to show the "glaring absurdity" of your theory and argumentation, nothing more. Truth must be somewhere—Let us try to find it.

Most respectfully,

Yours in the Hope,

J. N. JONES.

We have had Bro. Jones' article on hand for several weeks. Absence from home has prevented earlier attention to it. We now proceed to notice it. He speaks of two against one. If rumor may be credited two were against one in the preparation of Bro. W.'s article. Logicians, like poets, are born, not made. A man with a logical cast of mind, may be improved by the study of logic—is furnished with means of more readily testing processes of reasoning, discovering the faulty places, the errors in premise or reasoning and in confirming or exposing conclusions, but the study of logic never made a sound reasoner, a good logician. He must be born such, and he is the same if

he never learns a rule of logic and never becomes acquainted with one of its technical terms or definitions. But a knowledge of these rules very greatly aids the logician. Now bro. Jones is a logician by nature. He inherited a close logical mind from his father. He has a large massive brain brimming over with syllogisms. In addition to this, he is a constant student and teacher of the rules and principles of logic. Nature and practice both combine to make him a logician, profound and critical. If brother Jones fails then we shall conclude the failure is not in him, but in the illogical character of the position. An illogical position is an untruthful one, is one inconsistent with truth.

Logic looks to the premises, to the clearness of their statement, to definiteness in meaning of words and terms used, to the process of reasoning, to the conclusion reached. All these are essential to determine the truth. We will see how carefully these points have been guarded.

Take his first syllogism. We said government did not formerly punish men because they were good. It does not now punish them because they are bad. But as all men are either good or bad—he draws the conclusion for me—none are punished. He is reducing my premises to an absurdity to show they are wrong. Now let us try his reasoning. Human beings are not punished because they are males, they are not punished because they are females. Both these premises are indisputably true. Then according to Bro. Jones' reasoning they would involve the conclusion that neither males or females are

ever punished. No man is punished for being white, no man is punished for being black, but all men in this country are white or black—therefore no man is ever punished. That is Bro. Jones' reasoning applied to these premises. He cannot fail to feel ashamed of the absurdity of his own reasoning.

Both of our propositions are true, nor do they involve bro. Jones' absurd conclusion. Government formerly or now does not punish man for being simply good or bad, yet men are punished both good and bad. We of course use these terms good and bad in a Scriptural or religious sense. Men are punished for disobedience to civil law. Sometimes goodness tends to disobedience to civil law, as when civil law forbids a man to worship God, or orders him to slay his fellow-man. Sometimes badness leads to disobedience as in the case of the thief or murderer. He then asks, "Do you intend us to infer there is no morality attached to obedience or disobedience? To refuse to obey must be either good or bad. To obey must be a good or a bad act." Now here we dissent wholly from our brother. Obedience to human law is the point. Is it necessarily good, is disobedience necessarily evil? Our brother assumes it is. We deny. Else Christ was guilty of immorality and crime, every apostle disobeyed and died vile sinners and gross rebels. Christ disobeyed, the apostles disobeyed; as disobedience is necessarily a bad act in bro. J.'s estimation Christ and the apostles were guilty of bad acts. They did disobey. But their acts, their teachings are the standard of what is right

and good with me, with bro. Jones, with all christians. Then to disobey is not necessarily bad—frequently is the reverse of it—is essential to goodness.

Then bro. Jones draws an imaginary picture of the Judge passing sentence on a criminal in which he commits the sophism of attaching a double and doubtful meaning to words. Judge Hickerson, nor other judges, do not adopt the morality of the Bible, the goodness of the Bible, as their rule or standard. They may sometimes refer to it, but the law of the land embodied in the common law and the statutes, made not to make good according to the law of God, but to protect society from violence and temporal evil, merely is their standard. Hence they are never guilty of the absurdity of which bro. Jones speaks.

Again there is a flagrant sophism in his drawing the conclusion that because we said obedience did not necessarily involve good, nor disobedience bad, that no act of disobedience to human law, involved moral good or evil, We laid down no premise that involved any such conclusion. Some acts condemned by human governments are good, others are evil. Moral good caused Christ and the apostles to violate, disobey law; immorality caused the thief and the murderer to disobey them. Neither morality or immorality, neither goodness nor badness attaches necessarily to obedience or disobedience to human law. Bro. J.'s logic is very illogical all through this. We venture that Judge Hickerson does not regard bro. Ramsey as a bad or immoral man for disobedience. On the

other hand we will venture he has a higher estimate of his moral integrity and true manhood. Nor are the Quakers considered lacking in morality because they refuse obedience to the mandates of the government. On the other hand the world gives them credit for a higher standard of moral integrity for their persistent disobedience to law that they believe wrong. Human law is not a standard of moral good or evil.

Again, brother Jones seems to think that Judge Hickerson or the persecuting power must necessarily see it as persecution to make it such. We regard Judge Hickerson as a sternly upright man according to the rule he adopts. Just as Paul was when he was persecuting the church. Just as thousands of persecutors have been from that day to this. Paul did not account that he was persecuting for religion; the Jews did not think they were crucifying the Son of God for fidelity to the Father, but for blasphemy against him. None the less they were doing it. They did not intend it as persecution, it was intended only to punish those who disobeyed the law, it was none the less persecution though, for religion's sake. We do not blame Judge Hickerson, granting it right to accept to occupy the position. We blame a Christian for occupying such position—we blame the government that makes such laws. We do not judge those without. What he calls a true photograph of my position is a true photograph of what occurs viewed from a Christian stand-point and he approves it, not me. It is a true picture of what bro. Jones approves.

In the next place we never said a

man was not punished for goodness. We stated that the simple fact of being a good man did not call punishment down on us unless that goodness led to disobedience to human law.

Whenever our goodness thus leads us, as did Christ's and the apostles, that special goodness, not because it is goodness, but because it involves disobedience to human law, is punished. All can understand that. Bro. Ramsey was punished because his goodness led like the goodness of primitive times to disobedience to human law. Some goodness leads to conformity to some human law. It is never punished.

We said, 'The punishments inflicted by human governments are fines, forfeitures, imprisonment, disfranchisements, banishments, attainure and death. These stand as different degrees of punishment for refusing to obey the laws when they conflict with a man's convictions of duty to his maker.' Our brother makes a wondrous ado over this as though we said they were never used to punish save when law was violated because it conflicted with convictions of duty to God. Now the sentence conveys no such idea, nor anything akin to it. We stated they were all used as different degrees of punishment in such cases, by the governments persecuting. We said nothing of its punishing for other purposes, we had no occasion to speak of it. They constituted persecution for religion when inflicted on this ground.

Our purpose was to show that the State of Tennessee had used the same punishment in persecuting bro. Ramsey for his religion that had been

used by other governments in other persecutions. We stand to the grammatical accuracy and logical truthfulness and propriety of our expression, bro. Jones' logic and scholarship to the contrary notwithstanding. We will submit it to any committee of scholars in the land, that it does not convey the meaning he seeks to draw from it. His ridiculous conclusions result from his false reasoning, not from any premise of mine.

We say that our proposition is true, just as we stated it, of the laws of Tennessee and the United States. They punish disobedience to their laws as readily when disobedience arises from convictions of duty to God as when disobedience arises from other causes. Bro. Ramsey's case is evidence of this. He disobeyed the law for the reason that he believes, the law required him to do things contrary to the word of God. He was punished for this disobedience, we presume, in accordance with the law of Tenn. We did not say or intimate that the law did not punish disobedience for other purposes. We said it did punish for this. The remainder is the result of bro. Jones' brilliant logic.

Paul was as sternly upright as Judge Hickerson. He persecuted upright men have often persecuted from adopting a false rule. He asks, "what other laws beside civil and military there could be?" Religions certainly there were, my brother, you certainly were nodding when you asked that question. All governments known to me have a code of religious laws, especially where religion is established by law. Brother Jones thinks our explanation of how

persecutions arose, an apology for Rome in her persecutions. We are after truth. When truth apologizes, let truth be told. Rome persecuted Christians for the same purpose precisely that Bro. Ramsey was fined. Because they refused obedience to the law. We were historically and literally accurate in our statement. Not a word of his quotation contradicts us. We spoke of what originated the persecutions. Were we disposed to be exacting, we would tell him his historians, are mere special pleaders, and no historian has recognized them as having any claim as historians. Much more reliable historians tell us that it was proposed in the Roman Senate to adopt the Christian religion as one of the religions of Rome, to deify Christ. It was defeated merely because that religion involved disobedience to the laws of the empire. Could that religion been bent to support the empire and obey its laws, as it now is to suit human laws, no persecutions would have followed. The disobedience required by the religion caused the punishment. That punishment was persecution. We stated it extended to the mass because they as a body refused the services (required) and encouraged their members to refuse." We are correct, none of bro. Jones' quotations contradict or even militate against it. Had there no disobedience to the law been found, no persecution would have followed. Punishing disobedience to law, when that disobedience arises from religious conviction is punishment for religion; bro. J. says, punishment for religion is persecution.

Had the early Christians been as

yielding in their provocations and as ready to transfer the responsibility of their actions to the government as they are at present, had they supported them as heartily but little persecution would have followed. Nero, wicked as he was never slew those who served his purpose and obeyed his mandates. He cared nothing for religion. We apprehend if all Christians would unanimously stand for the truth as bro. Ramsey does, the fine would come to be inflicted on them because they are Christians; still it would all arise because our religion involved disobedience to the law. Bro. Jones' style is here insulting to Bro. Ramsey. Why say Bro. Ramsey obeys bro. Lipscomb as though he has no convictions of his own. Why not give him credit for as much honesty of purpose, as much respect for his own opinions as Bro. Jones. This style adds nothing to the force of an argument. It helps the truth nothing. It only shows a disposition to wound the feelings without cause. Bro. Jones assumes that his interpretation of Paul, and Peter is infallibly right, and mine and bro. Ramsey's wrong. Our failure to accept his interpretation of Paul is a contradiction of Paul. Well we do not recognize your infallibility my brother.

Bro. Jones admits with us all, that those commands of submission have limitations. They were given under the government of Nero. His laws as Bro. Jones claims forbade all profession of the Christian religion. It would be just as easy for bro. Jones to turn his logic against Paul and Peter and even Christ himself, Paul

said let every soul be subject to the higher powers. Paul says, you shall not submit so as to separate you from Christ. Neither powers nor principalities, nor persecutions shall separate me from Christ. So Paul is inconsistent with himself. Paul said whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. But Paul did resist the powers that be, therefore he contradicted himself.

Paul said they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." But he did resist, therefore he falls under his own sentence of damnation. Now we say that Paul teaches precisely the same things that we do. We believe and teach exactly what Paul teaches in every point. We are willing to affirm, bro. Jones does not.

Bro. Jones will not deny that subjection to the powers, by Paul; submission to the ordinances of man, by Peter are modified and limited by our duty to God first. Obey these powers so long as you can do this without disobeying God. That is all we or bro. Ramsey contend for. Now the question is this. Is service on the Jury by a Christian disobedience to God? Does a Christian in voting disobey God? Bro. Jones has assumed it does not involve disobedience, and based his whole argument from beginning to end on assuming the only point of controversy. This fallacy is called in logic "a begging of the question." His essay is based upon an illogical fallacy, and his reasoning is classified in logic as "reasoning in a circle." Bro. Jones again fails to draw the distinction between submission to a government

and active participation in it. Submission to a government is a recognition of that as an institution separate and distinct from us. Participation in a government is becoming part and parcel of the government, and it is hard to recognize the relation implied by being part and parcel of the government. We can hardly be said to submit to ourselves. The whole argument and effort is illogical, is a violation of the principles of logic.

The simple plain proposition is, serving on the Jury or hanging a man in obedience to human law, by a Christian a violation of God's law. There is the question to be settled with bro Ramsey. Every essay that ignores that question or assumes that question as decided is illogical, is contrary to the first principles of logic. If it is contrary to the will of God, bro. Jones will say he ought to obey God rather than man. He ought to refuse the service. If not contrary to the will of God, bro. Ramsey, we are bound for conscience sake to do it. We are bound for conscience sake (conscience toward God) to do all that God requires, to avoid all he prohibits—to obey so far as God's law requires, to avoid all he prohibits—to obey so far as God's law requires obedience, to refrain where that law does not require obedience.

Now Bro. R. believes, I believe, thousands throughout our land (and the number the judges tell us are rapidly increasing) believe all active participation by Christians in human governments is sinful, is violative of the law of God, and hence is not embraced in the command "submit to the powers that be."

We are perfectly willing to give

bro. Jones space in the *ADVOCATE* to affirm his faith on this point, or we will affirm ours and he may negative it. What say you?

Bro. Jones takes Webster to define persecution. And then undertakes to demonstrate that bro. Ramsey's fine is not persecution. 1st. It is punishment; bro. Ramsey was punished. 2nd. The punishment must be inflicted unjustly. He defines justly, is "in accordance with law." But with what law? Human? Is human law never unjust? Webster says, unjust—contrary to the standard of right established by Divine law. Bro. Jones has here committed the logical fallacy of using words with an indefinite or doubtful and double meaning and imposed upon himself with a very glaring sophism, even a child can detect. We ask again, is all human law just? Is everything done in accordance with human law just? According to bro. Jones' construction of Webster, and the meaning he adopts, this is true. But who believes it? We are in the habit of saying, There is as much stealing done in accordance with and through law as against law. Does human law never conflict with Divine? Human law is the standard of justice to no Christian. Judge Hickerson is an upright man as Paul was before his conversion. He persecuted and did many acts of injustice as he himself says after his conversion. Judge Hickerson is upright in carrying out the law he adopts. His law is unjust. Paul calls the judges of human law, "the unjust" Roman's 1 Cor. 6-1.

Whatever conflicts with Divine law is unjust. God's law, not man's, is the standard of justice. God's law

requires obedience to it first. Bro. R. believed God's law forbids his serving as a juror. "To him that esteemeth a thing unclean, to him it is unclean" Rom's 14-14. It was then wrong to Bro. Ramsey at least. To him it was a violation of God's law. But human law required him to do that which, to him at least, was a violation of God's law. That was unjust—wrong. Then the punishment was inflicted upon him unjustly.

Bro. Jones again imposes upon himself by the fallacy of making the punishing power the judge of the justice or the injustice of the punishment. According to this rule there never was a persecution. Never a power that regarded its punishment as unjust. The crucifiers of Christ regarded their deed just—they crucified him for blasphemy. It was unlawful. Paul thought he was doing God's service. Yet it was persecution. He says, Nero did not think he was doing wrong. All the Romish powers thought they were doing right in persecuring dissenters. The persecuting power is not the judge of injustice. He who looks at it from a Christian standpoint, the standpoint of Divine law alone is competent to decide it just or unjust. We are willing to undertake to prove it unjust according to this rule and from this stand-point.

He says it must be inflicted "particularly for adhering to a religious creed." Now Bro. Jones' construction of that sentence perverts Mr. Webster's meaning. He does not say no punishment is persecution unless it is for adherence to a religious creed. Then Mr. Webster would be

guilty of saying a man was never persecuted for his political creed or practice, for social or moral doctrines or practices. Mr. Webster never was guilty of such an absurdity as this. He meant that persecution was punishment inflicted for any offensive theory or practice. But it is especially referable to that inflicted for religious theories or practices. It does not mean that it is particularly essential that it should be for adherence to a religious to constitute persecution. My copy of Webster says: "Persecute" "To pursue in a manner to injure, vex or afflict; to cause to suffer pain from hatred or malignity; to harass; to beset in an annoying way." He gives these as definitions without reference to the ground of them. In the secondary meaning, "especially to afflict or harass or punish, for adherence to particular religious creed or system of religious principle or a mode of worship. This shows the construction Bro. Jones places on Webster's meaning is not the correct one. It is persecution when not inflicted for religion, it is especially so when inflicted for religion.

It is not necessary that it be intended as penalty for religion. But this is penalty. Bro. Ramsey's religion caused him to refuse the obedience. For the disobedience which his religion prompted, the punishment was inflicted. I may retort in Bro. Jones' own language: Is it logical to say the government does not punish for religion, but for disobedience when the religion causes the disobedience? We have only changed it from an affirmative to a negative proposition.

Next "it must be for compelling them to renounce their principles." He says this is wanting. What was it for? For what did Hickerson fine Ramsey? Was it not to make him surrender his principles, to practice contrary to his principles? Is not this a renunciation of his principles? If not I would not know how to renounce principles. Was it not to deter others from adopting the same principles? Now according to Bro. Jones, all punishment for disobedience caused by religion logically is for religion itself. Hence the essential elements are present in all of the five points. Although the five points are not essential to persecution.

We grant that Judge Hickerson did not punish Bro. Ramsey because he was a Christian, but because he disobeyed the law. His religion caused the disobedience. Precisely as Noro punished. Bro. Jones decides this is punishment for religion.

But he again thinks he finds glaring inconsistency in our saying we have not intended to call in question the propriety of civil government punishing offenders against its laws, &c. He did not quote our full language or it would have appeared different, but take it as he quotes it. What of it? Our saying, we have not intended in that article to call in question the propriety of certain things, is no evidence we saw no impropriety in the things. Many things we see impropriety in, we did not call in question in that article. We make this remark because bro. Jones is attempting simply a verbal criticism, a display of sharpness in picking flaws in our use of language in much that he writes. He strives to

show that we are not a very critically correct writer, fully as much as that we are wrong in position. That we are not disposed to discuss. We find he can criticise Mr. Webster and draw a meaning from him that he did not intend, when what we did intend is potent to every common reader.

But we do not call in question the propriety or fitness of the government punishing offenders. That is not saying it is right for the government to punish all offenders. Or that because it is right and proper for government to punishing offenders, it is therefore right for all individuals to engage in this work of punishing offenders. There is propriety and fitness in an institution or being acting in accordance with its true character and nature.

D. L.

(To be continued.)

Explanation.

Through an oversight, a part of the article on "Strange things," did not get into the hands of the types in time for all of Bro. L's reply to appear in this number. It will be finished in the next. We dislike to divide it thus, but it is unavoidable.

E. G. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

A Trip to West Tennessee.....	767
Lesson for the Day.....	771
Church News.....	773
"Strange Things".....	778
Explanation.....	790

12-050
2200
205

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 34.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, AUGUST 27, 1874.

Supposed Contradictions in the Bible.

"7. The disciples were commanded to take a staff, and sandals. Mark vi : 8, 9.

They were commanded to take neither staves nor sandals. Matt. x : 9, 10."

The passage in Matthew runs thus: "Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses. Nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat." The expression "two coats," in this passage gives us a clue to the whole difficulty. They were not to burden themselves with a change of raiment. We have no doubt the numeral "two" is understood with "staves," and "shoes." Not two staves, and not two pairs of shoes. Take simply one outfit: one coat, one staff, one pair of shoes, or sandals; with this view of Matthew, he and Mark agree perfectly together. There is no evidence that either Matthew or Luke knew what the other had written, and they were neither one of them trying to say what the other had said. But each one was giving the items of the

history of Jesus, as they occurred to him. They naturally view the same thing from different standpoints; yet, as each one told the truth, there will be no contradictions found between them. Matthew records what Jesus said in forbidding to take a change of raiment, while Mark merely speaks of the single outfit, of one staff, and one pair of shoes. While between them there is no contradiction. The very fact these men wrote so much about the history of Jesus, without any concert of action, and yet make no contradiction of each other, is a strong argument in favor of their truthfulness. If the life of Jesus had not been a reality, those men could not possibly have written histories that would thus have harmonized, without constant concert of action. But when they were writing the history of a real personage, and each one writing down items as they occurred to him, and at the same time writing the truth, they would need no concert of action to agree together. And such is the case with the writers of the New Testament.

"8. Two blind men besought Jesus." Matt. xx : 30. Only one

2200
2-1-1874

blind man besought Jesus. Luke xviii: 35-38."

The point of supposed contradiction in this case is, that Matthew speaks of *two* blind men, while Luke only mentions one. In order to make these passages contradict each other, it must be made to appear as a matter of certainty, that Matthew and Luke both speak of the same occasion, and at the same time it must be made to appear as a matter of certainty that the fact that Luke only mentions one, constitutes a denial that there were more than one. Neither of these can be done with certainty. For if it be shown that Matthew and Luke were both speaking of the same trip to Jerusalem, that by no means proves that both of them spoke of the same incident. It is just as reasonable to suppose that they were speaking of different occasions, as to suppose that they both spoke of the same. And in this view of the subject, there is no semblance of a contradiction. It is just as consistent with all the facts in the case, to suppose that two occasions of healing the blind occurred on this trip, and that Matthew spoke of one, and Luke of the other, as to suppose that both spoke of the same. And by this, we are entirely relieved of the difficulty. In fact, the indications are that they did not both speak of the same case of healing; for Luke speaks of Jesus coming immediately into Jericho, when the blind man of whom he speaks was healed, while Matthew speaks of his immediate approach to Jerusalem, after the healing of the two of whom he speaks, and these two places are some fifteen or twenty miles apart, so that

it is very reasonable and natural to understand that these writers were speaking of different occasions altogether. But even granting they spoke of the same circumstance of healing, that does not prove a contradiction. Luke in speaking particularly of one, does not by any means deny that there were more than one. He might single out one and speak of him separately, without at all denying that there was another, while Matthew might consider the case of both at once, without any conflict at all. So we take it upon the whole, that there is no conflict between Matthew and Luke, regarding the blind. There are two ways of reconciling them, that are quite as reasonable as to make them contradict each other.

"9. A centurion besought Jesus to heal his servant. Mat. viii: 5-6. Not the Centurion, but messengers besought him. Luke vi: 3-4." Both these passages may easily be true, and no contradiction. Whatever a man does through agents, he does himself. If we take it that Matthew and Luke were both speaking of the same man, we only need consider that Matthew relates the matter as though the centurion spoke directly and personally to the Savior, without mentioning the agents or messengers through whom he approached him. While Luke, on the other hand, is careful to mention the messengers, and make them a conspicuous party in the scene. By doing this, he makes the point that the Centurion was very popular with the Jews. But we are utterly unable to see how this difference in relating the circumstances, when both relate

the same great facts regarding the miracle of healing the servant makes any conflict between the two witnesses. And even if these witnesses should differ, or even come in conflict with each other about some of the circumstantial details, when they perfectly agree in all the leading facts of the case, it would not at all invalidate their testimony. But in this case, there is no conflict. One mentions the agents through whom the centurion made his communications to the Savior, while the other merely mentions these communications, without speaking of the agents or messengers. And it seems strange to me, that any one should reject the glorious story of the cross, upon which the redemption of a ruined world depends, merely because of some little apparent discrepancies in the circumstantial details, when the witnesses all agree in the grand facts that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, baptized by John in Jordan, performed a great number of wonderful miracles, was crucified at Jerusalem, buried in Joseph's new tomb, and arose again the third morning, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel, and that after remaining on earth forty days after his resurrection, he ascended to heaven, whence he will come again to take his people home.

E. G. S.

Réply to Bro. I. N. Jones.

(CONTINUED FROM LAST NO.)

We never saw unfitness or impropriety in the devil stirring the fires of endless wrath to punish the wicked

in hell. In one sense it is right. We could see great impropriety in Christ the Savior presiding over the realms of darkness and doing this fiendish work. We can see great impropriety in the devil presiding in heaven. We can see no special unfitness in the devil persecuting the church of Christ. It is in accordance with his character. We can see no impropriety in his subjects carrying out the work of their master. The governments of this world are recognized as the kingdoms of the Devil in the Bible. There is no impropriety or unfitness in the citizens, especially the office holders of this kingdom persecuting those who uphold an opposing kingdom. 'Tis their nature so to do. They are animated by the Spirit of the wicked one and use carnal weapons. They will strive to destroy that kingdom, either by seducing its members from fidelity to this kingdom and drawing them from serving their own master's kingdom; or they will strive to destroy them by persecution.

We see no special impropriety or unfitness in these things—even in Judge Hickerson, a sternly faithful man to his master persecuting bro. Ramsey. He is acting true to his position and office, faithful to his king.

That is not saying the government itself is not founded in rebellion against God, and as such there is fitness in those in rebellion filling its places and carrying out the true Spirit and work of rebellion.

There is no fitness or propriety in the servants of God, holding office in the kingdoms originating in rebellion against God and embodying the

rebellion of man against his maker. There is no fitness or propriety in their seducing their brethren into fealty and support of the earthly kingdom, or punishing them if they refuse to support the earthly kingdom.

Again, we do not see the impropriety or unfitness of the earthly kingdoms or their rulers punishing the flagrant violators of their own laws, such as Bill Kelly, and others of like character. Recognizing the existing state of affairs, we may say it is right and proper (though we did not say so) but this does not at all involve the idea that it is right for God's children to become the executioners, the judges and hangmen for the kingdom of the evil one. What have I to do to judge those without. Do not ye judge those within? but God judges those without.

Does not Bro. Jones recognize some things are right for some persons that are wrong for others? If so where is the point or logic in his syllogism? There is none. Some may partake of the Lord's supper, others may not.

It is right for a subject of Great Britain to be subject to his government in a way in which it is not right for a subject of the United States government to be. While a man is a citizen of human governments, of which the evil one is the Prince and Ruler, it is proper and right for him to obey that government. It is proper while he refuses to obey God he should be a subject and citizen of the other governments. God has ordained these governments for the rebellious.

The most loyal subject and even

ruler of the United States government could see propriety and fitness in a citizen of the confederate government sustaining, upholding, upbuilding the confederacy, could see fitness, propriety and even recognize it as right with the rebellion in existence for them to punish the gross violators of law, the disturbers of order, those who endangered the lives of its subjects. But he did not thereby recognize the rebellion itself as right or justifiable, nor did he recognize it as fit, proper or right for those believing the rebellion to be wrong and treasonable, to sustain and uphold it or execute its offices. The wrong, the impropriety is not in executing the laws after they enter the confederacy, the sin is in being a rebel to join the confederacy, or for one not a rebel, to carry out the laws and uphold the rebellion.

So we say it is wrong to have a government of human mold; for man to rebel against God's government in framing another government, but if man does rebel, it is proper and right, while in that rebellion he should have laws for his government, for the quiet and well-being of society; it is right and proper for those, in rebellion, sustaining the rebellion to execute the laws of the rebellious government; but it is wrong for one loyal to God, to participate in or uphold the rebellious government or execute its offices. Our connection with these governments are limited by God's law. Be subject not only for wrath (for fear of punishment by the government) but for conscience, that is a Christian conscience. But Christian conscience can go only so far as God's law goes. It must go this far. God's law says,

submit, it never says participate in, uphold or sustain. Then no Christian conscience can go beyond a passive submission to what is not contrary to the word of God. That must be its limit. But brother Jones says, go beyond submission, sustain, support, not limited by the demands of conscience, but because you love the government, the honor, the glory, the earthly good that comes from the world governments. Paul limits our service to that which conscience toward God demands. Bro. Jones goes away beyond Paul. Poor ignorant Paul! Paul says Nero's government was for the punishment of evil doers, brother Jones says, it punished men for being good—for being Christians. Now I say that all governments in the world punish evil doers. Not bad men because they are bad, viewed from a Christian stand-point. But evil doers who disturb society, and weaken all government, and in this work they minister good to the Christian. Hence I have never denied that human government and the government of the devil in hell, both minister good to the Christian. Oftentimes persecution is good. The flogging may be good for Bro. Ramsey. Imprisonment may be good for many of us. If so, it will sooner or later come. "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee, the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain." God restrains all wrath of man beyond what ministers to his praise. We are willing to say even more than we have said. It is right that those who refuse God's rule should be governed by the evil one and be punished by his governments. But that is not saying it is

right and proper for God's children to be, punished by these rebellious governments for fidelity to him, nor for his children to enter into these institutions ordained for the lawless and disobedient.

Bro. Jones thinks we as an ignorant and foolish man ought to be put to silence, by the well-doing of Christians in voting and holding office. We have never seen such course bear the fruit of well-doing. We have seen it bear the fruits of strife, bitterness, wrath. We have seen such men as bro. Jones driven from their homes, afraid to go to their families. We have seen old men and young men, Christians drawn into dissipation, corruption, dishonesty. We have seen churches divided and sundered, we have seen men murdered, their families impoverished, their wives and daughters made prostitutes of by such a course. We have seen brethren seeking each other's life with the fierceness of a blood-hound as the result of this course. We have seen whole countries made desolate and waste, we have seen hell-peopled with untold myriads. We have never seen one single good result from it. How can an ignorant and foolish man be put to silence by such fruits? Excuse us then in our ignorance and foolishness from talking on when there is only evil doing in such a course. Bro. Jones has represented us as saying, Don't submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake. Represented us as saying Peter don't know, when he says, So is the will of God that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. Our readers all know that in these things Bro. Jones is mistaken. We

have constantly argued it to be the duty of Christians to submit to every requirement of the government, where the Lord authorizes it. Submission when and to a degree that he has not authorized it, cannot be for his sake. Bro. Jones wishes us to submit to the ordinances of men for their own sake. Because he finds good in them. I have contended that with well doing we are to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, instead of going with them into their corrupting associations.

We have shown that this article is as illogical a tissue of sophisms as ever was written. There is not a sound logical criticism in it. Not one. Yet Bro. Jones is a logician both by nature and practice. He has adopted an illogical and false theory. No skill can make it logical. He thinks I am fond of reducing theories to absurdities. I am almost tempted to think he in the kindness of his heart attempted to furnish me a feast of fat things. But the work is too easily done, to keep up interest. But the only question that can help this decision is to go back and inquire, Is active service to the kingdoms of the world, by Christians, sinful? Will you discuss this question?

D. L.

Only One way to Pardon Men's Sins.

Editors of the Advocate: In my first number I showed that the patri-archs and Jews under Moses were pardoned and accepted of God, by believing and obeying the revelations God made known to them. Our Saviour told the Jews of his-day that if they were the children of Abraham

as they claimed they were, they would do the works of Abraham, or do as he did, believe and obey God's son. John viii: 39. Abraham did not, like the modern sects, tell God he did not know what he told him to do; whether to offer Isaac or one of his male servants; and secondly it was non-essential which of them he offered, or that he had told him to do more than he could do—as they tell him. What did John the Immerser tell the Jews of his day to do? Did he tell them to do what Abraham, Abel and Enoch did to obtain pardon of sins? No, he did not. Did he tell them to obey Moses' law for pardon of sins? No, he did not. Did he tell them, when they asked him what they should do, that they could do nothing to merit salvation, but to go and wait and hope for pardon of sins, and if they were God's elect, in due time he would speak peace to their souls, as I was told by the Old Virginia Baptist preachers to do; pray and seek and yet I could do nothing? No, he did not preach any such nonsense. Did he tell his myriads of inquirers to come to the altar of prayer; and let us kneel and wrestle in prayer, and command "God to come down now" and convert these sinners by his mighty power"? No, he did not. Did he say to his hearers, "have you an experience of grace on your heart? Yes. Then come forward and tell us your experience, and what the Lord has done for your soul." Are you "born again" of the Spirit "before faith" and without baptism? Yes; then you are a fit subject for baptism. Do you believe that your sins are forgiven you before baptism? Yes. I heard this ques-

tion asked the Hammond converts in this place not long ago, who joined the Baptist church, and they every one said yes they did. Did John the Immerser preach to regenerated sinners or to unregenerated sinners—which? Did he tell his hearers they were natural men, and that they could neither understand anything he said; nor do anything he preached to them, until they were born again? He did not tell them any such thing. Did he tell them that he was the successor of the old Jewish prophets; and that if they would come to him and whisper their sins into his ear and pay him so much money for it he would save them from purgatory? No. Such wickedness was not then invented. Did he say to his hearers; you are Abraham's children, as you know, and your fathers are in the church, and you are entitled to all the blessings of the Jewish church, on your parents' account, and baptism has come in the place of circumcision, therefore come to me and I will immerse you, because you are members of the Jewish church, and you have all experienced religion and the pardon of sins? No. No man sent from God as John was ever preached such falsehoods. Did he say, "do you not belong to some church and have you not sought and found religion? 'Yes.' Well then rise and shd't because you have found the salvation of your soul." Have you not got true faith and true repentance? Yes; then your sins are forgiven you, come forward and join the church. But did John tell them to do anything, and if he did, he was armenian, and cannot be saved by grace, but was

saved by works. His general instructions were to the great multitudes who flocked to him to hear him, Bring forth fruits, deeds, which will declare the honesty and sincerity of your repentance—and do not depend upon the piety of Abraham to save you, for they said that Abraham sat at the gates of hell and would not suffer any Israelite to go down to hell. His particular instructions to the people, to the masses, who said to him, what shall we do then? he that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food let him do likewise. The publicans came to him to be immersed and asked him, Master, what shall we do? He told them to exact no more than what was appointed them. They often extorted all that a man had; they were collectors of the public taxes. And the soldiers demanded of him, And what shall we do? And he said to them, do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be contented with your wages. And many other things in his exhortation preached he to the people. Luke iii: 1 to 22. Matthew iii: 6. Mark i: 1 to 10. John i: 1 to 38. These things were done in Bethabara beyond the Jordan where John was immersing. Thus this great man of God strenuously recommended the great duties of justice, humanity, charity and piety to his hearers. From these divine premises, I will now ask the preachers of the present day a few questions. Did not John preach faith in him who was to come, and repentance, and immersion as preparatory to the pardon of sins under the Messiah? Do you thus preach?

Did you do not, ate you a preacher sent from God" as was John & the Immerser? Is faith, repentance, and confession of sins and fruits and immersion, *faith alone*? If you preach, that sinners obtain pardon of sins by "faith alone" or by faith and repentance, do you not preach differently from John, and thereby preach what is false, consequently you are a false prophet, for a false prophet is a man who preaches *what is false*, contrary to what John preached. How many preachers who call themselves after John, preach, dress and live as did John the Immerser? Does not the word Do, which John used, kill your preaching as dead as a hammer? If your five Calvinistic points are true is there any pardon promised to the men who believe them? Can they be obeyed, as can the Gospel? Did John the Immerser who died before Jesus did, preach the Gospel, which Paul defines to be the death, burial and resurrection of Christ? 1 Cor. xv: 1 to 4. Did not John turn or convert the Jewish nation to God, and did you ever convert sinners to God as he did? Mat. iv: 6. Luke i: 16-17. Did not John die before the birthday of the church of Jesus Christ, and how then did his immersion bring his converts into a church, which did not exist till after his death? Acts ii. Did not Christ give the commission to the apostles to preach the gospel to all nations after the death of John, how then did he preach the gospel which he never heard, and which was given after his death? Will some "called and sent preacher" please answer these questions, and oblige

JACOB CREATH

Palmyra, Mo., August 13, 1874.

Plainness of the Word of God.

Bro. Bush wrote a most excellent article on this subject, page 701 of *Advocate*. We most heartily endorse his position. It is the only true rule of interpretation. The impression that all the passages of Scripture bearing on any given subject would leave on the unperturbed mind of an unprejudiced person is the true one. There is just one difficulty, that is to find the unprejudiced mind. Who with the practices of the churches of this age, can come with an unprejudiced mind to examine the subject of laying on of hands? Suppose a ten year old boy, with an unprejudiced but somewhat cultivated mind, were to read every passage of Scripture bearing on the subject of laying on of hands, what impression would they leave on his mind? He would find that every single case save two were specifically for conferring the miraculous gift of the Spirit. In these two, the object of laying on of hands is not mentioned, but manifestations of miraculous gifts follow immediately. What must be his conclusion? Who can doubt it? We have endeavored as nearly as possible to put ourselves in that position. Our conclusion when placed in that position, is certain. The force of habit, the former predilections and the universal practice of the churches make us doubt somewhat.

Bro. Bush says, "Any position that seems to detract from the plenary inspiration of Paul at any time of his ministry, is not in harmony with what is revealed in reference thereto."

We do not know exactly what our brother means by "plenary." If he

means he was fully inspired unto the work to which he was called, we fully agree with him. If he means, that he was fully inspired with all spiritual knowledge from the beginning of his ministry, we do not know where he finds any revelation teaching this idea.

Much of our ideas on the subject of inspiration, is preconceived opinion, not such as would come to an unprejudiced mind from reading all that relates to it in the Bible. We doubt if any prophet or apostle was continually under the impulse of the Spirit.

John says, I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day. This would indicate he was not at all times in the Spirit. This accords certainly with the impressions one would draw from the records concerning the prophets of olden time and of the apostles. The whole will of God was revealed to them in reference to the subject or duty assigned them. More than this we do not find. Much of the time they seem much as other mortals. James says Elijah was a man of like passions with us. They had truth revealed to them; then with a knowledge of the truth, were left to contend with their passions, prejudices and infirmities of other mortals. They sometimes did wrong. We doubt if Peter was in the Spirit when he dissembled.

We know of no revelation or intimation that Paul when a teacher and a prophet, possessed the plenary inspiration of an apostle. If Bro. Bush has any, we would be glad of it.

Sometimes persons think this is detracting from the authority of the Apostles, but the exact truth is what

will benefit the world and stop all carping infidelity and doubts. Let us then seek the truth just as it is, and cling to it.

D. L.

Is Faith Obedience ?

GOSPEL ADVOCATE: On page 329, brother Sewell says, (in answer to a query),

"He [God] has commanded us to believe; therefore faith is a part of our obedience to the Gospel. * * Faith is as much a matter of obedience as repentance or baptism."

1. Where is the command to believe?
2. Wherein is faith a matter of obedience?

The two propositions are one. But where is the command? I have sought it but have not found it. I find that "faith comes by hearing," but how it could possibly be a voluntary act I see not; and, unless faith be subject to the will, on what would God predicate a command to believe? Yet, though I should not be able to understand such a command and I yield I do not require the reason for it, if I but see the command, yet I could not believe voluntarily.

"God commands all men everywhere to repent." (i. e., reform.) There is a command, and it is pre-eminently *the command of God*.

Baptism is an ordinance. And though faith, repentance and baptism are, each and all, essential to the "making of Christians," they are essential, each in its own way.

Faith is the *primary necessity in order to salvation*; and baptism is

the divinely ordained instrumentality in order to salvation.

Faith is the product or effect of the evidence inherent in the divine testimony, and is the work of God: Repentance is the voluntary, rational virtuous work of man; and baptism is the act of both man and God—man returning himself to God in Christ, and God remitting man's sins in Christ, God with man and man with God uniting; consummating the only salvation from sin revealed in God's word for sinners.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believed not shall be damned."

DR. A. V. WRIGHT.

Devil's Bend, Wadeville, Navarro Co. Tex. Aug. 1st. 1874.

If Bro. Wright will read Acts 16, 31, where Paul and Silas were preaching to the Phillippian Jailer, he will find a positive command to believe. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Paul and Silas certainly spoke by inspiration, and therefore the command given on that occasion is the command of God. The passage quoted by our brother from the commission in the close of his article, makes faith a command. When Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized" it is in every way equivalent to a command, both as regards faith and baptism. And in carrying out this commission the apostles commanded both faith and baptism. See, as examples, Acts 2, 38, and 16, 31.

And when these apostles commanded these things by the inspiration of God, He himself commanded

them, and they are in every proper sense of that term, the commands of God. Then in John we have the following: "And this is his commandment; that we should believe on his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment." 1 John, 3, 23. Here is positive testimony again to the point, and in the very words asked for. But bro. Wright says faith is the work of God. So it is; but in what sense? Does God do the work himself, or has he ordained it for man to do?

We answer, the latter. When we do what God commands, we do his work, and not our own. When we repent, we do a work of God, and so with baptism. So when Christ represents faith as "the work of God," Jno. 6. 29, he only means that God ordained that men believe on his Son, and in doing this they do the work of God. Faith is a mental act performed by man; and is in some sense, as the Bible clearly shows, a voluntary act; one that in some way depends upon the will. When the apostles preached, some of the people believed, while others, in the same crowd, hearing the same things, and having the same opportunities, would not believe. Men can quietly consider the testimony of God's word and believe, or they can turn away their ears from it, and refuse to believe it as they may see proper.

When Paul preached at Athens, some believed, while others mocked. Yet all heard the same things. Man is therefore fully responsible for believing, and if he refuse it Jesus says he will be damned. The last two sentences of our brother, in attempt-

ing to assign the part that faith repentance and baptism perform are couched in unscriptural language. We suggest to him therefore that if he will speak of these things in Scriptural language, there will be no difficulty. But as he puts them, I cannot understand him: Peter says, "If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God." 1 Pet. 4, 11. If all who speak or write on the subject of religion would do this there would be no difficulty in being of the same mind, and all speaking the same things.

E. G. S.

Preachers' Families.

Are preachers required to sacrifice more for the Gospel, than others? I very much doubt it. I believe no preacher is required to neglect his own family to attend to the families of others.

I heard of a preacher the other day, whose family have lived on bread and water alone, for nearly a year past, simply because he was not paid for preaching. Nor could he send his children to school in the mean time, for the same reason. Now I do not believe that the Lord requires this at his hands. He has not required of me to preach to others, educate and build them up to the neglect of my own family, and when a preacher can not live, and properly educate his family by the Gospel, he should labor with his hands and be independent. It is a sin for the preacher to go round, and feast upon the good things of the land, while his wife, and children, live on bread and water. And the man who can consent to do

so, has not much of manhood, or of Christianity about him. He should preach every Lord's day, but six days he should devote to his family. I believe that the reason so many preachers' boys turn out badly, is owing to the fact, that the father neglects them, while he lectures, trains, and educates other boys. The first duty of any Christian lies at home.

J. T. POE.

Am I Baptized?

Brethren Editors: I appreciate the editors difficulty as to giving satisfaction in the disposition of queries. Yet, as Christian baptism is "the answer of a good conscience," that entire satisfaction might be given on this, seems to me not impossible. The difficulty is simply to show the law, or enlighten the conscience as to the act required.

God has proposed a covenant of peace and pardon to guilty mortals through the blood of his son Jesus. Baptism was appointed to declare the shedding of that blood—the death of the holy victim. (Where did you learn this. Bro. W.? E. G. S.) Hence it has become an essential article in the covenant of pardon. And is, on the part of the sinner, the consummation of the covenant.

Now if the sinner has been taught that God pardons without the covenant, or that the covenant is consummated without this violating act, the character of the covenant suffers in his mind; in the former, as to its essential fitness; in the latter, as to its divine integrity. In either case the blood of the covenant is disregarded.

The sinner is not made obedient to the form of the doctrine of Christ, nor is God honored as a perfect law-giver.

Still, it may be asked, do not the primitive Baptists and other religious parties requiring baptism as a condition to membership, hold it as a part of the Lord's plan of salvation? I answer No. They teach that salvation is before and without baptism—that it (baptism) is a "mere church ordinance" and has nothing to do with one's acceptance with God. In short, modern orthodoxy, generally, in the West, teaches that baptism is nothing between the soul and God, but a solemn essential between the individual seeking religious association and the sect that would secure his patronage. And the primitive Baptists even at their short remove from gospel simplicity, are not an exception. One may be a child of God, a Christian, according to their own admission, but he cannot enjoy Baptist association except he be baptized by Baptist hands. This is to exalt the Sectarian idea even at the expense of the divine ordinance. It degrades—displays the idea of obedience to God. And this is what gives efficacy to the act. To believe that God is in it and that he will reward him that thus seeks his favor, is that which validates the act; to believe that party privileges are in it and party favor secured by it is to invalidate it.

True, many individuals rise above the teachings of the religious parties by which they are surrounded, and exercise simple faith in the gospel, regardless of Sectarian notions. They believe, repent, and are baptized in

consequence of having been enlightened by the word of God. They may not know—probably don't care, what the peculiar views of "the church" (particular Sect) are as to any command. It is enough to them that God commands; it is their privilege, duty, pleasure to obey. To such faith, though it be not the most intelligent as to design, righteousness will be imputed. And such faith, we are happy to think, is often found among the Sects. Those exercising it become Christians in spite of false theories.

After all that has been said, our inquiring friends may insist there is still room for doubt. To such I would say, let it not longer be. Suffer not these unhallowed things to mar your peace of mind; "Perfect love casts out fear." The love of God is to do his commandments. If you doubt as to whether you have obeyed his command to be baptized, linger not in that doubt, but go at once and obey. It is only in this way that you can have the testimony of the Holy Spirit jointly with that of your own Spirit, that you are a child of God. It is only in this way that you can have the answer of a good conscience which the Scriptures teach as the gist of baptism.

J. R. WILMETH.

McKinney Tex. Aug, 10.

Church News.

Our Bro. Thos. J. Shaw held a meeting for us at Hebron commencing on the 2nd Lord's day in this month in our unfinished house. A large and listening congregation all through the week; closed on the

evening of the third. Baptized in all 9, 3 from the Baptists, one from the Presbyterians, and a lasting impression made on the minds of many good and true men and women. Bro. Shaw is a good and true man; a workman that needs not be ashamed. May the good Lord bless and preserve his profitable life long on the earth; although we differ in matters of opinion from him in some things yet we love him and love him much.

We learned from him, at Hebron, some noble thoughts that never before entered our hearts. Bro's Huffman, Denton and Mears have been with us some this year have had 3 or 4 additions through their labors; one by bro. Mears who had been on her bed for four years; had to haul her to the water; many said it would cause her death, but thank God she is now able to ride on horseback and is enjoying life happily. This is a very interesting case, wish we could speak of it more particularly.

Yours truly,

B.

Cainsville, Wilson Co. Tenn. Aug. 18th, 1874.

Brethren Lipscomb & Sewell: At the request of the Colored brethren at Philadelphia Church, we desire to announce through the ADVOCATE the success of a meeting held at that place embracing the first Lord's day in August.

The meeting began on Saturday, was conducted by brethren Womack and Smith (colored) of Lynchburg, Moore Co., Tenn. and resulted in seventeen additions by confession and baptism.

We had the pleasure of hearing these brethren, and think we have heard less gospel from men who have the name of being talented. They are now at McMinnville, where we trust the Lord may bless their labors.

Yours in Christ,

C. W. SEWELL, Jr.

Viola, Warren Co., Tenn. Aug. 8, 1874.

The above is the largest and most prosperous Colored congregation we know of anywhere in this section, outside of Nashville. We hope they will strive to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth.

E. G. S.

Dear Brethren: I am still going preaching "Christ and him crucified as the power and wisdom of God." Embracing the fourth Lord's day of July and first Lord's day of August in connection with bro. W. H. Dixon, we labored with the brethren at Swan Creek, Lincoln County. There were 34 accessions to the good cause. Arriving at home on Monday night after first Lord's day in August, found Bro. J. M. F. Smithson had arrived according to appointment, and was preaching at Antioch, (my home Cong.) He labored with us faithfully for seven days. There were 38 additions to the congregation during bro. Smithson's stay. We continued the meeting over second Lord's day in August, resulting in seven more accessions, making in all forty-five additions. O what cause we have to rejoice and thank God in seeing so many of our friends and neighbors, for whom we have labored and prayed, coming to Jesus. The

cause is onward, it will go on. We need not fear its enemies, the Lord save its friends from doing it harm. The Lord help us all, and to him be all the praise.

JAMES H. MORTON.

Berlin, Marshall Co. Tenn. Aug. 12th 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: Brethren W. N. Linton, G. Fergusson and myself, held a meeting on Willow Creek, Harris Co. Texas, commencing on last Thursday night. I left them on Monday. Up to that time there were eight additions to the Church of Christ. Meeting continued. On Monday I presented the claims of the ADVOCATE. Received six names, and \$12 at once.

Allow me to suggest to our brethren, the importance of putting into the hands of every member of the Church, good religious reading matter, and this can always be done at our retracted meetings with success. Brethren remember this.

Yours Fraternaly,

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville Texas, Aug. 11th, 1874.

The churches in Clark, Walton, Jackson and Grinnett Counties, Ga. are holding their annual meetings at this time—so far with good success. Numbers are coming into the kingdom of Christ. The Churches seem to be alive to the work. Prospects bright and brightening for a glorious Harvest.

Yours in hope of Eternal life,

A. J. MCGAUGHEY.

Monroe, Walton Co. Ga.

The brethren at Roan's Creek in Carroll County held a series of meetings commencing on Saturday before the 1st Lord's day in August. Up to Wednesday following about sixteen were added to the Church. Two, by letter, two reclaimed. Three previously baptized by Methodists and Baptists. The remainder by confession and baptism. The meetings still continued. Bros. T. G. Scott and John Johnson the week previous had baptized nine at a point in Benton County, not far from Hollow Rock Station, we believe.

At a series of meetings of the neighbors and friends at a new meeting House in White's Bend, eight miles from Nashville, during the last week of July, four persons confessed Christ and were baptized.

D. L.

Embracing the second Lord's day of August, we held a meeting at Philadelphia meeting house, in Warren Co. Tennessee, which continued seven days and resulted in 14 additions to the army of the faithful. The brethren of that congregation were much encouraged, and we had the pleasure of meeting with a number of young preachers at this meeting, just beginning the work of proclaiming the glorious gospel of Christ. Bro. J. L. Sewell was present, and added much to the interest of the meeting. There is a large congregation of members at this place, and they are exerting a good influence upon the community.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: I have just

returned home from Damascus Church, about 9 miles from Guntown, Miss., where Bro. W. H. Stewart of Utica, Miss., was holding a few days' meeting. Bro. Stewart is surely a good workman, such as need not be ashamed; the way he uses the old Jerusalem blade, it cannot help but cut. He puts the sharp edge in front all the time, and the only way to shun its wounds and fall victims to it, is to run out of reach. Bro. S. did the preaching and I did the baptizing—the result was 13 additions to the Lord's army, viz: two took membership, one restored, four from the Baptists, (one of them re-baptized) and seven by confession and baptism. "O, praise the Lord, all ye nations: praise him, all ye people.

Yours in the one faith,

T. A. J. WADE.

Near Molino, Miss., Aug. 14, 1874.

Dear Bro. David: On the second Lord's day in August Bro. W. H. Cooke and myself began a meeting near Dr. Kidder's on Murfreesboro and Lebanon pike, five miles from the latter place. We were joined, on Monday night, by Bro. W. C. Huffman. Together we labored for several days. Nine became obedient to the faith. Aided by the wise counsel of Bro. Huffman these additions, with nearly all the scattered sheep of the old Mount View flock, some 34 in all, came together and made new and solemn covenant with each other, and the Lord, to meet each Lord's day and keep the ordinances. I have never seen brethren and sisters more in earnest, than these seem to be. It will rejoice the friends of the Cause to know that

these brethren who have been so long in a disorganized condition are now in the bond of peace. May the blessing of the Lord rest on them. I am more than ever attached to Bro. Huffman. He shows himself ready for any emergency. To the murmuring he would repeat the words of Christ, "When ye stand praying, forgive if you have aught against any, that your father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses." To the contentious he would say with emphasis: "*Bury the tomahawk and the handle will rot.*" I feel sad to think that the sickle must soon fall from the tremulous grasp of this old reaper; he is now over 70.

G. LIPSCOMB.

La Guardo, Tenn., Aug. 18, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: Please report 41 accessions since my last. One at Lavergne, one at Old Center, thirty-five at Sam's Creek, two at Riggs X Roads and two at Lilly Hill. Let the Lord be praised.

W. F. TODD.

Goodlettsville, Aug. 20, 1874.

Death of O. L. Randolph.

Bros L. & S.: It is with sorrow that I announce to you the death of Bro. C. L. Randolph, President of Waters and Walling College. He was attacked by billious fever attended by inflammation of bowels, which resisting the skill of two of the best physicians of our town, and after the most intense suffering on the part of Bro. R., ended in mortification and death, August 7, 1874.

Bro. Randolph was born near New

Market, Alabama, in 1830, of poor parents, and having lost his father before he was grown, was early taught the lesson of self-reliance. At an early age he began school-teaching, and about 1851 commenced preaching. My impression is that he made his first effort at a discourse at Liberty, Marshall County. As his means would permit he would attend college, and thus add at intervals to his stock of knowledge. Finally, in 1855 he graduated at Bethany, Va.

In 1856 he was married to Maggie F. Moore, of Marshall county, who now mourns as only a wife can, the removal of the stay and comfort of her life. Let us "weep with those who weep."

During the war Bro. R. entered the Southern army as a private soldier, but was soon made a Quartermaster, and by successive promotions, reached almost the highest rank in this department.

On his return from the army he again began to teach and to preach. But supposing the Law offered fairer prospects of making money he entered that profession at Shelbyville, and followed it long enough to find himself pecuniarily embarrassed (for his partner) and the calling incompatible with his feelings of responsibility as a teacher of Christianity. Hence he returned again to the school-room and preached as much as opportunity allowed.

His ability as a teacher needs no encomium from my hand. His preaching was of that plain, modest, pathetic character peculiar to a man of no ambition for fame nor desire to wound the feelings of opposers. No man

teem of a community than did Bro. Randolph for the time (ten months) of his sojourn here. He leaves four children, one an infant, to buffet the storms of life without his paternal care.

But he is gone—cut off in the prime of life, in the midst of increasing usefulness, while we bow our heads to the will of an inscrutable Providence and in "sack-cloth and ashes" cry "not my will but thine be done." Our loss is his gain. We mourn not as those without hope.

I. N. JONES.

McMinnville, Tenn.

Habits Good and Bad.

There are a few habits which form a pretty good foundation for success in life and insure the friendship of the discerning and virtuous. First among these we would place the habit of self-help. This may and should be formed in a child before it can walk or talk, by providing resources for its amusement, and leaving it, within due bounds, to depend upon those resources. Then as it grows older it should be taught and gently compelled to perform in its own behalf all that it can do. Few of us but know young men and women perfectly helpless for all the ordinary uses of life. If they alone were the sufferers it wouldn't matter much, but they are social leeches, always demanding service and never rendering it. Good husbands, good wives, good parents, rarely, if ever, are found in this class of people. Next in importance to the habit of self-help we would place that of personal tidiness. We do not care to guess

How many American men and women sit down to breakfast every morning with their toilets half made, the men without collar or cravat, and the women with unkempt hair, and the children resembling the parents in dress as much as in feature. "But you see there are so many things to do in the morning—stock to feed, cows to milk, fires to make, milk to skim, children to dress, breakfast to get—that one can't spend much time fixing themselves up." All very true; but one doesn't go round bare-footed in the morning, or without washing face and hands, because a habit the reverse of all that has been formed. "My hair is combed in the morning for all day before I leave my chamber," said an elegant house-keeper the other day, and she keeps no girl. That "cleanliness is next to godliness," should be early and deeply impressed on every child and it should be taught to shrink from uncleanness and untidiness as it shrinks from vice.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

Obituaries.

Died July 15th 1874 near Molino Miss, my dear little nephew, C. H. Tate (son of Bro. and sister—John and Amanda Tate) age 8 months and 19 days.

Sweet Little Homer awoke from sleep early fourth Lords day morning June 28th. with all the beauty and sweetness of life—cooing to its Pa and ma making their hearts rejoice in its presence—but alas—before noon same day the fatal hold of cholera infantum came upon innocent Babe and, the next Wednesday the third day after the destroyer's visit—about noon—the Spirit of the Babe went to God who gave it, there to be cared for by the lover of little Children (Blessed Jesus) to await the final resurrection of the Just—when it will rise to join a convoy of angels to meet Jesus in the air—to sing praise to God and the lamb forever.

May God help us all to make use of his appointed means and so live that we may rise

in that day with an incorruptible, immortal body like to the glorious image of the Lord Jesus Christ.

J. A. J. WADE.

NEAR MOLINO, MISS.

Fell asleep in Jesus. July 25, sister Mary Elizabeth Walker, at the residence of her husband, in Williamson County Tenn. Sister Walker was nearly 24 years of age, when she was carried off by that terrible destroyer of our race, consumption. She lingered and suffered a good while, and bore her suffering with much fortitude and patience. She was a kind and faithful wife, and a tender and loving mother, a good neighbor, and an industrious and economical house-keeper. She was favored with the possession of many of those social qualities, that endeared her closely to the affections of her friends and acquaintances.

She was for a number of years a member of the church of God, and died in a full enjoyment of a lively hope of a blissful immortality. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, yea saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." She leaves a husband and two children, to mourn their loss of her. But they mourn not without hope. So farewell till the last trump shall sound.

E. G. S.

Died at her residence, Wilson Co. Tenn. Sister Mary P. Waters, after an illness of near four weeks. She suffered greatly, yet seemed to have no expectation that she would die, her companion who was ever watchful, thought two hours before her death that she was better than she had been for some time. Yet she passed over the river in such haste that her friends and companion could hardly believe that she had passed over and left them and her three little children to miss her motherly love and care which was unsurpassed.

We have great confidence to believe that the sweet sleep which she has gone to take, will refresh her weary soul from the many cares and troubles of earth.

We will miss her at Bellwood, but when we consider she has gone up to fill a seat in the church of the First-born above, it gives us consolation. Sister Mary was born Oct. 14th 1832, married to G. W. Waters Dec. 2nd 1851, died May 23rd, 1874.

Sister Waters had lived a strict member of the Church of Christ for twenty odd years; she died as she had lived, a soldier of the cross.

S. H. PATE.

BELLWOOD, WILSON CO. TENN. JULY. 3, 1874.

One by one like Autumn leaves we fall. We are called upon to mourn the loss of our venerable and aged bro. Dempsey soon, who was

born Dec. 29, 1790, died June 10th 8 A. M. 1874. For many years he lived a consistent member of the Baptist church. In 1856 or 7, he heard a series of discourses, by bro. Jesse Sewell, and becoming convinced that he had learned the way of the Lord more perfectly--he united with the Christian church at this place and lived and died in the full triumphs of the Christian's faith--although so far advanced in years, he would often walk in to prayer-meeting on Thursday-night, a distance of two miles. Summers heat nor Winters cold was not sufficient to keep him from the Lords house on Lord's day. Not long before his death he asked for his Bible; taking it in his hand he folded it to his heart and kissed it; saying once more before his departure he wanted to look upon and embrace the priceless treasure--for it had been to him a source of great pleasure in his declining years,--he gave me the text from which to preach his Funeral sermon. Luke xxiii. 28. He was loved and respected by all who knew him--his children and grand children, nursed, watched over and cared for him with all the tenderness and affection that human hearts could bestow.

But he has fallen like a ripe sheaf. He was ready--and while we weep and sorrow for the good old man, who so often had words of encouragement for us in our efforts to preach, so often encouraged us by his presence. Still we rejoice that he died in the full assurance of faith--we know that he has gone to rest--and if we hold out faithful as he did, will meet him in heaven.

E. B. CAYCE.

FRANKLIN TENN, JUNE, 28, 1874.

Another soldier has gone to her reward, Mrs. Mary Ann Milliken. She was the daughter of R. H. and M. B. Kirk, and the wife of Jas T. Milliken, Born July 6th. 1852, and died May 7th 1873. She was a good woman. She was not inclined to speak evil of any one. She was obedient, kind, generous-hearted both to parents and husband, and to all.

She leaves a husband and one little girl of 18 months, a father, brothers and sisters to mourn their loss of her. But their loss is her gain. She obeyed the Lord, lived right and fell asleep in Jesus.

Her illness was short, and her sufferings were severe, but she bore it with Christian fortitude.

She was in her right mind to the last moment and asked me to weep not for her, but to go on and meet her where parting is no more. She said she had no fears in dying.

A few minutes before she departed she pulled her little girl to her and kissed her, and locking up said, I wish I had breath to tell you what I see! She then said,

"Farewell, farewell to all below,
My Savior calls, and I must go!"

and in a few moments expired without a struggle.

JAMES T. MILLIKEN.

HENRYVILLE, TENN., AUG. 10, 1874.

Brethren L. & S: Another veteran soldier of the cross has closed his earthly mission. Bro. John Chapman of Lynnville Giles Co Tenn. He died on the 12th inst. of heart disease, aged about 58 years, had been a member of the Church of Christ about twenty years. He left a wife and eight children besides a number of brethren, sisters and friends to mourn his loss. He bore his affliction with patience and fortitude, spoke often and freely of his departure to his friends, and especially to some of his own family who are out of Christ, admonishing them to turn to God.

The Congregation at Lynnville has lost one of its most zealous members, earnest workers and pious brothers. To his bereaved wife and children we say, grieve not as those who have no hope, he cannot come to you, but continue faithful in well doing until death, and you can go to him where parting is no more, where God will wipe away all tears, and grief is unknown.

So then brethren and sisters let us all so live and act that when we come to die, that we may die as did our brother, in the triumphs of a living faith, for it is sweet to die with Jesus nigh, the Rock of our salvation.

H. J. SPIRY.

LYNNVILLE, AUG. 16, 1874.

Died, July 16th. 1874, in Harris Co. Texas, John T. son of Capt. H. W. and S. D. Whitefield. Deceased was born in Maury Co. Tenn. July 28th 1851, where many of his relations still reside.

J. T. P.

Making Things Right.

Nothing is settled permanently until it is settled right. Shifts, concealments, subterfuges, and evasions amount to nothing. A wrong may be apologized for, defended, endorsed, covered up, lied about, daubed over, winked at, or silently endured; but so long as it exists, there is trouble in store. Build your house as big as you like, if there is a wrong in the foundation you have put powder under the whole concern. While that is there, nothing can make the

structure safe. By and by the spark will find the train, and then comes an explosion, and the whole mass goes hurtling through the air.

From every wrong decision there lies an appeal. It may be conscience; it may be to the world at large; it may be to impartial men; it may be to posterity and to distant ages; or it may be to the Righteous Judge upon the Great White Throne. However the matter be stifled, smoothed over, or misrepresented, every wrong not righted, will come up, and keep coming up; or, if buried out of human sight, the resurrection trump will call it forth at last, when God shall bring every work into judgment, whether it be good or whether it be evil.

A wrong made right, confessed, repented of, and repaired, is done with, and done with forever; but a matter decided wrongly, by craft, or trickery, or guile, follows on and on until God shall settle it at the tribunal of ultimate resort, whence no appeal shall be possible or needful. Let us search and try to mend our ways, and let us be more anxious to do right by others, than to wrangle with them for the rights we claim. Time is short. Eternity is just before us. How soon will all the vexing trifles of this world pass away; how soon shall the suffering, trusting ones receive a full and great reward. No matter what we suffer, if all is right on our part. No matter how we prosper; all is vain if our wrongs are left to be settled at the Judgment day. Have we cleared ourselves of everything which shall bring down that wrath which is revealed from Heaven against all un-

righteousness of men? If not, let us make haste, for we cannot do it too soon.—*Selected.*

Correction.

Read—Peter, and John, left Samaria, *before*, Philip did.

AD. No. 30, makes me say—Peter left Samaria, *after* John did.

W. T. BUSH.

Dear Brethren: I take pleasure in correcting a report in regard to Mars Hill Academy *Bro. Larimore has not sold out* as reported but expects a larger and better school than ever next session.

Having no connection with the school now, I can speak freely—and I can most heartily commend Mars Hill Academy as a first class school—and to those having sons or daughters to educate we say send them to Mars Hill—if you wish them educated for time and eternity.

W. Y. TAYLOR.

Florence Ala. Aug. 13th. 1874.

CHOLERA.

Dr. John Murray, Inspector General of Hospitals in England, and late of Bengal, has written a book on Cholera based on forty years' experience in India, which has been republished by the Putnams. He divides the disease into three stages, and ascribes it the presence of cholera poison in the system. The first stage is *malaise*, which is frequently unnoticed by the patient, and indeed does not differ from the symptoms caused by over-excitement, fatigue, depression, etc.

It is only when the patient has been exposed to the cholera infection that these symptoms should be considered signals of danger. Improper food over-fatigue and purgative medicine (especially the last) tend to develop the second stage, which is a watery diarrhoea, purging, and varies in duration from two or three hours to two or three days. It is at this stage that infection is communicated. The remedy prescribed is composed of opium, black-pepper and assafœtida, made up in five-grain pills. These pills are used all over India, and distributed to the troops. Dr. Murray says that astringents are useless, and chalk, and capsicum, camphor in alcohol, etc., unreliable. The only safe solid food is farinaceous, such as bread, arrowroot, etc. The last stage is that of collapse, which is divided into incipient, confirmed and final collapse. To this Dr. Murray devotes much space, discussing symptoms and recommending remedies and methods of treatment. In the last phase the powers of voluntary life are very low, and those of involuntary life paralyzed. There is little hope of recovery, and no remedy upon which reliance can be placed.

Consultation Meeting.

Bros. L. & S: Please publish the following :

I am authorized by the action of the Elders and Congregation of Disciples worshipping at Murfreesboro Tenn., to state, that a consultation meeting will be held, the Lord willing, at said place, commencing Friday before second Lord's day in October. We expect to make arrangements for

reduced fare on the different roads, persons would probably travel, and all God's people are respectfully and cordially invited to meet and participate with us in our deliberations. *Christian Examiner Va., Christian Weekly Ala., Christian Standard and Review Cincinnati, and Apostolic Times Ky.,* please copy.

G. W. ABELL,
Pastor Christian Church Murfreesboro.

To The Little Folks. No. 12.

Uncle Joe was travelling; the weather was excessively hot. He stopped about noon, under the shade of some trees, by the side of a running brook, to cool and rest himself and team. While reclining upon the grass a young man came down to where he was, to gather some wild grapes. A few days previous, there had been a fight near that place, in which a man was shot. Uncle Joe asked this young man what the fight was about. He replied that he did not know, and that he did not want to know. Said he had not been in that section of country many days.

Uncle Joe concluded he was a prudent young man.

Have you just arrived in Texas :
Uncle Joe asked.

"No ; I have been in the State several years."

In what part have you resided ?

"First in Parker and then in Hood County."

In what part of of Hood ?

"Six miles above Grandbury, on the Brazos river."

How far from Thorp's Springs ?

"Three miles."

What kind of a Country is that."

"It is a splendid country, another sort better than this about here. My father lives there now."

What is your father's name?

"Brewer."

There is a good large college at Thorp's Springs is there not?

"Yes, there is a very good college there. It is a Campbellite College. I don't like the Campbellite doctrine?"

What sort of doctrine is it?

"They teach that if a man will repent and say he believes Jesus Christ is the Son of God and be baptized he will be saved. That is all that is necessary."

Did you ever hear one of them say that was all that is to be done?

"Yes. I heard a Campbellite preacher, down here by Cleborne, preach that all a man had to do was to repent and say he believed Jesus Christ was the Son of God and be baptized and he would go to heaven whether he ever does anything else or not."

He must have been a sort of a crazy man. What was his name?

"His name was Keeney. Do you know him?"

I have heard him preach, but he was not in one of his crazy spells when I heard him. He spoke very sensibly. He said that a man must believe with all the heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that he must repent and be baptized in order to the remission of sins, and then be faithful in all works of righteousness as long as he lives; and after death he would receive the reward of the faithful in Christ Jesus.

"Do you know Bantau?"

Yes.

"He is a smart man. But I don't like the Campbellite doctrine. Whenever I profess religion I mean to join the church that I profess in. I think every one ought to do that."

If a man should profess religion in the Campbellite church ought he not to join that church?

"I don't like the Campbellite doctrine; and that is the reason I don't like the Campbellite College at Thorp's Springs."

They don't teach the peculiarities of their religion in that College, do they, unless to some one requesting, it?

"Yes, they do."

Did you ever hear any one who sent to that College say they taught Campbellism to the students?

"Yes."

Who was it?

"Mr. Carpenter."

Well, my opinion is, that, if Mr. Carpenter said that, he does not know what Campbellism is.

"Do you belong to the Campbellite church?"

No. I never saw a Campbellite, that I know of.

It is remarkable what great prudence and wisdom we exercise concerning temporal matters, compared to what we do in religious. Now here was a young man exercising quite commendable prudence in relation to the fight. He did not know or care to know anything concerning it. It was other people's business, in which he did not wish to be concerned. But concerning the teachers at the College and their brethren, he claimed to know more than was true; and upon his false knowledge had formed his judgment; and a very unfavorable judgment at that.

UNCLE JOE.

Laura's Self-Denial.

Laura sat in the pleasant parlor of her home by her mother's side, busily at work on a pair of slippers, which she was embroidering as a birth-day present for her father. The day was not far distant, and every moment that could be spared from school and study was devoted to the slippers, that they might be done in time; for to have them finished a day too late, she thought, would spoil the pleasure of giving them. Just at this moment her work dropped into her lap, and her hand fell idly upon it, while her great brown eyes were fixed intently upon the little coal fire, which, though it was Spring, still burned in the grate. Her mother watched her a few moments in silence, and then, knowing Laura's anxiety, said pleasantly, "Don't be discouraged, daughter; the slippers will be done in time, if you are industrious."

Laura started and smiled a little as she replied. "Oh! it was not that, mamma; but I was thinking about Maggie Leigh. We were going past the confectioner's to-day, and I asked her to go in with me and buy some candy, and she said she was not going to eat any candy till next month. I asked her why, and she said it was for *self denial*; and then little Nelly James said she had put away all her dolls, and was not going to play with them for several weeks. And they asked me what I was going to do, and I said I didn't know; but mamma, what is there I could do for self-denial? You know the Bible says we must deny ourselves."

"I should be very glad to have you practice self-denial, my dear," replied her mother; and I do not think you will have to search far for opportunities of doing so. Our daily lives afford a great many more than we are apt to take advantage of; but what would you like to do, Laura?"

"Why, mother, if I had something fixed—some one thing, it would seem like doing so much more than just the things that come along in our lives."

"But it is just those things that God means as opportunities for self-denial, my child," answered the mother; "and it will not do to pass by the work which he gives us, to pick out something which we think we should like better. God constantly sets before us the two ways of pleasing him or pleasing ourselves; and when these two things come in conflict, there is the opportunity for self-denial. Suppose you take to-morrow, and watch for such opportunities, and if you do not find at least one *cross*, then perhaps it may be time to make one for yourself; but depend upon it, the self-denials which God makes for us are far more *real* than those we can make for ourselves."

The next day it was Saturday, and Laura's first thought on awaking was what a nice time she should have to work on her slippers. She also questioned what there could be in the course of the day in which she could deny herself.

Soon after breakfast, she had settled herself comfortably at work, and the slippers were progressing finely, when a gentle, but feeble voice was heard calling, "Laura!"

"What, grandma?" answered Laura in just that tone of voice which shows that the speaker did not wish to be disturbed. The voice, which was that of Laura's blind grandmother, proceeded:

"It is so nice and pleasant that

grandma thinks she would like to little walk and call on old Mrs. Williams; could you take me, dear?"

Laura knew that her grandmother walked very slowly, and that her calls, like most old people's, were apt to be long; and with the thought of her slippers, and the few days that remained to her she answered rather fretfully. "Why, yes, I suppose I can, but then I do so wish to finish my slippers, grandma; couldn't you take Willie?"

"Willie has gone fishing," replied the old lady; "but never mind my dear if you are busy I dare say I can go some other time."

Laura was just preparing to go on with her work, when, lifting her eyes, she met her mother's fixed upon her with a look which called the quick blush to her cheek in a moment.

"Oh, mother," she stammered, "I remember, but I did not expect it would be such a thing as this I should have to do. But I can go, of course," she went on rather dismally; "only I am sure I do not see how my slippers are to get finished." And she rose as she spoke.

"The Lord loveth the cheerful giver," Laura," said her mother gravely.

Laura went to her grandmother with a little cloud upon her brow; self-denial was harder than she had expected. But she struggled hard against her dissatisfaction, and the sun shone so brightly, and the old lady seemed so pleased and gratified, and the walk seemed to do her so much good, that Laura found that there was a pleasure in it after all, and really enjoyed it herself.

Laura came back and sat down

happily to her work again, and by the time dinner was reado, she found both hands and eyes pretty tired, and she made such progress that she resolved to put it by for awhile and amuse herself in some other way. Her father had just purchased a stereoscope with beautiful views. She now remembered it, and had just begun to examine with great pleasure the lovely pictures, when a note was handed in at the front door from one of her young friends, saying she was ill, and asking Laura to take her class in the sewing-school that afternoon.

Laura was already tired of sewing that day; like most young girls she did not like plain sewing, and a sewing-school is certainly a school of patience. Then she thought of the beautiful stereoscope. But Laura remembered the lesson of the morning; she was really desirous of doing right, and after a little struggle with herself, she sent an answer that she would go.

"Well, my daughter," said her mother that night, as she stopped in Laura's room on her to her own, "you have not found it necessary to search very far for occasions of self-denial to-day have you?"

"No, indeed mamma," answered Laura; "the difficulty was, that when they came I was so unwilling to meet them. I found it much harder than I expected."

"It is not easy for any of us," replied her mother; "but it becomes easier by habit, like everything else, and if you pray for grace to help, you will not ask in vain. *Great* opportunities for the exercise of this grace are not often given; it is the little, daily acts of giving up of self, that purify the character and make it

Christlike; and God takes care that we shall never be without these occasions. But how many of us, professing to be his, shrink from the daily discipline; how many turning from the cross he offers, choose one for ourselves?"—*Child at Home.*

The Sewing-Goblin.

The young mother of a family said to me not long ago; "I feel as if my sewing were a goblin that chases me by day and haunts me by night." She looked pale and tired, and as if she had the neuralgia. How I pitied her. But when I saw that she was covering her little boy's Jacket with soutache embroidery and that her baby's dress had a dozen tucks in it, I pitied her still, but it was because she seemed to me the victim of a strange infatuation. She really felt as if these things were necessary for her children. It could not have been because either child was healthier, happier, or better on account of them, but because "everybody else has them." And so she would spend hours upon hours in a stooping, unhealthy posture, injuring herself in every way, and depriving her little ones of the real help and joy that she might have been giving them,—to what end? that the next mother of a family who saw her children might say; "No one wears plain clothing now; I must embroider my boy's blouse and my girl's dress." And there would be another victim, for whom my friend would be partly responsible. Now I would not be understood to say that there is absolutely no beauty or charm about these delicate little adornings. They certainly are pretty, and we cannot help liking them. But what I do say

is that in most cases we pay for them incalculably more than they are worth. They have none of that high, noble beauty which makes the works of nature and those of true art an inspiration and a joy. It is a conventional prettiness, arising chiefly, if not wholly, from the mere evidence that hours of labor have been spent upon them. But for this we sacrifice the freshness and the vigor that would come from spending some of those hours in the open air?—the mental strength and treasure that we might gain by giving some of those hours to thought and study?—*Chicago Advance.*

It is a good and safe rule to sojourn in every place as if you meant to spend your life there, never omitting an opportunity of doing a kindness or speaking a good word or making a friend. Seeds thus sown by the wayside often bring forth an abundant harvest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Supposed contradictions in the Bible...	791
Reply to Bro. I. N. Jones.....	793
Only one way to pardon Men's sins.....	796
Plainness of the word of God.....	798
Is faith Obedience?.....	799
Preachers' families.....	801
Am I Baptized?.....	801
Church News.....	802
Death of C. L. Randolph.....	805
Habits Good and Bad.....	806
Obituaries	807
Making things Right.....	808
Correction.....	809
Cholera.....	809
Consultation Meeting.....	810
To the Little Folks.....	310
Laura's Self-Denial.....	812
The Sewing Goblin.....	814

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 35.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SEPT. 3, 1874.

THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY
SPIRIT.

I have often heard the question asked, What is the sin against the Holy Ghost? To my mind this is plain, when we look at the facts as they are recorded in the New Testament.

The Savior says, "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Math. 12: 31-32. Now the reader will be careful to notice that this sin is to be committed by speaking, "Whosoever speaks" &c. Now turn to the 7th Chapter of John, 37, 38, 39th verses, in the last day, the great day of the feast &c. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given because Jesus was not yet

glorified. Now it is plain to be seen from that Scripture that a man could not sin against the Holy Ghost when the Savior was here in person for says he the Holy Ghost is not yet given. And it was not yet given because Jesus was not glorified. Now when the Savior is glorified, then we may look for the descent of the Holy Ghost and not before.

The Savior said "if ye love me, keep my commandments and I will pray the Father and he will send you another comforter that he may abide with you forever." John 14: 16. "Howbeit when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he shall not speak of himself but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak and will show you things to come." John 16: 13. Now we learn from the Scriptures that the Holy Ghost is to be a hearing Spirit, and a speaking Spirit and his coming is conditioned on the glorification of the Savior. Now if we can find when Jesus was glorified, then we may begin to look for the Holy Ghost to come. Turn to the 24th chapter of Luke 51st verse, "And it came to pass while he bless-

ed them he was parted from them and carried up into heaven." Now we have him glorified, now we may look for the Holy Ghost. Now turn to the 2nd chapter of Acts of the Apostles. There we find that the Holy Ghost did come and did confirm the fact that Jesus was the Christ, 36th verse. Now to deny that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is sinning against the Holy Ghost.

Now for the proof, turn your attention to the 13th chapter of Acts of the apostles and 8, 9 and 10th verses and you will see that Elymus sinned against the Holy Ghost. Again, 1st John 3rd & 4. We see that sin is the transgression of the Law. The Savior commanded his apostles to "go into all the world and teach the Gospel to every creature, he that believes and is baptized shall be saved. Now faith in the Son of God and repentance, confession and baptism in the name of Father Son and Holy Ghost is the law of pardon to the alien sinner. This was confirmed on the day of Pentecost. Acts 2: 38. God has joined all these together for the remission of sins. And whatsoever God has joined together, let no man put asunder. Now when a man accepts one of these conditions and refuses or neglects the rest, and teaches men so, that man is sinning against the Holy Ghost. Again in his 1st letter to the Thessalonian brethren 5: 19. Paul commanded them not to quench the Spirit. The word quench means to put out, to extinguish, to destroy. Again Peter says that it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness than after they have known

it to turn from the Holy commandment delivered unto them. If a disciple of Christ should become dissatisfied with his conversion and turn away and join the Sects and says he gets religion according to the mourners bench system, he has quenched the Spirit, he has turned from the Holy commandment and has put out the light of the Gospel, and has put Christ to an open shame. I could write more on this subject, but I think this is enough at present. May God help us to live in obedience to his holy commandments.

JOHN H. McDONALD.

Brethren do themselves and the truth great injury by making special applications of these general truths of the Bible. The foregoing article in its general position about the sin against the Holy Spirit is correct. It could not be committed before the Spirit came. It was committed only after he had come. It could be committed so soon as he came, and doubtless was often so committed. But there was no one then denying that baptism is for remission of sins. Then that could not have been the sin against the Holy Spirit, neither were there Sects to join or mourners benches to go to. Denying it under some circumstances may be a sin against the Holy Spirit; so may many other offences be a sin against the Holy Spirit. Any rejection of the teaching of the Holy Spirit willfully persisted in, amounts to the unpardonable sin it seems to me. If the simple error spoken of in the preceding article constituted the sin against the Holy Spirit none who hold it could ever repent and be saved.

Let us never interpret a great and living truth of the Bible by the light of a temporary and local error. It does violence to the word of God. The sin could be committed by acting as well as speaking.

D. L.

THE PURE HEART; WHAT IS IT?

In the sermon on the Mount, Jesus said; "blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Matt. 5, 8. Many speak of a pure heart as if it were a kind of abstract something, that could exist outside of any church relations, or any acts of obedience to the word of God. Hence we often hear the expression, "if the heart is right, it does not matter about the outward acts of obedience." "If a man's heart is right it does not matter whether he has been baptized or belongs to the church or not, it will all be right with him." Such are the common ejaculations of many religious people. By this they certainly mean that a pure heart may be obtained and kept, independent of any outward acts of obedience. Hence the idea of many is, that we can have "the substance o' religion, without the form;" that is, without any *particular* form. Any *form*, or no form at all will do, according to these claims. There is a tendency in religious society to do away with all forms of religion and to seek after something that is called heart or soul communication with God direct, without the intervention of any forms or specific acts of obedience. The tendency of all this, is to turn men away from the word of God, to follow some imaginary monitor, that is supposed to impress and lead men.

Upon this principle, believer's baptism has been exchanged for infantrantism, and baptism itself changed into rantism, and finally baptism has come to be called a nonessential, and thus virtually set aside, for something merely imaginary. The time has never been, when God proposed to guide and save men merely by some inward monitor, or some kind of sanctimonious musing or meditation upon God, and his holiness and goodness. True, it is well for people to meditate much upon the mercy and goodness of God; but this alone will never save them. King Saul would have been insulted no doubt had he been told that his heart was not right, when he was saving out the best of the sheep and in order to make a sacrifice to the Lord his God; for he claimed that this was the design in saving them. But when it came to the test, all his good desires of sacrificing to the Lord were disregarded, and he was rejected for not doing just what the Lord commanded him to do. The Lord from this time forward abandoned him, refused the kingdom to him, and chose David, and would no longer communicate with Saul. Hence he went to the witch of Endor for information, and finally died in ignominy and disgrace. God will smile upon none who disregard his word, no matter what their claims of pure hearts, or *hearts right* may be.

Saul knew perfectly what God commanded, and yet he deliberately did something else. No man's heart is right in the sight of God who acts this way. A pure heart, one that is right in the sight of the Lord, always trembles at his word—is always willing to do just what he says. And

whenever such an one decides to do something else besides what God has commanded, and to leave undone that which God has required, that very moment that man's heart becomes impure—becomes rebellious in the right of God, like king Saul's also did. And as Saul was rejected for his course, so those who do similar things now may expect similar treatment at the hands of God.

An humble and pure heart is always ready to hear what God says, and do exactly what God requires. Caleb and Joshua were men of pure hearts. Their hearts were *right* in the sight of God. They yielded implicit obedience to the things God required. In consequence of this they were spared through forty years wandering, and were permitted finally to cross the river Jordan and enter into the promised land. It was not so with the other Jews which came out of Egypt at the same time. They did what was right in their own eyes, as Moses told them; but this happened not to be right in the sight of God. Consequently they died outside of the Holy Land—died a miserable death, wandering and dragging out their lives in a dreary, waste country. This was the end of doing what seemed right in their own eyes. Even Moses and Aaron lost the privilege of entering into the land of Canaan, because their hearts were not right in the sight of God. They did not yield themselves to do just what God required, but did that which seemed good in their own eyes. Consequently the Lord chose their delusion, and sent their fear upon them. So they found when it was too late, that their hearts

were right only when they were willing to follow to the very letter what God had said. Just so soon as they set out to do what seemed right in their own eyes, they brought ruin upon themselves. But it was not so with Abraham. His heart was always right. He was at all times willing to do just what God commanded no matter what it was, or how great a sacrifice it might cost him. At one time, he had to leave his country and his kindred, and come out into a strange land to him; but he conferred not with his own personal interest: he obeyed, and went out, not knowing whither he went. At another time he was called upon to make of his own Son, Isaac, a burnt offering to the Lord. At this demand he faltered not, but went forward at once to do the thing required. And had not the Lord interfered, the command would in one moment more have been completely obeyed. When God commanded, Abraham never stopped to consider what might seem right in his own eyes, but was ever ready to yield himself entirely to the will of God. Nothing short of this can ever constitute a pure heart in any one. That the Savior embraced all these principles in the passage above quoted from the sermon on the mount, there is no room for doubts. He had no reference to some abstract emotion of the heart, in the way of communion with God, as separated from the Lord's appointments. The closing part of this sermon itself forbids such an idea. The language is, "not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven. But he that

doeth the will of my father which is in heaven." No matter how devotional a man's heart may be, nor how much he may reach out after holy communion with God, the very moment he refuses one single one of God's commands, that very moment his heart ceases to be pure. He has then ceased to do the will of God, and no matter how much he may boast of an humble spirit, he has no promise of seeing God while in that condition. In the first place no man who hears the gospel and refuses to believe it, can ever, while he remains thus have a pure heart.

But instead thereof, will be under constant condemnation, while he refuses to become a believer. But when a man hears the gospel, and at once believes it, till his heart and affections are set on God, and he loves God and the Savior, and the ways of righteousness and truth, then his heart is purified by faith. But if he stops here, his heart will at once become impure again. For God has commanded all men everywhere to repent. And if now he refuse this command, his heart is no longer pure nor right in the sight of God. For Jesus has said, "except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," and there is certainly not much purity of heart in one that is doomed to perish. Again; the man that refuses to repent, hears the sayings of the Son of God, and does them not: Hence he will be like the foolish man who built his house upon the sand; and when the storm came, the house fell, and great was the fall of it. The idea of a pure heart, while refusing to do what God has commanded, is preposterous—is an utter

impossibility. But suppose the sinner repents, and then refuses to confess the name of Jesus. This refusal to confess him, amounts to a denial of him. And he says, he that "denies me before men, him will I deny before my Father which is in heaven." The heart of a man is not very pure when he is guilty of an offence so great that Jesus will deny him in the presence of his Father. But suppose he submit to all these requirements till he comes to baptism, and then shrinks back, and says, baptism is a nonessential, it will do me no good. I can be saved as well without it as with it. Can he retain a pure heart and thus act? Not for a single hour. In so doing he is rebelling fully and squarely against God and his Son. And there are not many promises in God's word to a man in rebellion against God, by refusing one of his positive commands.

The whole idea of purity of heart, while refusing a single one of God's divine institutions, is contrary to everything taught in the Bible. Peter tells us what purifies the soul:

"Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently." 1st Pet. 1, 22. Peter was here writing to a people that had obeyed the gospel in full. We read of their obedience in second of Acts. Peter had preached the gospel to them. They had enquired what to do. Peter had told them. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." This is what purified their souls.

They heard the word; were told what to do. They did it forthwith. And by so doing, they purified their souls. Had they refused these things when commanded, not one of them could have had a pure heart. Such would have been impossible. No man can have a pure heart while in disobedience to God. Just the same things that were required of those people, are required now of those who would be Christians, And they need not dream of a pure heart till they do them. Notice, Peter says, "ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth." *Obeying the truth* was the means of purifying their souls. So *obeying the truth*, is the means of purifying the soul now. Vainly may the people seek for pure hearts at altars or anxious seats, or in groves or closets, while they withhold obedience to the gospel. God never ordained such things to give the alien sinner a pure heart, and they never can give it. The people are following a vain delusion, when they suppose they can have and retain pure hearts in the sight of God without trembling at his word, and doing whatever he has required.

And not only is this true in regard to the alien sinner, but it is also true regarding those who have obeyed the gospel, and become Christians. Whenever a Christian refuses to do what God commands, or does what God has forbidden, that moment his heart begins to be impure. Simon the sorcerer most certainly obtained a pure heart when he believed and was baptized, for in doing this, he obeyed the truth, which Peter says purifies the soul. But he afterward exercised a wicked, speculative

thought, of purchasing miraculous Spiritual power with money. The moment he did this, he was told by Peter, "thy heart is not right in the sight of God." And to him it was said, "repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." And if this man obeyed these things, doubtless his heart was made right again. If he had refused, doubtless his heart never would have been right again. The hearts of Ananias and Sapphira were doubtless once pure, but they allowed themselves to be blinded by the love of money, and undertook to palm off a deception upon the apostles about the price of their land. And on account of this wicked hypocrisy and falsehood, they both died suddenly in the presence of the disciples; thus leaving a lasting warning against falsehood, deception, and too great a love of money. So brethren whenever we begin to turn aside from the requirements that God has made at our hands as Christians, just that soon will our hearts begin to become impure, be like Simon's, not right in the sight of God. God commands Christians to "pray without ceasing, to pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting." And whenever we begin to refuse, or turn aside from these things, our hearts begin to become impure; and the farther we depart the more and more do our hearts become impure. No Christian can retain a pure heart long without humble, earnest, devotional prayer. For when he ceases to pray, he ceases to obey God. And no one can retain a pure heart, a heart right in the sight of God, while in rebellion against him.

Again ; the people of God are required to assemble themselves together on the first day of the week to break bread. And whenever a Christian deliberately stays away from the Lord's house on the first day of the week, when there is nothing to hinder him from going only his own indifference on the subject, that man's heart is not right in the sight of God. And it would be well for him to repent and pray to God that he may be forgiven ; for such are not guiltless in the sight of the Lord, nor can they be, while in this disobedience to the word of God. For it is only obedience to God that makes a pure heart. God said through Isaiah, "But to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite Spirit, and trembleth at my word." Isa. 66, 2. The Lord regards with favor only those who tremble at his word ; those who do his bidding.

Again ; no man can have a pure heart, and not love God. And no man can love God in a Scriptural sense, and not do his bidding. Jesus says, "If a man love me, he will keep my words." John 14. 23. Again in same chapter he says, "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 to him." If therefore we do not love Jesus, and do his commandments, we will not be loved of God. And we need not claim that we love Jesus, unless we are constantly striving to do his will.

Not only are we required to love

required to love one another. Peter says, "love one another with a pure heart fervently." And the Christian who is not constantly striving to do this, need not claim that he has a pure heart. The church at Ephesus left their first love, and were threatened with destruction unless they would repent, and do their first work. So then if we would keep our hearts right, we must do the Lord's will continually.

E. G. S.

Satisfactory.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb : I have received your private letter in reply to mine of July 16th, and have also read your published reply in the Advocate. I was glad to learn that no offence was intended, although several brethren agreed with me in my conclusion. And since you have set the matter before the brethren in the right light, far be it from me to hold anything against you. On the contrary, it adds to my admiration to see that while you acknowledge that you are rough, yet you are not ruthless.

I did not intend to return evil for evil. The course intended was for my own safety. Since you disclaim intention to injure, I can see that my course was unwise, for it now seems like a kind of revenge for your act. But then I thought you had intentionally trodden upon my feelings ; hence, I said : " I shall scarcely give you occasion to use my name, until you show a willingness to deal more gently with my feelings and reputation. You have shown that willingness now and explained your language so I do

not fear any longer that you would intentionally wound my feelings or cast a cloud over my character. I desire peace and friendship with all men, especially the brethren; but sometimes I am forced, for the sake of peace, to follow the policy of Abraham when he gave Lot his choice and went the other way. I am glad that we have no occasion thus to separate, and I sincerely wish that all the brethren would show such a spirit, so that jars and jealousies would cease. My heart is sick of strife and envy among brethren! I have no objection to courteous criticism—I love to see it; but fault-finding is sin. Oh, let us be filled with the peaceable fruits of the Spirit!

My reason for not writing sooner is that I have been absent from home and did not see your article till this morning. The good cause is prospering here more than it has for many years past. In this and Grayson County hundreds have come into Christ in the last few months, and still the good work goes on. Some of our best men are in the field—such as Kendrick, Carlton, Polly, Ellis, Horn, Darnall, etc., and are doing good labor. May the Lord use us to his name's glory!

Yours in Christ,

J. M. WILMETH.

McKinney, Tex., Aug 22, 1874.

"Self-Murder of Jesse Oliver, the champion Campbellite Preacher of Miss-

"Jesse Oliver was formerly a beneficiary at Murfreesboro, when Bro. Pendleton was Professor of Theology, and was looked upon as a young man

of promise, if not of piety. Some year or two after the war, Mr. Oliver renounced the faith into which he had been baptized and embraced Campbellism, and soon became the acknowledged champion of that system of religious infidelity in North Miss. His ministry was characterized by the bitterness and constancy of his opposition to Baptists. But he was evidently an unhappy man, and like most of his class, a blasphemer of the Holy Ghost, denying the proper influences of the Spirit and attributing them to something else. This is sinning against the Holy Spirit. Bro. Smith informed us that this poor man recently shot himself through the heart with a pocket pistol, while in bed with his wife.—A terrible end of a perverted wrecked life."—*The Baptist*.

The above is copied from *The Baptist*, of July 18th. Of course no other pen could write an article of this character except J. R. Graves's. Seldom have human beings seen marks of such malignant and dark depravity in any human being as this exhibits. It is a humiliation to be compelled to notice the ungrounded, false statements of this vile defamer of the living and the dead, but I cannot bear to see the unblemished character of a departed lover of truth thus malignantly and maliciously assailed, without speaking a word in defense.

I am not afraid that anything will be detracted from the good name of J. C. Oliver, by anything J. R. Graves might say, where both men are known—far from it. Where it is known—as it is here—that J. C. Oliver was a pious, humble, self-

sacrificing Christian, and that J. R. Graves is not believed by his own brethren except in isolated sections, that he has been published by Baptist papers as a defamer and falsifier, that he stands excluded from the largest Baptist Church in the State of which he was formerly a member, for falsehood, &c. I say, where these things are known, it is useless for this persecuter of the Christian religion to defame the name of a departed follower of the cross, and belch forth his filthy calumny. But where Graves is believed, and J. C. Oliver is not known, he might possibly do his name some injury.

"He was looked upon as a young man of promise, if not of piety." Who ever doubted the piety of Jesse Oliver? Not a single individual who was not so full of prejudice that he could not do justice to any one. He was very "pious" as long as he remained a Baptist, but so soon as he threw off the fetters of Sectarianism, according to Graves, he became very impious. One thing is sure, he had too much piety to slander the dead, or misrepresent the living. Would to God J. R. Graves and others of his stamp possessed such a spirit! He had too much piety and good sense to hurl offensive epithets at his religious neighbors, and to call people and things by opprobrious names.

"That system of religious infidelity"!!! What kind of a spirit dictates such expressions as this? I think it might appropriately be denominated the *Graves* spirit. I think it almost peculiar to himself—at least I hope so. If we would just adopt a human creed, a human name,

and a few unscriptural practices, like Graves, such as calling mourners, relating experiences, &c., &c., we would then be received into the pale of orthodoxy, and would have no infidelity among us. Does he not know it is unjust to call people infidels whose fidelity to the Bible is unsurpassed by any people on the globe? Yes; he knows it, but he cares little for justice.

"His ministry was characterized by the bitterness and constancy of his opposition to Baptists" He was opposed to Baptists just so far as Baptists are opposed to the Bible, no farther. True he was opposed to the unscriptural doctrines and practices of Baptists, as he was to those of all other denominations; but as regarded the individual members he always spoke of them in the kindest terms; and to-day, there are scores of Baptists who fondly cherish the memory of this noble, though unfortunate man. There are a few prejudiced, unprincipled men, such as J. R. Graves, who rejoice in his misfortune, and seek to make the impression that it was caused by religious dissatisfaction. But a more slanderous insinuation has never been circulated. "He was evidently an unhappy man." I ask, what evidence has J. R. Graves or any other man that Jesse Oliver led an unhappy life? Simply none at all. There is not the semblance of truth in this statement. A man can scarcely be found who exhibits more signs of peace of mind, who is more firmly fixed in his faith, and more zealous in defense of the same, than was he. To say that he was an unhappy man is without evidence, does him the highest injus-

lice, and is prompted alone by a disposition to avoid the truth and make a false impression.

"A blasphemer of the Holy Ghost." O God! May he repent of this awful charge against one who is known by thee to be innocent. May he be forgiven before being called to stand before thy great tribunal of justice, to receive a reward according to the deeds done in the body.

Bro Oliver denied no influences of the Spirit. No man was ever a stronger advocate of Spiritual influences than was he. He only tried to draw the proper lines between a wild enthusiasm and the true Spirit of our God. Nothing is affirmed of the Spirit in the word of God which he did not earnestly believe and teach. If to teach the word of God just as it is, and persuade men to accept it, is to deny the influences of the Spirit then he was guilty of the charge. It is very easy for such men as J. R. Graves to decide that a man has sinned against the Holy Ghost, but thanks be to God, we do not have to be tried before such petty tribunals, but the Infinite One, who knows the hearts of all men will judge us, and award to us our dues.

"A terrible end of a perverted, wrecked life." Such expressions as these are enough to arouse the righteous indignation of every honest man. Upon what grounds can a man say his was a perverted life? He lived a faithful Christian, as thousands to-day will testify. He was universally beloved by all unprejudiced persons who knew him, he labored earnestly for the blessed Redeemer's cause, sacrificing everything in reason for the welfare of others. Was this

a perverted life? None but Graves, or some other possessing the same malicious disposition, could say it.

As I said in the beginning of this article, under any ordinary circumstances I should not have noticed J. R. Graves, for be it known that I consider him entirely beneath the dignity of a gentleman, but J. C. Oliver was a man whom I had known from my childhood, one whom I loved as a brother indeed, one who was a *friend* to me in the true sense of the term. He was interested in my welfare, he did all he could for my benefit and encouragement. Now, he is dead and gone, and I deem it my duty to defend his character.

I do not deny that Bro. Oliver was a champion defender of the Christian faith, in North Mississippi. We owe much to him here for his untiring labors, for his faithful counsels, his wise admonitions, and above all, for his godly examples of piety and devotion to the cause of religion.

I shall ever revere his memory, and shall expect to meet him beyond the rolling river. If Mr. Graves had told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, no harm could have been done. But he did not do this. Why did he not tell that it was insanity which led to the unfortunate deed? Why did he not tell that his mind was injured by sun-stroke? Simply because he wished to conceal the truth and make an erroneous impression.

I have spoken in pretty severe terms of J. R. Graves, but I am thoroughly satisfied that it is not in the least undeserved. I again re-iterate what I have said of him, and claim that I have not given him what

he deserves, even at that, but he can supply the deficiency—he knows his own principle,

Respectfully,

A. W. PRYCE.

Bro. Oliver's death was noticed in the Advocate, before we knew the manner of his death. The manner of his death has never been announced in the Advocate. We understand that he shot himself through the heart while in bed at night. He had a sun-stroke a year previous, which seriously affected his mind. His friends thought he had recovered, but clear symptoms of insanity, and especially of depression of spirits returned, which culminated in the fatal deed of self-destruction. With Bro. Oliver we were not intimately acquainted, having met him but once or twice. But that he was a conscientious man we have no doubt. He was a beneficiary of the Baptist school at Georgetown, Ky. So soon as he began to doubt Baptist theology, he refused to accept Baptist aid, even before he had fixed his faith or determined to leave their communion. He was a laborious, self-sacrificing and faithful man, as his labors in Mississippi and West Tennessee attest. Why in the providence of God our Father such an end should befall such a man we cannot tell.

That it under the circumstances should be made the occasion of gloating triumph by a religious teacher, indicates as near an approximation to total depravity as we can imagine. We suppose Mr. Graves never heard of suicide by a Baptist preacher. We can now call to remembrance more acts of self-destruction by Baptist

preachers and by prominent and zealous members of the Baptist church, than of any other one class of people in our acquaintance. Yet we are sure many of them were good men. We never considered it a judgment of the Almighty upon them for being Baptists. Had we so considered it, we could not have exulted over it as Mr. Graves does the death of Bro. Oliver. To afflict the afflicted, to taunt the fallen, to exult over the misfortunes of those cast down is cruel. It is hardly human. He must be possessed of something of the malignity of the evil one who can do this. Solomon says, "Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thy heart be glad when he stumbleth lest the Lord see it, and it displease him, and he turn away his wrath from him."

We do not know that the vituperative slanders of such men as Graves, Ditzler, Collinsworth should be noticed. Not one of them can do harm to any, save those who countenance them, where they are known. Where they go, they soon make all know them. Mr. Graves lived in Nashville a number of years, scarcely a man there of any communion has any respect for him. Collinsworth has not preached in the county in which he lives for a dozen years. Nobody wants to hear him. Ditzler lives in Kentucky, where Campbellites as he calls them are a hundred fold as numerous as in Alabama. Yet he leaves them in peace and quiet there, and spends his time in fighting the monster in Alabama. Why this? He is known in Kentucky, his pretensions and ravings command no more respect than the ravings of a maniac.

All that is needed to give them their proper influence is that they be known.

D. L.

Our Convention at Murfreesboro,

APPOINTED TO BEGIN, FRIDAY BEFORE
THE SECOND LORD'S DAY IN
OCTOBER NEXT.

Brethren Lipscomb & Sewell: In addition to the notice on the postal card, already forwarded you, please insert in the Advocate, Dr. Ransom's note to brother Hall, found on page 149 of the Christian Weekly.

I have requested the favor of the Examiner, of Virginia, the Weekly, of Alabama, the Standard and Review of Cincinnati, and Times of Kentucky, to publish my notice of this meeting. Brother Allison of Bridgeport, Ala., will regard his sheet as added to the list. I would likewise request the kindness of the brethren conducting these various journals, to call the attention of their readers to this matter. Nor in this connection, would we by any means, fail to include our laborious, zealous brother Munnell, of The Missionary: nor any other good journalistic brother, who may think proper to volunteer his services, in this good undertaking. You observe from my notice, we will endeavor to secure for you reduced fare on the various roads, so you may reach us with as little expense as possible; and from Dr. Ransom's letter to brother Hall, you perceive that when with us, no pains shall be spared to render you as agreeable and comfortable, as can be. Come brethren, come sisters; come

one, come ALL. We want to see among us, our BIG men, our little men, our *middle-sized* men, from *in* and *out* of our State. We wish to be brought into sympathy and co-operation with the great heart of our great brotherhood. We protest most solemnly against being regarded as isolated from them. We wish the vital stream not to become stagnant, when it reaches the State of Tennessee, but to circulate very freely, through all our veins. Don't forget we are all of THE ONE CHURCH, THE ONE KINGDOM, THE ONE BODY. Come, then, and give us the benefit of your counsels. And may God come with you, and be with us, and may we have 'times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.'

Fraternally,

G. W. ABELL.

QUERIES.

Bro. Lipscomb: In ADVOCATE No. 30 the question is asked, "Am I baptized into Christ" the questioner stating at the same time that she did not understand the Gospel plan of salvation, never had heard the Gospel. She believed herself fit for baptism because the preacher said if she thought of baptism when she saw water, she was all right &c. Now bro. L. is it safe to teach that in all this confusion and disbelief that we can render acceptable obedience to God: when he says the way is so plain that the way-faring man though a fool shall not err in it. Bro. L. how does this sister's case compare with those at Rome? Paul says, "Ye

know that ye were baptized into Christ; into his death; that ye had been buried with him in baptism and had been raised, and that too to walk in a new life; now this sister can't answer this in the affirmative. She knew nothing of the result of her baptism, she can't say this of her baptism.

I know you are sincere in all, and your position is hard to refute, but you admit that you may be wrong, now I ask could there be harm in this sisters' being baptized understandingly? Could there be any harm in this sister saying O Lord I do from the deep recesses of my heart wish to obey all that thou hast commanded, I fear I have not, I now understand all thy commands, and can fully realize all of thy promises, O Lord do accept this my sacrifice, and may I enjoy all the promises, full remission of my sins" &c. I ask do you believe the good Lord would condemn this sister for this, even if it should turn out that she had been baptized. I know your position is hard to refute, but little is said of it in the Bible, nothing of this sort ever came up in the days of the apostles. But we do know one thing; when John's baptism went out of use some of his disciples were baptized again; and I do think that if ever Baptist baptism was in use, it is, or ought to be out of use in this age of the world. Your teaching on this subject is doing more to ease the Baptist friends, than all the teaching they can bring to bear. I hear them saying "we Baptists are the best folks in the world; the Methodists all want us; the Presbyterians all take us, and even these Campbellites,

particular as they are, are continually after us: Oh" say they "who would not be a Baptist." We can't say aught against them in this, we admit them to be Christians, and this is as good as I can wish them to be. You get a Baptist to believe himself a Christian then he can't be moved from the position. But all this does not prove you wrong. But could we believe that a true position would cause so much error, so much trouble, men and women; shedding tears over their doubts did you ever know of a case that obeyed the gospel understandingly to be in doubts and fears.

Bro. Hinely in the same ADVOCATE says he never had heard the Gospel. Is it possible Bro. L. for us to have faith before the Gospel is heard by us? The order is reversed; the order is, "hear, believe, be then baptized;" but in this case it stands: "be baptized, then hear; then believe, be then baptized." Now this is fair reasoning, this man says he had never heard the gospel when he was baptized, and of course could not believe before he heard it; and you say he was baptized; Oh I do wish we could understand this aright, it is doing so much harm in the world as it is now understood, but enough. May God bless you in all your efforts to do good lawfully.

I am yours as ever,

B.

Cainsville, Wilson County Tenn.

We were aware many most excellent brethren, whose judgment we esteem very highly differ from us on this subject. Still while we respect their judgment, when it comes to

action, our own judgment must control us. We do not think any of the difficulties our brother speaks of are increased by the position we assume. We believe we, with our position, have been about as successful in reaching Baptists as those occupying a different one. But truth is the only question. But bro. B. gives an extreme appearance to the sister's position. It is true she says she did not understand the Gospel plan of salvation. That is she means she did not understand the theory of it. She did understand, she must believe in Christ. She did believe in Christ. How do I know. She became troubled about her sins. No one ever becomes troubled about her sins until she believes in Christ. That trouble about sin, led to a desire to quit sin, to obey God. Conviction of sin indicates faith Christ, sorrow for sin, a disposition or desire to quit sin. She desired to join the church. Why? Because she thought it was God's will—and in doing this she would serve God. She desired to obey God, she did obey him, in baptism. She believed in Christ, she repented of her sins, she was baptized in obedience to Christ. She did not know that put her into Christ. She did not know all the blessings and promises connected with it. But does the fact that her anxiety to obey him, prompted her to be baptized without a knowledge of the blessings that flowed from it, invalidate that baptism? It seems to me if there were merit or virtue in the submission, there would be more in submitting under adverse circumstances, than in doing it under more favorable ones. But it seems to me that

this whole view of the subject, places the merit in our understanding of the results that flow from obedience rather than in obedience itself.

This sister's faith was environed with cloudy mists, but through them all it led to obedience. I do not see why she cannot say of herself now all that Paul said of and to the Romans.

Bro. Hinely did not say he had never heard the Gospel, he said he had not heard it in its purity. The Gospel is, Christ suffered and died, was buried and resurrected for our salvation. He had heard that, But this had been mixed up with human speculations. But who can say our teaching of the Gospel is absolutely free from human speculations and human theories. We are men. We are frail men. Then how much of human error connected with Divine truth, is necessary to destroy the efficacy of that truth. We all have more or less of it mingled with our faith. It all injures our faith. It hinders our Christian life. But where is the line, beyond which all error is fatal, this side of which it is not fatal? We say error that prevents obedience is fatal. That which does not prevent obedience is not fatal. Is this right? Where else can the line be drawn?

Now we ask no Baptist or Methodist or Presbyterian or Roman Catholic or Mormon to ignore any faith, to turn from any obedience, he or she may hold. We rejoice in every item of faith they hold, in every act of obedience they render. We do not wish them to forsake or turn back from truth and obedience which they hold. We wish them to cling to these and forsake only the errors, that

hinder the disobedience. We are certain this position must be true. We have known persons who were baptized understanding baptism was for the remission of sins, who afterward wanted to be baptized again.

wish all to cling to the truth and obedience they have rendered, to forsake the error. This is right and effectual.

D. L.

—
Bro Sewell: Please explain through the Advocate Rom. viii, from 31st to 39th verses.

Now I cannot believe in this thing of falling from grace, for I think if persons are once filled with the love of God in their hearts, that is, if they have the right kind of grace, they will never think of falling. I should think a clear conscience of doing what God commands us and the enjoyment of it would never allow a Christian to once think of turning back: but I would like to have some information about it.

Yours respectfully,

F. B.

—
Here are the verses in full. "What shall we say then? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or dis-

treas, or persecution, or famine or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, for thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

This passage teaches as plainly as anything can be taught, that so long as we continue faithful to God, he will continue faithful to us, and that all the powers in the universe outside of heaven can never harm us. And so long as this is the case, there can be no danger of falling from grace. We do not know that we understand what is meant in the above, by "the right kind of grace." Those who in any way have the grace of God at all, have the right kind. The word *grace* means *favor*, and hence to have the grace of God, is the same as to have the favor of God. The expression 'the grace of God,' sometimes has reference to the Gospel of Christ, the great plan of salvation provided for our ruined race. Such is the case in second of Titus, and second of Ephesians. The man that becomes a Christian, by obeying the Gospel of Christ, thus obtains an interest in the grace, the favor of God. And so long as such a one lives the Christian life, just so long does he retain the grace of God. But whenever he turns aside from the requirements of God through this plan or system of

favor, then he falls from grace—from the state of favor that he occupied in the sight of God. Paul taught the Galatians, that all who should turn back to the law of Moses, and be circumcised, they were then debtors to do the whole law; they were *fallen from grace*. And I suppose this was the right kind of grace, too, from which the Gallatians were about to fall, and from which some of them had fallen most likely, according to Paul's letter to them. And if people could fall from grace by going to the law of Moses, they could certainly fall by going off from God in any other direction. Paul also says to the Corinthians, tenth chapter, "Wherefore, let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." If there be not a possibility for people to fall, we can see no meaning in this passage at all. The apostle had been giving an account of the vast multitude of the Jews who fell in the wilderness, after crossing the Red Sea. These Jews had been all saved alike, by the mighty hand of God from their enemies—had all eat the same spiritual meat, and had all drunk the same spiritual drink; and yet these Jews, all save Caleb and Joshua, fell, and perished outside of the land of Canaan. So these people fell from grace, and if they did not have the right kind, we do not know who ever did. Paul also says these things were our examples, and written for our admonition, and we should certainly take heed, lest we fall. The fate of these Jews, who were saved from their enemies at the Red Sea, and afterwards sinned, and fell in the wilderness, outside of the Holy land, certainly ought to be a lasting

warning to Christians, to induce them to strive to live nearer to God continually, lest they also "fall, after the same example of unbelief." Heb. iv: 11. These passages have no meaning, unless there is a chance, and even danger that Christians may fall away, and be lost, after once obtaining the favor of God. Peter speaks of some which had forsaken the right way, and to whom says he, "the mist of darkness is reserved forever." These were fallen from grace. He says moreover, "For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, "the dog has turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." We know that this passage does teach that people may at one time be righteous, and then turn from it, and be in a far worse condition than if they had never known the truth. Even angels sinned, and were cast down to hell, and surely there is some danger that Christians may sin, and be lost, after once enjoying the grace of God. So then while the Scriptures teach that no power can harm us while we are faithful to the Lord and his cause, they teach us at the same time that we can turn away ourselves, and that when we do this, God will abandon us, and leave us exposed to ruin, unless we repent, and turn to him again. Christians therefore, should be forever on their guard, always watching, lest "the world, the flesh and the devil," should get the upper hand of them. God will not allow

any power to harm us, if we will be faithful to him. But if we turn away from him, he gives no promise to keep us from falling then. But it seems strange that any Christian, with all the blessings of God around him in this life, and the promise of the glories of an eternal life in heaven at the end of the race, should allow himself to be so far allured by the things of this world as to turn away from God, and lose such glorious blessings at last. Yet some have turned from the right way, and others may do the same thing. Let us all heed the Savior's admonition, "Watch."

E. G. S.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: I will give you a few lines relative to the success of the Gospel in one of the dark corners. On Saturday embracing the fourth Lord's day in July brother J. H. Spivy and I commenced a meeting at Punccheon Camp where I had previously delivered some six or seven discourses monthly. We continued until Thursday following, assisted until Sunday evening by brothers Nance and Carter, all of which resulted in five additions to the cause of Christ, two from the world and three from the Baptists. Brother Spivy did the most of the preaching, the audience was large unto the close of the meeting, with much interest manifested all the while. Brother Spivy and I then came to Shoal Bluff, my own Congregation, commenced a meeting on Friday night which continued until Thursday, resulting in nineteen additions to the good cause

by confession and immersion, all from the world. Brother Spivy again did most of the preaching. Brother Thompson aided much by his able prayers. The brethren and sisters were alive in the cause. The audience increased unto the end of the meeting, manifesting great interest. Also on the third Lord's day in this month at Punccheon Camp I delivered one discourse and immersed four more all from the world. O, that we may all be faithful unto the end is my prayer.

Your Brother in Christ,

WILLIAM SMITH.

Shoal Bluff, Giles Co. Tenn. Aug. 21st, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: I send you a little good news. I was sent for a Baptist brother in Cherokee County, who informed me that they wanted me to hold a meeting of three or four days or longer if I was able. I went with him, tried to preach for them four days. Seven additions came from the world, nine from the Baptists, two from the Methodists, one from the Presbyterians, twenty in all. As I am far advanced in age and the weather was extremely hot I had to close. The name of the church is Lone Dove.

Yours in the faith of the gospel,
A. KYLE.

Ionias, Anderson county, Texas, Aug 1, 1874.

Bro. Lipscomb: I came to this State from Kentucky last October, and located in Clarke Co. I am preaching at Antioch and Union in Clarke, the rest of my time is devoted to the churches at Mt. Vernon, and

Corinth, in Walton Co. Wednesday night before the fourth Lord's day in July with Bro. P. F. Lamar, I began a meeting at Corinth, continued until Monday, and resulted in three additions. Friday before the first Lord's day in August with the same Bro. we began at Antioch, continued one week with twenty-seven additions, six from the Baptists, four from the Methodists, seven restored, the rest from the world. Friday before the second Lord's day we commenced at Union, continued five days with five additions by baptism. The cause of Christ is advancing in these parts. To the Lord be all the glory. My address is Watkinsville, Clarke Co., Ga.

Yours in Christ,

T. M. FOSTER.

Laurenceville, Ga., Aug. 18, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: Bro. David Pennington closed a meeting of four days continuance at "Sand Point Church" two weeks ago, the immediate result of which was three additions to the church, two by confession and baptism, and one reclaimed. The church at that point numbers some one hundred and forty members, with G. W. Dykes and J. W. Hawthorn overseers, and Amos Gustine and Richard Hurt, Deacons. Bro. Pennington is a fervent and eloquent preacher, one that leaves his hearers without excuse. There was a good attendance during the meeting and the church was encouraged and instructed. Bro. A. H. Foster is their regular preacher; he is an old and well-tried preacher and as true to the Gospel as the needle is to the pole. May the Lord bless you abundantly

in your labors, is the prayer of your brother in hope of eternal life,

J. D. HOOKER.

Milano, Milam Co., Tex., Aug. 20, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: I have been preaching as best I could at some four or five different points on Saturdays and Lord's days, being engaged in teaching school, which I am compelled to follow as a means of support. There have been some few souls added to the army of the faithful under my labors this year. I held two meetings at Dawson's school-house this year, resulting in 35 accessions. These meetings were largely attended; one was held in January, the other in May. In April I held a protracted in the forks of Pine Oak with 4 additions. I closed a meeting at Bald Prairie, being the place of my residence, on the 12th of this month: having delivered 16 discourses, principally at night, the days being too warm for comfort, with 12 additions. During this meeting a scene occurred that I never witnessed before. Three brothers in the flesh and in the Spirit leading three brothers in the flesh to the watery grave to be translated into Christ. One of the above was unfortunate in the recent war and lost one of his legs. This meeting was largely attended all the time, and much good was done. The church here numbers about 150 members. To God be all the praise.

B. P. S.

Bald Prairie, Tex., Aug. 17, 1874.

Errata.

Dear Brethren: Permit me to make a correction or two, in my last article, 'Co-operation — concluded.' For the benefit of your Greek readers—page 758, first column, for 'kossassoonoos,' please read, 'keerus-sontos, one doing the work of a keerux. On the same page, second column, for your latin readers, instead of 'suari:ò in modo ; förtitu in re,'—insert, 'suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.'

In this, as well as the preceding articles, there are several other typographical errors ;—e. g., p. 587, first column, 'co-operative effect,' should be, 'co-operative effort ; and two lines below, 'vigorously persecuted me,' should be 'vigorously prosecuted me ; but as these do not materially affect the sense, and as the intelligent english reader will correct them in his own mind, I will not farther disturb you in regard to them. Wishing you and your readers peace, prosperity and happiness, I am ever,

Your brother and co-laborer,
G. W. ABELL.

Our Greek was worse mutilated than our brother's as was also Bro. Henry's Latin, but its all Greek to the English anyway.

D. L.

Acknowledgement.

Last October and November received the following contributions to finish the Christian house of worship at Jonesboro, Tenn.

East of Cbattanooga,	\$20,00
Chattanooga,	10,00

C. D. Ostell,	5,00
Philadelphia church,	16,00
McMinnville,	20,00
Flat Creek, and sister Quail	34,00
Nashville,	26,00
Clarksville,	4,50
Hazel Wood,	27,00
Trenton,	15,00
Liberty,	17,00
Hopkinsville,	12,00
Madisonville,	17,50
Robt. D. Patterson, St Louis,	2,50
Sallie D. Patterson, " " "	2,50
Sister Allen, " " "	5,00

Materials of different kinds sent, but amount not known to the writer. Expecting more promises fulfilled this report has been delayed.

I take pleasure in behalf of the brethren at Jonesboro, (and my own) to return hearty thanks for Christian courtesy and liberality manifested. May the Lord bless his people and prosper his cause. Our next Co-operation will be held in the said new house of worship embracing the 1st Lord'sday in Sept. next. All—all, are respectfully and affectionately invited to attend.

Fraternally,
W. G. BARKER.

Aug. 16th, 1874.

Correspondence.

Bros. L. & S.: I arrived here in March last and am well pleased with California, climate, soil and productions. We have a fine crop of wheat, oats and barley. I am in an irrigated section. Those who have not seen the result of irrigation, have but an indefinite idea of it. We grow two and three crops in one year. We have eaten water-melons this year

and planted the seed and have melons now growing on the new vines. We have corn growing where we have harvested a crop of wheat, and so on.

Spiritually, we are in want of help. We want preachers; we have but one in this county, a Bro. John Baker, and but two congregations. Will organize one more soon. A good opening for a preacher; good land cheap, from \$12 to \$50 per acre. Plenty of people to be taught the truth.

Yours &c.,

THOS. J. McQUIDDY.

Visalia, Tulare Co., California,
Aug. 10, 1874.

Courage In Every-day Life.

"Moral Courage" was printed in large letters and put as the caption of the following items, and placed on a conspicuous place on the door of a systematic merchant in New York for a constant reference:

Have the courage to discharge a debt while you have the money in your pocket.

Have the courage to speak your mind when it is necessary that you should do so, and hold your tongue when it is prudent that you should do so.

Have the courage to speak to a friend in a "seedy" coat, even though you are in company with a rich one and richly attired.

Have the courage to own you are poor, and thus disarm poverty of its sharpest sting.

Have the courage to tell a man why you refuse to credit him.

Have the courage to tell a man why you will not lend him your money.

Have the courage to cut the most agreeable acquaintance you have when you are convinced he lacks a principle; a friend should bear with a friend's infirmities, but not with his vices.

Have the courage to show your respect for honesty, in whatever guise it appears, and your contempt for dishonesty and duplicity by whomsoever exhibited.

Have the courage to wear your old clothes until you can pay for new ones.

Have the courage to prefer comfort and propriety to fashion in all things.

Have the courage to acknowledge your ignorance rather than to seek for knowledge under false pretenses.

Have the courage in providing an entertainment for your friends, not to exceed your means.

Have the courage to insure the property in your possession, and thereby pay your debts in full.

Have the courage to obey your Maker at the risk of being ridiculed by man.

JESTING.

Many persons indulge in this, and call it wit. But there is a clear distinction between the two. Wit is defined as "the association of ideas in a manner natural, but unusual and striking, so as to produce surprise, joined with pleasure." Jestings is "talking for diversion or merriment." The first is often proper and useful. It has an exhilarating influence upon the mind, and excites thought while it gives pleasure. But uttering that which is simply ludicrous for the mere purpose of exciting laughter;

and perhaps saying that which is not true, merely for diversion is at least idle, and therefore wrong. In the letter to the Ephesians, it is classed with filthiness and foolish talking, and its entire disuse is enjoined. And yet, how much of the conversation of some persons is made up of jest! However short a time you may be in their company, you hear these jests, if you are not made the butt of them. And professional Christians are sometimes found indulging in this jesting, and are even the leaders in this kind of conversation!

Persons who indulge in jesting, often say that they mean no harm, and they express surprise that any one should be so fastidious as to object to it. But by jesting words, false impressions are often conveyed, and the feelings of persons are severely wounded. Perhaps you have yourselves suffered in this way. An incorrect statement, or a statement capable of a double interpretation, has been made in a playful manner, and was intended as a jest. But you have felt that it was calculated to convey a wrong impression respecting you; and yet, because it was uttered as a jest you could not treat it as a serious matter, and you were thus prevented from explaining what appeared dubious, and defending your character from the unjust aspersion cast upon it.

And actual injury is often inflicted in this way upon those who are absent. We remember a case in point, which occurred some years ago. A number of persons were talking of a lady of their acquaintance who was generally respected. One of those

present, concurring in the general remarks of approval, added: "But she drinks." This statement excited general surprise, but was believed. He saw that he had created a wrong impression, and tried to undo it by immediately adding, "tea and water." But it was too late; the foolish jest had done its work, and the lady was treated by her friends with distrust, and, if we remember aright, died of a broken heart. Jestings do not have such fatal results; but, "as a mad man who casteth fire-brands, arrows and death, so is a man that deceiveth his neighbor, and saith, 'Am I not in sport?'"—*Nat. Baptist.*

To The Little Folks. No. 12.

"Uncle Joe, are our Mormon brethren increasing much in numbers now?"

Why do you call them "our Mormon brethren?"

"Isn't it right to call all who are trying to serve God brethren?"

The Mormons may be trying to serve God, but they come very far from truly serving him. And, besides this, they do not recognize us as sons and servants of God, nor do they recognize any other religious body than themselves as such. We cannot therefore, call them brethren consistently with their views of our own.

"Doesn't our preacher call persons of other religious bodies brethren?"

He does that by way of Courtesy.

"Is it courtesy to claim a relationship with a man who disclaims any such with us? Shall we claim a relationship with those who claim

that *they* are the children of God, and say *we* are not?"

It is right to cultivate amicable and kind feelings toward all.

"Should we dissemble and recognize a relationship we know does not exist?"

We should be kind and courteous to these people that we may be the better able to lead them into the truth.

Would not that be practicing an untruth in order to impart the truth? Doing evil that good may come?"

You know our preacher is very popular with all parties and is doing much good.

"Yes, I know he is, to all appearances; but the question with me is, is he doing right? Would not more real good be effected by a frank, consistent course? I heard a Methodist say, the other day, our preacher was different from any other Campbellite he had ever seen; that he called the members of all the different churches brethren. Now here is a Methodist who calls us Campbellites—a name which we do not acknowledge—who denies us the right to be called Christians; and yet we call him brother! A man who refuses to be born again and become a child of God. The Savior said we must be born again—born of water and of the Spirit. Now we all hold that born of water means baptism, and that nothing but immersion is baptism. And yet here is a Methodist, who has had only a little water sprinkled upon him; and we recognize him as a child of God, born again, by calling him brother. Would it be right to call the Roman Catholics brethren?"

No, they do not recognize us as

being right in any respect; and we know they are not right.

"Then if we cannot fellowship the Mother, how can we fellowship her daughters? You say, the Roman Catholics do not recognize us as being right in any respect. In what respect do the Methodists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians recognize us as right?"

You know the Roman Catholics denounce all these Sects as being wrong the same as us. They consider no one right but themselves; and of course, we cannot consistently fellowship them.

"How much nearer are these Sects to us than the Romanists? The Romanist says we are wrong, in common with the others. The "orthodox" sects say that we are the only people who are radically and totally wrong? Tell me in what sense we are brethren. Not brother Protestants are we?"

No, we cannot be brother Protestants; for we protest as earnestly against the errors of these sects as we do against the errors of Romanism.

"Just so, Uncle Joe; we should protest against all error, and endeavor not to practice any ourselves. If we are right, the balance of the religious world are all wrong, in some respects. If any other religious body is right either in name or doctrine, we are wrong, and should try to get right by occupying the ground of that one that is right. Then please tell me, Uncle Joe, in what sense are the religious sects our brethren?"

Well, we are at least brethren as being all descended from Adam. We are brother mortals.

"Then, this calling those belong-

ing to the sects, brother, is a mere sham. We could just as consistently and truthfully say, brother Mason, or brother Odd Fellow, to a member of either of those bodies, as to say brother Methodist, or brother Presbyterian to a member of either of these. If I were a Mason or an Odd Fellow I could brother a member of such body, and not without. Then unless I were a Methodist or a Presbyterian I could not brother one of such body."

Perhaps it would be best to deal with all frankly, but kindly. Treat them with respect and courtesy; yet give those in error to understand plainly that we consider them in error. Show them that, however highly we may esteem them, we cannot fellowship error. Let us give them to understand that we consider the Savior's brethren as our brethren; and he says you are my brethren if you do whatever I command you.

UNCLE JOE.

Always too Late.

Some people are always too late, and therefore accomplish through life nothing worth naming. If they promise to meet you at such an hour, they are never present until thirty minutes after. No matter how important the business is either to yourself or to them, they are just as tardy. If one of this class is to take passage by steamer or railway, he arrives just as the boat has left the wharf, or the train the station. His dinner has been waiting for him so long that the cook is out of patience. This course, the character we have described

always pursues. He is never in time for church; at his place of business, at his meals, or in his bed. Persons of such habits, we cannot but despise. Always start in time, and be ready at the appointed hour. We would not give a fig for a man who is not punctual to his engagements, and who never makes up his mind to a certain course till the time is lost. Those who hang back, hesitate and tremble—who are never at hand for a journey, to meet an appointment for business, or anything else—are poor sloths, and are ill calculated to succeed in business or get a living in this world.—*Selected.*

A Lesson to Smokers.

Plain speaking was formerly considered a duty by the Quakers. It is a pity they do not practice it often on smokers, taking the following as a specimen:

Recently, a Quaker was traveling in a railway carriage. After a time, observing certain movements on the part of a fellow-passenger, he accosted him as follows:

"Sir thee seems well dressed, and I dare say thee considers thyself well-bred and would not demean thyself to do an ungentlemanlike action, would thee?"

The person addressed promptly replied with considerable spirit,

"Certainly not, if I knew it."

The Quaker continued:

"And suppose thee invited me to thy house, thee would not think of offering me thy glass to drink out of, after thee had drank out of it thyself, wouldst thee?"

The interrogated replied—

"Abominable! No! Such an offer would be most insulting."

The Quaker continued:

"Still less would thou think of offering me thy knife and fork to eat with after putting them into thy mouth, wouldst thee?"

The interrogated answered:

"To do that would be an outrage on all decency, and would show that such a wretch was out of the pale of civilized society."

"Then," said the Quaker. "with those impressions on thee, why shouldst thee wish me to take into into my mouth and nostrils, the smoke from that cigar which thou art preparing to smoke out of thine own mouth?"—*Chicago Standard*.

DON'T DEPEND ON FATHER.

Stand up here, young man, and let us talk to you. You have trusted alone to the contents of your father's purse or his fair fame for your influence or success in business. Think you that your father has attained eminence in his profession but by unwearied industry, or that he has amassed a fortune honestly without energy and activity? You should know that the faculty requisite for the acquiring of fame or fortune is essential to, nay, inseparable from the attaining of either of these. Suppose father has the money in abundance, if you have never earned anything for him you have no more right with his money than the gosling has with the tortoise; and if he allows you to meddle with money before you have gained it by your own industry, he perpetrates untold mischief. Sooner or later you must

learn to rely on your own resources, or you will not be anybody.

EVERY DAY.—I pray you with all earnestness to prove, and know within your hearts, that all things lovely and righteous are possible for those who believe in their possibility and who determine that, for their part, they will make every days work contribute to them. Let every dawn of morning be to you as the beginning of life, and every setting of the sun be to you as its close: then let every one of these short lives leave its sure record as some kindly thing done for others, some goodly strength or knowledge gained for yourselves; so, from day to day, and strength to strength, you shall build up indeed by art, thought, and by just will, an edifice of which it shall not be said: "See what manner of stones are here," but "See what manner of men."—*Ruskin*.

The soul is the life of the body. Faith is the life of the soul. Christ is the life of faith.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The Sin against the Holy Spirit.....	815
The Pure Heart--what is it?.....	817
Satisfactory.....	821
Self-murder of Jesse Oliver, the Champion Campbellite preacher of Miss...	822
Our Convention at Murfreesboro.....	822
Queries.....	826
Church News.....	831
Errata.....	833
Acknowledgment.....	833
Correspondence.....	833
Courage in every-day Life.....	834
Jesting.....	834
To the Little Folks.....	835

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 36.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SEPT. 10, 1874.

Queries on Church Jo operation.

Bro. Lipscomb: In No. 28, page 669, in reviewing *Bro. Abell*, you say, "Now the true and only issue is, are the simple congregations of Christ without new modifications or combinations, without creating new functions through their heaven-appointed agencies sufficient for the work. That's the issue fairly and squarely made."

Now will you please inform us plainly, clearly, definitely, *what* these "heaven-appointed agencies" are, and how the "simple congregations" can help, assist, or co-operate together without some kind of consultation together, or communication with each other. Now then if consultation or communication is essential to co-operation, how is it to be brought about? Suppose *Owens*, *Franklin* and *Hillsboro* were willing and able to support a preacher in the general field, what means ought they to adopt in order to ascertain the fact? Tell us plainly, are you opposed to all Consultation Meetings—and are you opposed to the co-opera-

tion of churches in the great work?

Your Brother,

E. B. CAYCE.

Franklin, Tenn., July 12, 1874.

◆The heaven-appointed agencies are the agencies found recorded in the Bible. If our brother is a teacher in Israel and has not yet learned what the agencies and organs connected with the church are, we are hopeless of informing him in anything we may write. They are the church, simple and pure, with all its ordinances observed and its members each working in his proper position and with true diligence in the church of Christ. There is not a single consultation meeting or organization between the churches, or over the churches or under the churches in all these appointments. Not one. Nor can they be added without treason to the Master.

2ndly. The simple congregations can co-operate, help, assist, by each of them doing just what the Master commands them. We have strong and implicit faith in the concert, harmony, co-operation, success that arises from all obeying implicitly the

laws of God, the commands of the great captain. If we will do that, without care on our part, not a jar, not a discord will be found in all the movements of the King's armies. They will all work harmoniously, effectively, successfully. All the churches in the world thus co-operate under the Divine head.

We have not a particle of confidence in any co-operation ever resulting from human consultations about how to act harmoniously and in accord, but discord, confusion and defeat. Human consultations as to how God's work shall be done never produced anything but discord and strife. It is just as if, when an army is drawn up in battle array, under the lead of its great general, the different regiments and companies should conclude, there will be no co-operation or harmony in our efforts unless we all hold a consultation and agree how each will move, what each will do,—they must have an understanding.

Now every one knows such a course would result in confusion and disaster. More than this, such a desire for consultation among the different wings, divisions, regiments and companies could arise only from a distrust of the wisdom and skill of the commanding general, and would be regarded as mutiny and treason.

God is the great commander. He issues his commands to every company. Tells them what to do. If they move as he directs, only harmony and concord, co-operation and success will be the result. But each company and squad is crying out, If we do not consult, if we do not understand each movement to be made,

if we do not devise a system of co-operation, things will go hap-hazard and discord will come; no unity of action will prevail. It seems to me such a feeling can arise only from a distrust of the wisdom and skill of our king. The devising of these co-operations is a direct impugment of his wisdom, foresight and power. It looks to us like mutiny, treason, rebellion against the great king, to stop to consult, combine, form co-operations, when God tells each one to do his own part, and he will supervise and overrule all. All each individual or church can do to secure perfect and complete co-operation, under the divine guidance, is just to do what the divine commander requires, obey the orders given. He directs, he harmonizes, he so arranges that each doing his will, will co-operate most heartily, perfectly, successfully with every other individual or number of individuals in the universe, who obeys God or is in harmony with his laws. Obedience to God secures perfect harmony, perfect co-operation under God. Consultation as to how we shall work and co-operate ensures discord, strife, confusion under men, and is rebellion against the Divine commander. Investigation to learn the will of God, that we may do it, is a very different thing from consulting how we may move and work in harmony.

I am plainly, religiously, conscientiously, opposed to all consultation meetings, to devise plans as to how we shall do any work of God, how we shall effect co-operation among the churches or people of God. We believe that one and all such, are treasonable, are as productive of evil,

as destructive of all order and harmony, all law and authority as would the determination of all the different companies in an army, instead of obeying the commander, and trusting him to preserve harmony, concord, and co-operation in their movements while obeying him, to determine they would call a meeting to consult how they could co-operate and preserve harmony in their movements.

We never expect to attend or participate in such a meeting unless it be to protest against the treason to my Master in such movements.

If a church desires to learn the will of God on any doubtful or disputed point, we believe it legitimate for that church to invite Christians to come and aid in such an investigation. In these we can see good. In others only evil.

We do not know anything about general or particular fields. It is every man's duty to do all he can to spread the word of God, to sound out the truth in the regions around. It is the duty of all to aid one engaging in any work of the church, in need of help. Churches helped Paul by his letting them know his wants, or by sending with tender care and thoughtful solicitude, to look into his wants. We know of no better way than heaven's approved way now.

What are usually termed co-operations are really not co-operation of churches. They are organizations, combinations that do the work of churches. So destroy all church operation and co-operation. There can be no co-operation without operation. Operation is working, co operation is working together to

the same end. Two churches, both working by the same law, for the accomplishment of the same end are co-operating.

When they both comply with the law of God they are co-operating under his law, his command. He guides and directs that co-operation. All that any church has to do to get into this perfect co-operation is to obey God faithfully. But when they seek and frame organizations of man and call them co-operations, they destroy all Divine co-operation of churches. We seek the Divine co-operations. They are destroyed by the human co-operations.

We are not certain that the gospel would perish, if the congregations at Franklin, Owen's and Hillsboro never agreed together to sustain a preacher. If the members would consecrate themselves to the service of the church of God, instead of squandering their energies, talent and means in the upbuilding and support of human institutions, there would at once be talent, and much more than means enough for each to support a servant of the Lord in sounding out the word in all the regions around. We think each of those congregations a thousand fold able to sustain a teacher in instructing the people in the way of the Lord. It is a gross shame that churches of the wealth and numbers these congregations possess, should be talking of seeking associations with other congregations to help them sustain a modest, faithful, unassuming, economical and industrious teacher of the religion of our Savior. None other should be sustained.

It would be a blessed thing if each

of these congregations were cut off from all looking abroad and were made to feel the necessity of relying upon their own talent, their own means, their own devotion for developing their own spiritual lives, and instructing those around them in the way of the Lord. This necessity would develop life, activity, spirituality within themselves. They have ample means and talent. The sisters in each of these congregations, spend enough every year, in the sinful "putting on of gold and costly apparel" to sustain a teacher of the religion of Christ with an average sized family, to devote his whole time to instruction of the people in the way of the Lord. But when every Christian mother and child must have her fashionable attire, her gay clothing, her forbidden gold, her costly jewelry, her useless and sinful earrings, finger rings, bracelets, etc., nothing is left for the cause of God.

The brethren in each of these congregations spend enough in tobacco and whiskey, in paying their dues in Granges, Temperance, Masonic and other human associations and in other useless and sinful dress and dissipations to support every needy widow, and orphan in the county, and teach them the way of the Lord. One sinful course demands another. The determination to violate God's law in the style of dress and living, in supporting institutions of men, all of which are to perish with the handling, disables the churches from obeying the Lord, and demands these organizations of men to supplement the failure of the churches, and enable them to exist and make a

sham of extending the religion of Christ, while violating its sacred laws. God's plan of extending that religion necessitates its being true and pure. Man's systems are to extend its corruptions and impurities. We think then Owen's Station, Franklin, and Leiper's Fork congregations, if both teacher and taught will diligently cooperate with God in his institutions and appointments, by obedience to his laws, are each able to amply sustain a teacher of its own. We think no provisions ought to be made for their violating those laws, surrendering his institutions, and still living. Death or humble and faithful obedience to the laws, ought to be the only alternative presented to churches and individuals. Anything else will demoralize and corrupt them. We never wish to be a party for providing for a church or individual living in disobedience to God.

Another difficulty in the way, of teachers being sustained, is in the course of the teachers themselves. Many of the brethren, the truest, best brethren believe that God's own church, his own institution, cemented by his own blood, is the only institution in the world, against which the gates of hell will not prevail. They believe the gates of hell will prevail against every other institution in the world, that they will be destroyed, when the world and the works thereof shall be burned up, will be engulfed with all the citizens and subjects thereof in hell. They believe that "every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," shall be destroyed by the consuming fire of God's

unquenchable wrath. They believe that all work done through those institutions of man is vain, is worse than vain. Only that labor which is in the Lord, is not in vain.

They believe all service performed by God's servants in these institutions is so much detracted from that which is due God's kingdom, God's service. No principle is more plainly and indelibly stamped on the pages of inspiration than this, God will only be acceptably served in his own institutions and his own appointments. He will not be served through human inventions nor in human institutions. They believe that all work done in and through these human institutions is in discord with God, and with every being in harmony with his laws, that such works breed strife and ruin rather than harmony and reconciliation and detract from the honor and glory of God and his institutions.

Yet teachers who expect these brethren to sustain and aid them, instead of devoting their energies faithfully and wholly to the upbuilding of the church of God, divide their fealty and service with, and spend their time in upbuilding, these human institutions. They are frequently men of excitable and unsteady faith, "they are tossed to and fro, they are carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive," they drift into every frail human institution devised by the cunning and craft of men, they serve and honor these rather than the only institution in the universe which shall never be destroyed, against which the gates of

hell shall never prevail. One sets the example and advises brethren publicly and privately, to work in and through human governments, encourages them to enter the dirty pool of politics. Another spends his own precious time, energy and zeal in building up human Temperance Societies, and encouraging brethren so to do. Another through the Granges, and others other man-made institutions of almost every device and design under the sun.

How can unanimity or co operation result from such a course? How can brethren who believe such courses bring discord and weakness to the church, and result in separation from God instead of co-operation with him, have heart or hand to sustain a teacher pursuing such a course.

Many of the more earnest, steadfast and faithful brethren believe the advocacy and encouragement of Christians entering these man-devised institutions more than counteracts the good influences of their teaching of the Bible and their advocacy of the claims of the church. They lack heart to sustain such teachers. The teachers are to blame for this.

Then every individual in the universe, that works in God's institutions, according to God's will, co-operates with every other individual in the Universe, in heaven, earth, or hades, that works in harmony with the will of God, even though the one never hears of the other, much less consults with him. We have much faith in the co-operation that arises from obedience to God. We have no faith in that which springs from human consultation.

Man's only duty is to study God's

will and do it. Doing this will puts him who does it, into full accord and co-operation with God, and with every being that obeys him. That is co-operation enough for me.

Then when a man works faithfully in the church of God, he co-operates with God. When he works through temperance societies, human governments, co-operative organizations and other human institutions that result from human consultations, he works discord with God and God's servants and institutions. He rejects the wisdom of God and follows the folly of man. We hope we are understood. We have tried to give our convictions of what is and what is not co-operation and the difficulties that are in the way of effecting it. We believe in real Divinely appointed church operation and co-operation under the laws and guidance of God. We utterly oppose all human consultations for effecting human co-operations. God's co-operation requires none of these. It requires only obedience to divine law. Now will our brother tell us plainly whether he believes God's law sufficient for effecting his purposes, for conducting his institutions and for accomplishing the work for which God appointed them? Wherein does he find authority for human consultations and inventions in working God's institutions? Are the Scriptures sufficient to guide men into every good work? These are the simple elemental questions lying at the foundation of these matters.

D. L.

Paul's Confidence.

"For I am persuaded either death, nor life, nor angels, nor prin-

cipalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Rom. 8: 38, 39.

What confidence; what firm unshaken, unwavering faith, in the promises of God. Paul's heart was fixed—his faith was firm. He felt persuaded, or confident rather, that death, with all its terrors, should not drive him from the love of God. And in his death, he verified what he here expressed. Nor should this life—if permitted to live on—present to him any allurements to win him away from the love of God. He had settled it in his mind that he would henceforth glory in nothing, save Jesus Christ and him crucified; and though an angel might so far forget himself as to preach another Gospel, even this, should not move him from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, but would simply say "let him be accursed."

Nor could principalities and powers combined, move him. He was persuaded that Cæsar could enact no laws, no rule, which should in the least detract from his service to God, and thus separate him from the love of God. And rising higher as it were in order to express his unbounded confidence in God's love in Christ, he adds, "nor things present," nothing that now surrounds me, "nor things to come" nothing that may surround me—No circumstance in which I may be placed—no height of prosperity, or excellence—no depth of poverty, or humility, nor any other creature—if anything else can be im-

aged which *might* lead the soul away—"shall be able to separate me from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord." Paul's object was not to show that it is impossible to be separated from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, but simply to express his unbounded—his firm unwavering confidence in Christ—in the Gospel and in the power of God to save him, through the Gospel of Christ. He had settled it in his heart that the doctrine of Christ was true—that the gospel is God's power to salvation, and he determined that, that being true, nothing should move him from his purpose to live and die in the love of God, in Christ. And what was the end of his confidence? Hear him, when near the close of his warfare. "None of these things move me." Only, so I may finish my course with joy. A little later, and with the near prospect of death immediately in view, "I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith, henceforth (it's all over now,) there is laid up for me a crown of life."

A sublime faith; and a triumphant victory, after a hard battle. May we be able to say with Paul, "I am persuaded that none of these things shall be able to separate me from the love God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville Texas Aug. 25th 1874

The Bankrupt Law--Church Discipline.

We have been requested to answer the following question:

"What should a church do with a member who, neither forced nor encouraged by his creditors to go

into bankruptcy, voluntarily goes into it to avail himself of the advantage of the homestead provision?"

As the question is one of general interest, we prefer answering it through the columns of the *Herald*. Every case of bankruptcy must, of course, to some extent, be judged by its peculiar circumstances. The motives of the bankrupt, so far as they can be discerned, should be candidly considered. If there is good reason to believe that he went into bankruptcy, not to defraud, but the more conveniently and certainly to pay his creditors, he should not be censured; but if, on the other hand, there is just ground to conclude that his object was to avoid the payment of his debts, and promote his own interests, by securing for himself a "homestead," he should be treated just as any other swindler. No human legislation can efface the distinction between right and wrong, between honesty and knavery. A man is bound by every principle of charity, integrity and honor to pay his debts; and no human laws can exempt him from the obligation. Besides, the "homestead" provision of the bankrupt law may lead to flagrant injustice. The bankrupt may have a home, while his defrauded creditors may be without a shelter. Nay, more; the very money by which he obtained his "homestead" may have been borrowed, or otherwise secured, from his unfortunate creditors; or his dwelling may have been erected by their unrequited toils. The estimate which God places on such conduct may be learned from the language of James, addressed to the dishonest rich men in his day: "Behold, the hire of the laborer who

have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth." James v. 4. We need hardly to remind the reader that fraud is not less offensive to the Lord when practised by the poor than by the rich.

A church should not tolerate such gross iniquity. Christians are forbidden to associate or eat with the "covetous;" and neither "thieves nor covetous" can inherit the kingdom of heaven. 1 Cor. v. 11; vi 10.

Great discretion and tenderness are demanded in the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. If possible, the offender should be brought to see his error, confess it, and make amends where injury has been done. In most cases, justice may be secured, and the character of a church vindicated, by wise counsels and fair arbitration; but in instances of persistent wrong, she should maintain the right and exercise her authority.

To the above from the *Religious Herald of Richmond, Va.*, we append the remark that the circumstances would be of a very remarkable nature that would justify a Christian man taking the benefit of the bankrupt law to release him from his obligations to his creditors. The law is so universally used to defraud and swindle—it justly has such an odium of dishonesty that the cases are rare that would justify a Christian man incurring such odium on himself and the cause of Christ. No member should ever think of such a thing without first advising with the orderly faithful brethren of the church.

But if Christians will obey the Lord and keep out of debt there never will be any occasion to take such a step.

D. L.

Praying For an Outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

There is nothing more common in modern times among the denominations, than to pray for the Holy Spirit to be poured out upon the people, in order to their conversion. It is done everywhere that those denominations exist. And the question comes up, where do they find the authority for this? Do they find any command to that effect? If so, where? We know of no such command. Jesus promised the Spirit to the apostles, to guide them into all the truth, and told them to wait at Jerusalem, till the promise of the Spirit should be fulfilled. But he never told these apostles to pray for the Spirit to be poured out upon the sinners in order to their conversion. But on the other hand, the miraculous power of the Spirit that was given to the apostles was intended for the conversion of sinners, by inspiring the apostles to enable them to preach the gospel everywhere, to every creature, and in all languages of the earth. And when this was done, there was no necessity for any promiscuous outpouring of the Spirit among the people. For instead of a secret work of the Spirit, in some mysterious way, the Spirit went to the people through the apostles, and talked to them, in their own language, and taught them openly and plainly, all about the plan of salva-

tion, and upon what conditions they could be saved. And at the same time these men were enabled to perform miracles, in attestation of the truth of what the Spirit spake through them. This was far better than any secret work of the Spirit upon the sinner could have been. And we have just as great advantages now, as they had then. We have the same preaching of the Holy Spirit in the word of truth that made Christians then, and if these words of the Spirit be read or heard, and obeyed now as they then were, they will just as certainly make Christians now, as they then did. We have the same word now, accompanied by the same miraculous demonstration through the divine record, that they had. And if we credit the word of God as truth at all, the records of these miracles should have the same effect upon us, as if they were actually occurring before our eyes. And in this case, we have no more need of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the sinners, than there was then. The words of the Spirit are with us, in our houses and in our hands, to enlighten our minds upon the whole subject of salvation. And if the Spirit were to come directly from heaven to give the same information over again, there would be nothing gained by it; such a work would be a work of supererrogation. Not one new thought would be added to what we already have, in the word of God. If the people were taught to look to the words of the New Testament for instruction as to how to become Christians instead of being taught to wait for the Spirit to come directly into their hearts from heaven, then

they would have a certain, definite guide to go by. This guide is always at hand. They do not have to wait half a lifetime for the information to come. They can take up this divine guide any day of life, and learn therefrom how to become the children of the living God.

But not only is it true that the apostles were not commanded to pray for an outpouring of the Spirit, but it is also true that they never prayed such a prayer, so far as the word of God records. We fortunately have some instances of prayer by the apostles, but not one instance of such a prayer as that. But we will see how they did pray. We have one of their prayers on record in the fourth chapter of Acts. The apostles had been taken up and publicly threatened for preaching the gospel, and commanded not to preach any more in that name. And it does seem that if there ever was a time when an outpouring of the Spirit upon sinners was needed it was then. The apostles were about to be prevented from preaching. But these enemies of theirs could not have interfered with a secret outpouring of the Spirit. They might have raged in vain, but could have made no interference with such a work as that. We conclude therefore that if it had been in accordance with the will of God to do such a work, these apostles would have understood it, and would have prayed for it at this time. For the object of their prayer was for the spread of the gospel, and if this secret work of the Spirit had been even one of the means of spreading the gospel and of converting sinners, these apostles would most certainly have availed themselves of it in this

case, when their work was so much opposed and interfered with. But here is their prayer: "And now Lord, behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants that with all boldness they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thy hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy Holy child Jesus." Acts 4, 29, 30. Here is a most earnest prayer for the spread of the gospel, but not one word about the spirit being poured out upon the sinner. They knew well the command had gone forth that they were to preach the gospel to every creature. They had no idea that the world could be converted any other way. Now is it not strange that these apostles did not pray for the Spirit to be poured out upon the sinners to convict and convert them? if indeed that were ever God's order. But instead of that, the prayer was, that with all boldness they might be able to speak the word. They also prayed for ability to confirm the word spoken by miraculous power. All that was needed, in their estimation, was that the word of God should be spoken, and confirmed by signs and wonders. We now have this confirmed word, and that is certainly all that is needed to convert sinners at the present time. But not only do these apostles pray themselves that they may be able to spread the truth abroad, but they direct others to pray for the same end. And we will now see how they directed Christians to pray for the conversion of sinners. And in those days when so many difficulties were interposed in the way of spreading the gospel, they would certainly pray for every possible means of advancing the truth, that would be according to the will of God. Paul gives the following, in directing his brethren at Ephesus." Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel; for which I am an ambassador in bonds; that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak." Eph. 6, 18-20. Here is a whole congregation of Christians to pray for the extension of the gospel of Christ. And in all that is said, there is not one word about praying for any direct, secret or abstract influence of the Spirit upon the heart of the sinner. But on the contrary, the burden of the prayer is, that the apostle may be able to open his mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel. And this prayer is in exact accordance with the commission of Christ. "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." This was the duty and work of the apostles everywhere. And in doing this work they were constantly opposed, persecuted, and every possible effort was made to hinder them, and to deter them from the glorious work. Hence the simple prayer, that they, the apostles may open their mouths to speak boldly as they ought to speak. Now if it was right for Christians to pray for the Holy Spirit to be poured out upon the sinner in order to his conversion, Paul failed to teach the Christians at Ephesus their duty in this respect.

But again: "Withal, praying for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds; that I may make it manifest as I ought to speak." Col. 4, 3, 4. Here the same thing is prayed for again: that the way may be opened for the apostle to speak. But no intimation about the separate work of the Spirit. If there were any such thing then, it was entirely overlooked by Paul in this letter.

But once more; Finally brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, as it is with you; and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all men have not faith." 2 Thes. 2, 1, 2.

Now in all these instances, there can be no doubt that the design of the prayers is for the conversion of the world. And in none of them is there an intimation of any such thing, as that these Christians were to pray for an outpouring of the Spirit of God upon the sinner. But in every instance the prayer has reference to the word of God, as the all sufficient means for the conversion of the world. In those times the apostles were persecuted greatly. They were imprisoned, were publicly whipped, and everything that the ingenuity of wicked men, and Satan could possibly invent was done, to prevent the apostles from preaching the gospel. And the whole meaning of these prayers was, that the apostles might be delivered from such men, and that they might have boldness and utterance to preach the word of God. So then we find that the apostles have not in their own lives given us any example of pray-

ing for the Spirit of God to be poured out upon the sinner in order to his conversion. And not only that, but those apostles were guilty of an entire failure to teach the churches their duty, if indeed it be their duty to pray the Lord to send down his Holy Spirit into the heart of the sinner, to convict and convert him. Can any one believe that the apostles, guided as they were by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit would have been guilty of such an oversight? No one who seriously thinks for a moment on the subject can believe it. Would they have overlooked so important a work of the church for the conversion of the world as this? It is a known fact, that with the denominations generally, the praying to God to send his Spirit to the sinner to regenerate the heart, is their main reliance for the conversion of the world. They even think, many of them, that the heathen will be converted and saved that way. But we have now shown, that these denominations, in praying the Lord to send down his Spirit to convict and convert the sinner, are doing so without either precept or example from the apostles for any such thing. So they are relying almost wholly for something entirely unauthorized by the word of God, for their success. And we may therefore conclude that so far as they have any success in these things, that success is entirely contrary to the word of God. Their apparent success in these things, is therefore not from God. For we are taught by the apostles, that everything needful has been furnished us in the word of God. Peter says: "According as his divine power hath given unto us all

things that pertain to life and Godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue.' According to this, everything that pertains to the great economy of man's redemption has been given, everything pertaining to *life* and *Godliness*. Everything pertaining either to conversion, or to living the Christian life has been given us, and stands recorded in the word of God. Again Paul says: "All Scripture given by the inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3: 16, 17. So then Christians are furnished in the Scriptures *to all good works*. But they are not furnished with instructions or examples for praying God to send his Spirit into the heart of sinners, to convert them. Hence when they do this, they are not only doing an unnecessary work, - but a work that is not ranked among good works, for the Bible teaches us that in it we are furnished unto all good works, and this one is not found among them. So therefore we cannot place that practice among the good works, But Christians certainly have the perfect right to pray for the success of the word of God; and not only the right, but we think it is their duty to pray that the word of God, as spoken by the Holy Spirit through the apostles, may now have free course, that it may be glorified among the people now, as it was in the days of the apostles. And it is the duty of Christians not only to pray for these things, but to labor to the extent of their ability, to spread abroad

a knowledge of the word of God among the people. To give them a chance to hear and understand the word of God, so that they may embrace it, and be saved by it. For Peter teaches that people are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." There is therefore brethren, every encouragement to extend a knowledge of the word of God among the people. It "is able to save their souls," if they will be doers of it. Then brethren, let us be earnestly engaged in trying to make known the word of life, and in praying that it may have free course, and that it may be glorified among the people by their reception of the same.

E. G. S.

The Cause of Christ in Johnson County
Texas.

I know of no County in our State where the Cause has a more firm footing than in Johnson. I have just returned from there, where I helped Bro. Bantau in two most excellent meetings—at Caddo and Alvarado. There we saw re enacted the scenes of good old meeting times. Brethren flocked in from every part of the County, bringing their families in wagons and on horseback, and with their earnest labors in talk and song, they fortified the preaching with strong bulwaaks.

There were father and mother Bills, who were veterans in the cause before I was born. They came every day five miles, and returned after night meeting. With such soldiers

of the cross, one on the right hand the other on the left, who would not be nerved to declare boldly the whole counsel of God.

Not the stilted artistic songs of fashion, but the soul-stirring music of Zion's songs rang out strong and clear on the night air. And there were the warm hand shakings and the joyous greetings and congratulations when noble sons and daughters and kind neighbors made the good confession.

The preaching in the County has been done this year principally by Brethren Bantau and Wm. Richardson, who have worked on their farms and preached Saturdays and Sundays and frequently at night during the week.

Bro. Bantau moved to that County about twelve months ago, and has been hard at work on the farm and preaching regularly for four congregations, besides irregular night preaching. He has often plowed nearly all day, then taking the horse from the plow rode him several miles to preach that night. Bro. B. is too well known to the ADVOCATE readers to need any word of commendation from me. I will however just add that he can do more work of mind and body than any man of his strength I ever knew, and that he is the most agreeable preaching companion, and best young preacher's friend I have met.

Bro. Wm. Richardson is a young preacher just getting fairly in the harness; he is true metal and is doing a good work. There were 16 additions at a late meeting he held in the southern part of the County, five of them Methodists.

These two brethren will be kept out of the corn-field and in the Gospel field another year. The brethren of Johnson will do this. They have taxed themselves for this purpose. Let other Counties follow the example and the great work will go on. More zeal and less grumbling about hard times, we need. Let brethren get warmed up, and the rusty dollars will crawl out of their shells, purse strings fly loose, and hard times take wings and fly away.

May God speed the good work in Johnson.

A. CLARK.

Thorp's Springs, Tenn., Aug. 1874.

Church News.

Bros. L. & S.: Since my last report, I, in connection with bro J. J. Dotson held a meeting at a school house, called Rockwell, commencing on Saturday night before the second Lord's day in this moth, and closed on Thursday night with fifteen additions, six by confesison and baptism. We then commenced preaching at Castorville on Saturday night before the third Lord's day inst. and closed last night—preached nine discourses which resulted in thirty one additions, twenty-six by confession and baptism.

I certainly never have witnessed such happy meetings as the two that we held at Castorville. The results of the first, I sent you some time ago in which I made a small mistake. I reported forty-three additions, when it should have been forty eight. In the two meetings at Castorville there have been seventy-nine added to the household of faith. To God the Father be all the praise.

Brother John. J. Dotson is a faithful worker in our master's vineyard. He is a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. It is the power of God unto salvation to whoever believeth.

There are but three preaching brethren in Stoddard County, and we are acting under the Apostolic plan, working with our own hands that we may have plenty, and to give to them that need. Yet however the brethren are very liberal and are willing to lend a helping hand when necessary, and we would be glad for any of the preaching brethren to visit us at any time, for I believe they will be amply rewarded for their trouble. You shall hear from me again soon.

Yours in the hope of eternal life.

J. T. CROW.

*Casierville, Stoddard County, Mo.
Aug. 22nd. 1874.*

Bros. L. & S: The Gospel still has power without anything tacked on. I wrote you last from Knob Creek; our meeting closed at that place with 22 additions. We were aided by the presence, prayers and exhortations of Bros. Frazer and Reynolds. From thence we went to Thompson's Station, at which place we preached four discourses with one addition. Bro. Frazer assisted us. We have a few good brethren and sisters at this place.

However, the cause seems to progress tardily. We think that harmony and faithfulness on the part of the brethren will do more good for a time than preaching. We are now at Lamalsamac, Dyer Co. Tenn., and have had six accessions up to this time.

We are assisted by Bro. J. H. Roulhac of Hickman Ky., who is a master workman in the Lord's house. The brethren in West Tenn. need the labors of Bro. J. H. Fillmore, they are very much behind many of our Middle Tenn. congregations, in their singing and general Christian sociability.

Every where I go I find the ADVOCATE actively engaged in the pertinent work of condemning error and supporting truth. I have just heard bro. L.'s examination of Bro. I. N. Jones' article, which is certainly overwhelming.

I will write you again soon.

Your Bro.

J. M. F. SMITHSON.

*Lamalsamac, Dyer Co. Tenn. Aug.
26th. 1874.*

Bretren L. & S: We held a meeting with the brethren at Big Creek, including fourth Lord's day in this month. The visible result was as follows: 23 additions by confession and baptism, 4 from the Baptist, 10 restored, 5 who had been withdrawn from by the Big Creek congregation, 5 from various other congregations.

We met with and formed the acquaintance of a number of brethren that we had never seen before, among the rest was old fother Dunn, J. M. Curtis, we also had the assistance of William Smith of Shoal Creek, Giles County, an earnest worker for the Lord. In a word we never met more generous, warm-hearted brethren and sisters than those of Limestone Co. Ala. To the Lord be the Praise.

Yours in Christ,

H. J. SPIVY.

Lynnville, Aug. 30th 1874.

Brethren L. & S: We have closed a meeting to-day in this neighborhood, Decatur, five miles east of Plano Collin Co., with 22 by confession, 4 from the Baptists, two from the Methodists, one from Presbyterians, some reclaimed, and some received into the congregation from other parts.

Bro. Polly was with us a few days at the commencement and did some good preaching. Bro. Faulkner, who preaches regularly for the congregation was with us, laboring faithfully till toward the close.

Yours in Christ,

J. R. WILMETH.

Decatur Tex. Aug. 26.

Bros. L. & S: I have been here preaching four days, baptized six this morning—two men and four ladies. All but one heads of families. No Christian preacher has ever been here before. This is a wild frontier town. A body of Indian warriors, about one hundred strong passed down within a few miles from here last night. The Rangers are hot after them, and will, I hope, soon drive them from the country.

I shall remain this week and gather what I can into the Lord's vineyard. The great necessity for plain, elementary preaching almost unnerves me. I never, before, felt so keenly my incapacity.

Day and night eager listeners crowd to hear; and as I stand before them, my mind is bowed down with the great anxiety to speak what I ought.

An old lady, 70 years of age, has made the confession, and been baptized. She never heard the truth

before; but she had read it and was ready to obey it.

A. CLARK.

Jonesboro Texas Aug. 26, 1874.

We have just had two very interesting protracted meetings on Flat Creek; the 3rd Lord's day at Flat Creek with four additions; the fourth at New Hermon with twenty one. The preaching was done by Bros. J. H. Morton and W. H. Dixon.

J. D. FLOYD.

Flat Creek, Tenn. Aug. 27th 1874.

Bro. Lipscomb: Thinking that you and your readers would be glad to hear of the success of the Gospel away down here in Georgia I have thought proper to give you a report of a meeting held with Bethany church, Jackson County, embracing the third Lord's day in August—continuing about 8 days, which resulted in twenty-one baptisms and one reclaimed. The meeting was conducted principally by Bro. Dr. Doster and myself. Bro. P. F. Lamar was with us on Lord's day. Bro. Dr. F. Jackson also aided two days—towards the last of the meeting, and greatly aided by Bro. J. L. Hardegro by his prayers and songs.

Yours in the one hope,

W. T. LOWE.

Clark County, Ga., Aug. 31, 1874.
Apostolic Times please copy.

Brethren L. & S.: Have just closed another meeting near this place. Preached four discourses. Three additions.

JOHN T. POE.

Huntsville, Texas, Aug. 31st 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: I will make a

brief report of labors and success in my field for the month of Aug. Assisted by bro. F. M. Kibbey, we held a meeting with the church at Milburn Ballard Co. Ky., commencing on Saturday before 1st Lord's day; and continued till the following Friday without any visible effect so far as additions were concerned, yet I think that much good was accomplished. Bro. Kibbey doing most of the preaching. From thence I went to Blandville, where I was met and assisted by our truly worthy brother J. E. Flower, of Paducah, who is an efficient and earnest worker. We continued the meeting over two Lord's days with 45 additions as the result of our united efforts. We left Blandville on Monday morning, leaving the good work to be continued by bro's Truman and Owens, as the final result 52 were added to Zion's host. Bro. Flower and myself went to Charleston, Mo., commenced the work on Monday night, which continued under our united efforts till the following Monday night with 13 added.

Bro. F. left me to go to his family at Evansville Ind. I continued the meeting until Thursday evening, closing with 15 added mostly from the world. The cause of truth is gaining a footing in Charleston.

The Methodist preacher in charge there, made a very fair exhibition of the true Spirit of Methodism, by commencing a meeting a week in advance of my appointment, and continued his meeting nearly to the close of ours. But in praise of the truth of God's word, be it said, he was not able, with all his efforts to keep even all his own flock away.

They would go where they could hear something to entertain them. Several ones we gained were from the leading business men of the city whose wives were Sectarians. We are becoming too popular as a people to be as successful as we were forty years ago. We need to be persecuted more to give the truth palpable success.

I shall [if the Lord will) commence a meeting in Saltillo, Miss., on Saturday before the 2nd Lord's day of this Month (Sept.) which I hope to be able to continue for at least a week. I hope the brethren will have everything in readiness for a good meeting. Bros. Crooke and Carter have just concluded a meeting at Montrose, near Fulton Station with 32 additions.

Brethren let us all labor earnestly, and pray fervently for the triumph of the truth over error.

Your Bro. in Christ,

R. B. TRIMBLE.

Mayfield Ky. Sept 1st. 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: For many years there have been a few disciples in this community but for several years we have been destitute of a preacher, during which time we have not often attended to the observance of the ordinances of God's house, yet not one of us has ever departed from the faith.

On the 3rd Lord's day in this month brother J. M. Joiner came among us and delivered seven discourses, the immediate result was nine accessions by confession and baptism.

Those who obeyed were all young people. There was a good impress-

ion made on the community and a fair prospect of others bowing to the authority of Zion's king.

We expect soon to build a house of worship, and we hope yet to make a Scriptural exhibition of the Christian religion. We ask the prayers and sympathies of God's children. We number at present, in our own community thirty members.

Your Brother,
E. T. HILL.

Delta Ala. August 31st 1874.

Answers to Queries by Eld. J. Creath.

Editors Gospel Advocate: Permit me through the columns of your Advocate to answer some queries proposed by Mr. Jacob Creath of Palmyra, Mo., Aug. 13th, 1874. Query 1, page 797, Vol. 16:

"Did not John preach faith in him who was to come, and repentance, and immersion as preparatory to the pardon of sins under the Messiah?"

Answer 1. He did not. He preached repentance, (Mat. iii: 1-2) and faith as preparatory to pardon of sins, (Acts xix: 14) and baptism (not immersion) as the initiatory step into the kingdom, or mystical body of Christ.

Page 798. Query 2. "Is faith, repentance, and confession of sins and fruits and immersion, faith alone?"

Answer. They are not. Neither are they all embraced in the condition of salvation. There is but one condition (and only one) of salvation, viz: *faith* in Jesus. Repentance is not the condition, nor a part of it. It precedes that faith that purifies the heart. It places man in the position to comply with the condition, and is

essential to salvation. Luke xiii: 3.

Query 3. Did John the Immerser who died before Jesus did, preach the Gospel, which Paul defines to be the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ?" 1 Cor. xv: 1-4.

Answer. He (John) did. So did the prophet Isaiah, 712 years B. C. Isaiah 53. See John's language as recorded by Mark i: 7-8.

Query 4. "Did not John turn or convert the Jewish nation to God, and did you ever convert sinners to God as he did?"

Answer. John did not turn or convert the Jewish nation to God. As a nation they (Jews) did not receive him (Jesus.) John i: 11.

Again, I trust as an humble instrument in God's hands, that I have turned many from darkness to light; from Satan to God.

Query 5. "Did not John die before the birthday of the church of Jesus Christ?"

Answer. No. Christ or God has never had but one kingdom or church; which began with the first believers, nearly six thousand years ago. That kingdom or church is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. Eph. ii: 20. Compare this with Isaiah xxviii: 16.

Query 6. Did not Christ give the commission to the Apostles to preach the Gospel to all nations after the death of John, how then did he preach the Gospel which he never heard, and which was given after his death?"

Answer. Let us first ascertain the exact meaning of the word gospel. What is its true import? The origi-

nal word *evangelion* is a compound, composed of *ev*, well, good, and *aggelion* a message, tidings, etc. Then the gospel implies, good tidings, glad tidings, a good message. John certainly proclaimed good tidings, consequently he preached the Gospel when he preached Jesus, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. John i: 29 and 36.

F. J. TYLER.

Lynnville, Tenn., Sept. 3, 1874.

We give the above as the position taken by our friend on the questions propounded. We like for our readers to hear all sides, even though others refuse this courtesy to us. Will each reader for himself test the truth of these answers by an examination of Scripture teaching on the subject. It was worth ten times as much for each one, for himself to search out these matters than for bro. Creath or any one else to reply for our readers.

D. L.

Bethany College.

Editors Gospel Advocate: Permit me through the columns of your paper to speak a few words for Bethany College. It seems that she has been almost forgotten by Tennessee for the past few years. Only three or four have been in attendance each session for some years.

President W. K. Pendleton and Prof. C. L. Loos, (both long and faithfully connected with the College) with a full and efficient corps of assistants, are fulfilling the aim of the great founder: that of giving a *liberal* and *thorough* education to all who seek her halls, with that end in view.

Those who wish to graduate on *merit* and not on the "four years plan" can do no better than to take a course at Bethany College. To young men preparing for the ministry special facilities are offered. The situation of the College is advantageous both to moral and physical health. The graduating class of '74 were, without a single exception, members of the Church.

We advise any of your readers, who purpose to enter a college this fall, to try Bethany College, and we feel confident that they will not regret it if they do so. The next session begins Sept 28th.

JAMES F. LIPSCOMB.

Murfreesboro, Tenn., Aug. 29th, 1874.

Obituaries.

Brethren L. & S: It is our duty, by the request of his wife and the brethren at South Harpeth, to record the death of our bro. Isaac W. Pritchard. Brother Pritchard was born Dec. 26th 1834, obeyed the Gospel of our Savior in the Summer of 1867, and died July 10th, 1874. It is sad to see any one die. It is a sore trial to give up our brethren, friends and relatives. Indeed it is trying to bid them adieu, although we may have the full assurance from their lives and the calmness in which they depart that the brilliant rays from the Sun of Righteousness pierce their tombs and illumine the path through the dark regions of death to the bright shores of bliss eternal. Our brother was earnest in the cause of our Master, and showed by his conduct from the day of his burial with our Savior in baptism to his burial in the silent tomb, that his heart was in the work. His health has not been good for several years, having weak lungs. His sufferings lasted only a few days. When told by his physician that he was dying, he exclaimed: "glory to God, my sufferings will soon be o'er."

He talked frequently about leaving, and said, all was bright in the future. He gave much good advice to his relatives and friends who were present, and requested them to meet him in a better world. He asked his wife not to grieve for him, but to be faithful and raise his three children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. He leaves a large circle of

brethren and friends to mourn his loss; but we are consoled by the thought that our loss is his gain. Though sad to witness a death, it should be encouraging to see one die in the triumphs of a living faith. Let us all endeavor to so live that our exit from this stage may be triumphant.

Your Bro. in hope;

W. ANDERSON.

CARTER'S CREEK STATION TENN. AUG. 23 1874.

Died, on the morning of July 28th, 1874, at his home in Hopkinsville Ky., Bro. Gabriel Long, in his sixty-sixth year. He had been an earnest member of the Christian Church for thirty-five years, and for several years past had filled the office of Deacon. He left a wife and six children; also two brothers, one in California, the other, Judge A. V. Long of Christian Co., to whom he was especially endeared by fraternal and social ties.

Bro. Long has been well known to this community, having been born and raised in this county. A man, upright and exemplary in all of the walks of life, possessed of sterling character, strictly honest and punctual in the discharge of every duty, he had no sympathy with wickedness in any form. He was a kind father and an affectionate husband, and those who knew him best, loved him most.

Death came to him invested with no terrors.

In his last moments he spoke often of eternity; and when the dust returned to the earth as it was, and the spirit was taken to God who gave it, he died calmly, with an ever-brightening hope, and a firm Christian faith in a life beyond the grave.

T. A. CRENSHAW.

We announce through the Advo A death of sister Mary McKenny, who departed this life at her residence in Butler Co., Ky. July 30, 1874, with Typhoid Fever, after an illness of 18 days. She has gone to dwell where sickness, pain, nor death can ever come. She united with the Christian Church in Wilson Co. Tenn. at an early day. Sister Mary was a daughter of Robert Sweatt of Wilson Co. Tenn. Married Wm. McKenny of Butler Co. Ky. Where she made her home until her death aged about 40 years. Sister McKenny was a most highly esteemed lady, and Christian mother. She esteemed the cause of Christ above all others, sister McKenny was always found at the bed of sickness and bestowing charitable means to the afflicted and distressed. She leaves a husband and five children to mourn her loss, and a large circle of friends, some of whom live in Wilson Co., Tenn.

Dearest friends are doomed to sever,

And to meet on earth no more;

Yet blessed thought; 'tis not forever,

But We'll meet on Canaan's shore.

R. F. HOLLAND.

BOWLING GREEN KY. AUG. 27, 1874.

A Good School.

We have many good schools, and we rejoice to see the number of schools in connection with the congregations multiplying. We hope to see the day when every congregation of disciples in the land will have a good school of its own, and in that school the Christian religion in all of its parts, taught as the most important branch of learning.

If children ever make true Christians, it will be effected by schooling them in the love and practice of the teachings of Christ daily through childhood and youth. While schools are growing up in and around the congregations, let the religion of Christ be more and more taught and practiced. Let not the religion of Christ be sacrificed for the sake of popularity or success. Education without Christian holiness is worth nothing. Schools without the Bible as the most important of all text books are valueless. They are evil in their tendency. The Bible in all of its parts should be taught and studied as carefully as arithmetic, or grammar or any other science is taught. While calling the attention of our readers to the schools, we call the attention of our school managers to these things. They must be heeded, or the schools will not be worthy of the esteem of Christians.

Of the schools among our brethren, we do no injustice to others in directing especial attention of those wishing to send their daughters from home, to Murfreesboro Female Institute. We know of none more earnest or faithful in the discharge of their duties than Bro. and Sister

Scobey. We know of none in the country to whose care we would sooner commit a girl to be educated, with the assurance that she would be carefully and properly developed in mind, morals and manners.

They have devoted themselves for a number of years wholly and singly to this work, and propose to make it their life labor. They have succeeded well, and merit the support of all who must send their daughters from home to be educated.

The above was written some ten weeks ago. Certain contingencies then probable prevented its publication at the time. It was laid aside and overlooked until now. The session is now under headway. Since the above was written Prof. Wm. Lipscomb has become associated with Bro. Scobey in the school. As he is our brother, it becomes us to speak modestly of him. He has spent his life in teaching. He was chosen Professor of Ancient Languages in Franklin College, at the age of nineteen. He occupied the position for twenty years up to the war. He has since been connected with the Institute at Murfreesboro, Union University and has had charge of the public schools of Murfreesboro. He was instructor very greatly of both Bro. Scobey and myself. We think the school with its present arrangement offers advantages for thorough scholarship superior to any school known to us. D. L.

Truthfulness is a corner-stone in character, and if it is not firmly laid in youth, there will be ever after a weak spot in the foundation.—Anon.

THE FIRESIDE.

EDITED BY

J. M. Barnes.

To The Little Folks. No. 14.

Faith, repentance and baptism.

What are they for?

For the remission of sins.

Where do the Scriptures so teach?

In Acts 16: 31 the jailer was commanded to believe in order to pardon. In Acts 2: 38, the people were commanded to repent and be baptized in order to pardon.

Did the jailer and the people referred to in Acts 2nd. comply with precisely the same conditions?

They certainly did. Otherwise, the Lord pardons the same class of persons, under the same dispensations, upon different conditions, and thus would be a respecter of persons, which the Bible says he is not. The jailer inquired, before he believed on Christ, what he should do, and was told to believe, as his first duty. This he did, and then repented and was baptized. The people referred to in 2nd of Acts had believed before they enquired what they should do; and were then told to repent and be baptized. Hence, they believed, repented and were baptized. In both cases they did precisely the same things.

We know the jailer was commanded to believe, and that he was baptized, for it says so; but how do you know he repented?

Because the Savior said on a certain occasion, "Except you repent you shall all perish;" and Peter on Pentecost made repentance a condi-

tion of pardon. His subsequent conduct was that of a pardoned man. Therefore, he must have complied with every condition.

How do you know the people on Pentecost believed?

Because the Bible says, "without faith it is impossible to please God;" and Peter would not have told them to repent and be baptized, had it not been pleasing to God; which it could not have been, unless preceded by faith. So you see precisely the same conditions are required of every person in the same state.

To what class of persons are faith, repentance and baptism conditions of pardon?

To aliens; those who have never been born again; those who have never become Christians. Baptism is not an item in the law of pardon to Christians.

What is the law of pardon to the Christian who has sinned?

Faith, repentance and prayer.

Why not faith, repentance and prayer to the alien?

Because it was not given as such. It is not the will of God.

Could a child of God be pardoned for an offence by faith, repentance and baptism?

No; no more than an alien could be pardoned of his sins by faith, repentance and prayer.

Why do religionists teach the alien that through prayer alone he can be pardoned?

That is a question the Bible affords me no answer for—unless it be, it is their desire to "teach for doctrines the commandments of men."

Then you consider faith, repentance and prayer, or prayer alone for

pardon, applied to the alien, as a human law?

Thus applied, I certainly consider it a human law?

Can we have the pardon of our sins in this life, and finally an acceptance in heaven by compliance with a human law.

Certainly not. If we could, then the U. States Congress or the State Legislature might enact us as good a law, by which to get to heaven, as we could desire.

Do you view the teachings of religious parties as of no higher authority than legislative enactments?

Perverting the law of Christ as they do in the case under consideration, I do not. I would as soon try to get to heaven by act of the Legislature as an edict of theirs.

UNCLE JOE.

Her Silence Saved Me.

"I remember," said a young man, "being in company with several thoughtless girls. Among them however, there was one exception; a serious, quiet, and beautiful woman, whose religious opinions were well known, and whose pen had for a long time spoken eloquently in the cause of truth and virtue through the columns of our village paper. Suddenly I conceived the thought of bantering her on religious subjects, and with the fool-hardiness of youth and the recklessness of impiety, I launched forth with some stale infidel objections that none but the fool who saith in his heart, "There is no God," would venture to reiterate. The flock of silly goslings

about me laughed and tittered, and I encouraged by their mirth, grew bold and repeated my innuendoes, occasionally glancing slyly toward the principal butt of all my fun. She did not seem to notice me at all; but she did not smile, did not look away, and did not look at me.

"Still I continued my impious harangue, thinking that she must refute something, that she would not surely hear her own most holy faith held up to ridicule by a beardless boy. The snickerers around me gradually began to glance toward her. Her face was so quiet, so even solemn in its quiet, that seriousness stole over them, and I stood alone, striving by own senseless laughter to buoy up my fast sinking courage.

"Still she never spoke or smiled—scarcely moved; her immobility grew awful; I began to stutter—to pause—to feel cold and strange—I could not tell how. My courage oozed off; my heart grew faint—I was conquered.

"That night after I went home, in reflecting over my fool-hardy adventure, I could have scourged myself. The sweet angelic countenance of my mute accuser came up before me in the visions of the night; I could not sleep. Nor did I rest till some days after, I went to the house of the lady I had insulted and asked her pardon. Then she spoke to me, how mild! how Christianly! how sweetly!

"I was subdued, melted down; and it was not long after that I became, I trust, an humble Christian, and looked back to my miserable unbelief with horror.

"Her silence saved me. Had she

answered with sarcasm, with sneer or with rebuke, I should have grown stronger in my bantering and more determined in my opposition. But she was silent, and I felt as if my voice was striving to make itself heard against the mighty words of an Omnipotent God! O! how often would it be better, if instead of vain argument or hot dispute, the Christian would use the magic of silence!"
—Selected.

Restitution.

Have you, in any way, injured another? It is not enough to say, and to say with grief, "I do remember my fault." You are bound in duty to repair the injury as much, and as speedily as possible. Have you defrauded another of his property? You are bound to restore it with interest too. Have you injured your neighbor in his character, by defalcation and slander? You are bound to explain and vindicate his character in the most explicit terms. Have you corrupted the heart of your brother by loose talk and infidel principles? You are bound to use every effort to counteract the influence of such deadly evil, and to furnish him with the knowledge of scriptural truth. Have you injured the health of your friend, his peace of mind, his family comfort; have you in any way drawn him into sin, temptation, and danger? You are bound, by every tie of humanity and justice, by every bond of reason and religion, to repair the awful mischief you have done, and to benefit your friend by every possible means. Repentance is nothing without reformation; and

reformation, in many instances, is a mere name, without *restitution*.—*Kidd.*

A Word to the Erring.

If you have led a sinful life, and are now ashamed and weary of it—if you arise and go to God, he will receive you graciously and will abundantly pardon. All his assurances are the same affecting tenor. "He is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish." "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways." And here he is represented as the merciful Father whose pity survives the longest provocation, and whose love is such that when the prodigal at last returns he presses him to his bosom. Such is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus; and if you are wise, you will let no bold suspicions or subtle casuistry cheat you out of the strong consolation. You cannot err in doing as he directs. Be assured that God is as kindly disposed as in the parable of the prodigal son he is represented to be. The invitations, promises, which he has given us in the gospel, mean the utmost of what they express, and God is as earnestly desirous that sinners should return unto him, and as much pleased when they return, as the strongest language of the gospel declares—*James Hamilton D. D.*

Put Away Lying.

It is an evil thing to linger near the verge of falsehood; to live in such

a way that the truth will be against us, and the only smooth story we can tell must be a lie. It is better to live so uprightly that there will be no shadow of an occasion for prevarication and deceit. With truth in the inward parts, we shall have truth in the outward life; the good tree will bear good fruit, and the pure fountain will pour out crystal streams. On the other hand a sin may call for a lie to hide it, and blast a life, and leave such memories of shame and bitterness as nothing earthly can banish or subdue. Satan is a liar;—in Christ there is truth; and no lie that could be told would make his reputation any better than it is made by the simple truth as it is in Jesus."

Put away lying, put it so far away that it will be out of reach, out of sight and out of mind. Live in an atmosphere of truth, so near to the God of truth that no lie can dwell in the light of his presence; so near that falsehood shall slink away from the open countenance of truth, purity and love. The Lord hates lying; see that you hate it too. Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord; let them be abominable to you also. And when all liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, see to it that you are found in that city where the lip of truth shall be established, and where the God of truth shall reign. "Lie not one to another, seeing you have put off the old man with his deeds."

"Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor, for ye are members one of another."—*Selected.*

Need of Carefulness in Old Age.

An old man is like an old wagon, with light loading and careful usage it will last for years ; but one heavy load or sudden strain will break it and ruin it forever. Many people reach the age of fifty, sixty or even seventy measurably free from most of the pains and infirmities of age, cheery in heart and sound in health, ripe in wisdom and experience, with sympathies mellowed by age, and with reasonable prospects and opportunities for continued usefulness in the world for a considerable time. Let such persons be thankful but let them also be careful. An old constitution is like an old bone—broken with ease, mended with difficulty. A young tree bends to the gale, an old one snaps and falls before the blast. A single hard lift ; an hour of heating work ; an evening exposure to rain or damp ; a severe chill ; an excess of food ; the unusual indulgence of any appetite or passion ; a sudden fit of anger ; an improper dose of medicine—any of these, or other similar things, may cut off a valuable life in an hour, and leave the fair hopes of usefulness and enjoyment but a shapeless wreck.—*Popular Science Monthly.*

RELIGION IS A PRICELESS TREASURE.—It is good in every condition of life. It soothes our sorrow. In sickness, it sustains and cheers. In death, it gives the victory. Its real value is only known to those who make it a daily life. It will shed a halo of glory along the path of every humble, trusting disciple of Jesus.

“It is disgraceful,” says the author of *Companions of My Solitude*, “that men are so ill-taught and unprepared for social life as they are; often turning their best energies, their acquisitions and their special advantages into means of annoyance to those with whom they live. Some day it may be found out that to bring up a man with a genial nature, a good temper and a happy form of mind, is a greater effort than to perfect him in much knowledge and many accomplishments. Then we might have that tolerance of other people’s pursuits, that absence of disputatiousness, and that freedom from small fussiness that would render a companion a certain gain.

HEARING RESTORED. A great invention, by one who was deaf for 20 years. Send stamp for particulars, to JNO. GARMORE, Lock box 80, Madison, Ind.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Queries on Church Co-operation.....	839
Paul’s Confidence.....	844
The Bankrupt Law--Church Discipline	845
Praying for an outpouring of the Holy Spirit.....	846
The cause of Christ in Johnson Co., Texas.....	850
Church News.....	855
Answers to Queries by Eld J. Creath...	8
Bethany College.....	856
Obituaries.....	856
A good School.....	857
The Fireside.	
To the Little Folks.....	858
Her Silence saved me.....	859
Restitution	860
A word to the Erring.....	861
Put away lying.....	861

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 37.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SEPT. 17, 1874.

Supposed Contradictions in the Bible.

"11. Jesus was crucified at the third hour. Mark xv: 25. It was the sixth hour. John xix: 14, 15."

The difficulty in this case, is not a discrepancy as to the facts they relate, for in this, they all agree. But merely a difference as to the hour of the day in which the facts occurred. And this little difference in time would by no means invalidate their testimony, even if there were no way of reconciling them. But this we think can be sufficiently done. In the first place, in the old original Greek Manuscripts, numbers were expressed by letters, not by figures, or by words, as at present. The Greek letter that stood for *third*, and the one that stood for *sixth*, were so nearly alike in form, that in transcribing the old manuscripts, the one may have been taken for the other. And in this way most likely the difficulty occurred. For, in the second place, there is good authority to the effect that some of the ancient manuscripts have the *third* hour in John, as well as Mark. These two facts taken together, first, that the

Greek letters for *third*, and *sixth*, are so much alike that one might be taken for the other in transcribing, and secondly, that we find good authority, such as "Horn's Introductions," establishing that some very ancient manuscripts have both alike, ought certainly to be satisfactory on a mere circumstantial point, when in all the main facts, they perfectly agree. Were a man on trial for his life, in a murder case, and two competent witnesses are examined, and should both testify that on a certain day they saw this man deliberately shoot down another with a pistol, and they perfectly agree in the facts, and even in the little circumstances connected with the event, except that one says nine o'clock, while the other said twelve o'clock, I should think it a pretty clear case. Just such is the case with these men, taking the passages as they are. Both these writers testify that Jesus was condemned by the Jews, that sentence was passed against him by Pilate, that he was led away by soldiers, and crucified upon a cross, that he arose again from the dead. They both agree as to the day on which he was put to death, and that he was buried by

Joseph of Arimathea, they both agree that he rose from the dead on the first day of the week. And all this, too, so far as we can learn, without any concert of action, or any effort to say the same thing. Each one was intent upon recording the facts concerning Jesus, without any fear or care whether others said the same thing or not. These facts, together with the explanations already given of the apparent contradiction between these two writers, we think sufficient to relieve the passage of all difficulty.

"12. Two thieves reviled Jesus. Mark. xv: 32.

Only one of the thieves reviled him. Luke xxiii: 39-40."

There is no necessity at all to regard this as a contradiction. It is entirely possible that both thieves at first reviled him, but that one of them afterwards became more humble, and asked Jesus to remember him. Or, again, the language asking Jesus to remember him might have been ironical, and while two of the witnesses regarded all that was said as railing or reviling, Luke mentions the language that one of them used, without saying whether he was sincere or not. Some have explained the matter in this way. But take it either way, there is no necessity of placing the two witnesses mentioned above in contradiction with each other. It looks very much like catching at straws, to bring up little outside circumstances out of which to make contradictions, when all the witnesses are a unit as to the facts in the case: especially when in these little circumstances the language has

to be strained to make out even an apparent contradiction.

"13. Vinegar mingled with gall was offered to Jesus. Matt. xxvii: 34. Wine, mingled with myrrh was offered to him. Mark xv: 23."

In this case, the difference is merely verbal, but not contradictory. The vinegar of those times, was a kind of wine, with a sharp taste, that was much used as a beverage, so that what is called vinegar, is really wine, so that Matthew and Mark do not contradict each other, but both of them speak of wine. The word wine, as used by Mark, may be applied to every kind of wine that was made from the grape. But that which by Matthew is called *vinegar*, signifies a certain kind of wine, or wine in a certain state. And if this be a contradiction, then two men would contradict each other, if one were to say a tree stood in the yard, and the other should say an *oak* stood in the yard. In this case one of them uses the general word tree, while the other simply uses the word oak, which names a certain kind of tree, and so each one told the truth. So it is with Matthew and Mark, regarding the wine. One uses a general, while the other uses a specific term. And as to the words *gall*, and *myrrh*, both mean *bitter*. The word *gall*, in its New Testament use, in the Greek, signifies bitterness, and may be applied to anything that is bitter, while the word *myrrh* signifies a kind of aromatic, bitter, resinous substance or gum that exudes by incision from a small thorny tree, that grows in Egypt, Arabia, and Abyssinia. These words are therefore in nowise contradictory. Gall may be applied to

anything bitter, while myrrh signifies a certain kind of bitter. No contradiction here therefore. And besides this, there are plain indications in the narratives, that something was offered him more than once, and in that case different mixtures of wine and bitterness may have been offered. In Matthew's account, he mentions that they gave him vinegar mingled with gall, when they first came to the place where they crucified him. Then after he had been on the cross for some time, and cried out, "My God, My God, &c.," one of them took a sponge and filled it with vinegar, and handed it to him. Even if we grant (which we do not,) that Matthew and Mark *necessarily* speak of different mixtures, still they can be reconciled upon the principle that drink was offered him more than once, and therefore different mixtures of wine and bitterness may have been given, and one may have spoken of one kind, and the other of another. So in no case is there necessarily a contradiction. If one of these witnesses said wine, and the other said water, or milk, then there would be some show of contradiction. Or if one said they gave him vinegar to drink, and the other said they gave him nothing at all to drink, they might in that case make out a contradiction. But as the matter stands, there is none. If those who are searching for contradictions in the Bible would spend as much time in calmly searching out the evidences of the truth of the Bible and of our holy religion, they would not be long in yielding the truth that the Bible is a revelation from God; that it deals in truth, not in falsehood and

fable. They will find moreover that the purest characters ever known in this world, are those that are formed by the teaching of the word of God.

E. G. S.

Difficulties of a Devious Way.

Having been engaged for about ten days in a protracted effort with the Disciples at Decatur, Collin Co., Texas, endeavoring to exhibit Christ crucified as the only hope of perishing sinners, with two or three discourses daily, and an additional service at the water's edge every day except one, it was thought well to give respite from 11 o'clock service to look after needful temporal affairs. The writer and a few others took advantage of the recess to witness a service in a Baptist meeting which had been steadily kept up for the same length of time as our own, and only about a stone's cast from our preaching place.

The scene was a large new house and in an audience of about fifteen persons. The preacher was a man of fair mental development and fine physical proportions, a combination of the sanguine-nervous temperament, or assumptive-assertive disposition. He "taken" his audience to be ignorant and of course his discourse "partaken" of the same nature. At least, the terms of it indicated that the grammar and the Bible had not been seriously consulted. But whatever it lacked as to grammatical or biblical accuracy, it had no lack as to the speaker's confidence in himself and his subject. This was manifest from the boldness of his assertions and the swelling tones of his voice.

His departure was from the 5th chapter, 29th verse of Deut.: "O that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me, and keep my commandments always," etc. This afforded a pretext for sundry concessions, assumptions and suggestions, or conclusions.

The first was a concession that the Old Covenant was annulled, and consequently we must look to the New Testament for the plan of salvation. Here alone must be found the satisfactory answer to the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" And this question is asked by every one when "waked up."

The second step is to assume that the sinner, though "waked up," has not a heart to do the commandments of God, and hence cannot do them. In other words, the sinner, the "waked up" is still dead. He became spiritually dead in the fall. The decree was "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." And he did die that very day. That is he became carnally-minded, and "to be carnally-minded is death." Since then the sinner is dead, or carnally minded, he cannot obey; for the carnal mind is enmity to God—"is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Hence the impossibility of the unregenerate keeping the commandments. Yet notwithstanding this manifest impossibility, the preacher is "persuaded that thousands keep the commandments through a slavish fear of hell." And as a proof of this persuasion he cited the case of the rich young man who came to the Savior. And the writer concluded the case one in point. In that what was impossible with men

was possible with God. In this, what was impossible according to the preacher's reasoning, is quite possible according to his observation.

The third step was to show how this dead sinner, or carnal mind, could be made alive. The gospel is the means. The conversation with Nicodemus serves as a pretext for an episode to dodge baptism. On this his views are peculiar. He regrets that his own brethren are so much in the dark on this subject that they believe and teach that baptism is symbolized by the water in this passage. As for his own part he cannot believe this unless it first be shown that baptism has two references, one to a birth and the other to a death, things the very opposites of each other. Strange that the very same act should be a means of death and a means of life. But the writer could but think that what seemed so strange in grace, is not in nature strange. The planting of a grain of wheat is the means of its decay, or death, while it gives life, or rather birth to a new plant. But tho' "born of water" could not in his superior judgment refer to Christian baptism, he deigned not to tell us to what it does refer.

Resuming, he endeavors to show the how of this process. It is like the blowing of the wind. It is mysterious and consequently can not be told. Nevertheless it can be experienced, or felt.

Still it is brought about by the gospel as the means. But then it may be asked, What is the gospel? Webster defines it as *Good news*. But this is not deemed sufficient; so he dives away into the darkness of

supposition and confusion, and never reaches the proposed Scripture definition.

This solution, however, is given, at length. "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and in sins." "The letter killeth but the Spirit maketh alive." The letter, that is, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" kills, but the Spirit regenerates what the sword has killed, and makes it alive.

Now if the sinner can't see his way he must be blind as well as dead. Oh, for a little of the salt of common sense to save from the blighting mystifications of modern theology and allow the word of God to exert its legitimate influence on the human heart.

J. R. W.

The Way men obtain the pardon of their Sins under the Gospel Dispensation.

No. 3.

No man from Adam to the resurrection of Christ, obtained the pardon of sins, according to the Commission given by Christ to the apostles after his resurrection: "Preach the gospel to every creature, he that believes the gospel and is immersed shall be pardoned or saved." Mark xvi: 16. The reason of this is, no man can be pardoned or condemned by either a human or divine law before that law exists, or is published, before he has learned what the law is. As this law was not published, until after the resurrection of Christ, no man could be pardoned by it, *before that time*: consequently men are now pardoned in a way different from the patriarchs

and Jews under Moses. This commission as recorded by the four evangelists and developed by the Apostles in the book of Acts, comprehends the birth of Jesus Christ, his death, burial and resurrection. Moses, the prophets, psalms and four evangelists prove these facts true. Faith in the testimony concerning these facts changes the affections and purposes of the human heart, and produces repentance, which begins in the mind and heart, and issues in the life and conduct of the penitent, in the abandonment of all sin and in obedience to the Gospel. Then immersion follows faith and repentance, then pardon of sins, then the Holy Spirit is given to the obedient. See Acts ii: 38. Acts iii: 19, Acts v: 30, 31, 32. So in every instance in Acts.

The apostolic gospel was facts, things done, testimony, faith, repentance, immersion, pardon, the Holy Spirit, perseverance in well-doing till death, a resurrection from the dead, eternal happiness. The papistical or Romish arrangement of this gospel practically is, sprinkling or pouring of water on the heads or faces of unconscious babes, without faith, without repentance, without reason, without Scripture, uncalled for by them, done arbitrarily, and then as they grow up, they believe in the traditions, councils, decrees, popes, cardinals, clergy and all sacraments and customs of that Hierarchy, and are finally saved if they do not happen to stop in their half-way house, called purgatory. This is the papistical gospel practically. John Calvin's gospel reads, practically, predestination, decrees, foreknowledge, total depravity, special operations of the

Holy Spirit on this mass of depravity, to regenerate it, then special atonement, then perseverance and then heaven. I should have stated that like the papists, they pour or sprinkle water on children's heads or faces, without knowledge, faith, reason, repentance or conscience, and then comes faith in the dogmas named above. The Methodist gospel reads practically, go into all the world and sprinkle or pour water on children without faith, reason or Scripture, then they seek religion, get religion, obtain religion, and then *feel* that their sins' are pardoned, and join the church; then obey the Discipline, and if they do not fall from grace, they will be finally saved. Martin Luther's gospel reads practically, go sprinkle children, without faith, repentance or anything as a prerequisite to baptism, then faith alone for pardon is a wholesome doctrine, and full of comfort—and so says the Helvetich confession of opinions, the French confession of opinions, the Augsburg confession, the Assemblies Catechism or Westminster confession of opinions, the English confession of opinions, all the Protestant sects with one voice proclaim, "Wherefore that we are pardoned or justified by *faith only*, is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." To all this great and learned testimony, I oppose the Divine testimony of the apostle James, in the second chapter of his epistles from the 14th to the 26th verse where he argues this very question, when he says, "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he have faith, and have not works? Can faith save (or pardon) him?" Yes, say all these confessions

of human opinions, true faith will pardon him. This question of the apostle, is the strongest affirmation, that faith alone cannot save him, as his reasoning in the chapter proves, and then at verse 24, he says, you see then how that by *works* a man is justified, (or pardoned) and not by *faith only*. For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." verse 26. This testimony of the Holy Spirit, and all the cases I have adduced from the patriarchal, Jewish, and the age of the Immæser, and now from the Christian age, does not look much like "there was but one way to pardon sinners from Adam to 1874," which dogma of the Lutheran Reformation and Protestantism I am now combatting, that of "faith alone." There certainly cannot be much "comfort" in it to those persons who believe the Bible. Luther invented it, to cut off at one stroke the manneries and masks of the papists, the Protestant sects, apply to believers immersion for pardon of sins, which is for pardon of sins. The Protestant sects, which all have been born since the Lutheran Reformation in 1517-20, use this dogma to destroy a divine institution, or to avoid it, when Luther to destroy papistical masks, declared the epistle of James "a chaffy or strawy epistle." The sects to destroy an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ for pardon of sins, according to the creeds of papists and sects, for the remission of sins, declare this ordinance a "nonessential." Luther its father, and his children use this contradiction to the whole Bible, for a very different purpose. He to

destroy Catholicism, they to destroy an institution.

J. CREATH.

QUERIES.

Brethren L. & S. Please give your views through the GOSPEL ADVOCATE of Luke 23rd chapter and 43rd verse "and Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."

2. Do we have any proof that the thief on the cross was baptized? Also please explain Revelations 5th chapter and 9th verse, "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation." 7th chapter and 9th verse. "After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds, and people and tongues stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands."

Yours in Christ,

T. JOHNSON.

Corpus Christi, Texas, May 31st, 1873.

We are inclined to think in the passage before us, the word paradise refers to the grave, the regions of the dead. We have no intimation that the thief knew anything about the future kingdom of Christ. We have no knowledge that he was ever with the Savior during his personal ministry at all, or that he had any opportunity to learn anything about the kingdom that Jesus came to estab-

lish, either here, or hereafter. And how could he then understand the nature of this kingdom, so as to ask the Savior to remember him when he should come into his kingdom? For to carry out the common idea of this passage, the thief must have understood what was the design of the death of Jesus, and of the great plan of salvation he was to provide, and of that everlasting kingdom he was to establish for the eternal happiness of all his people, and that he must have asked for a blessing in that everlasting kingdom, and that the answer of Jesus promised him a home in heaven. Now we think all the facts and circumstances of the case are against such an idea. Even the apostles, who had been with the Savior all the time, had eaten and slept with him; had seen all his miracles, had heard all his lessons of instruction during his personal ministry, never understood the nature of the kingdom Jesus was to establish: either his kingdom on earth, or his everlasting kingdom. For up to the time of the ascension to heaven, the apostles themselves were expecting an earthly kingdom, like that of David and Solomon. For when Christ was about to ascend, the apostles said to him, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Restore *again* the kingdom to Israel, shows that the apostles themselves, with all the advantages they had, did not understand the nature of the kingdom of Christ, either earthly or heavenly. And as these apostles, who had all advantages did not understand the nature of Christ's kingdom, how could the thief understand it, who had none of

these advantages? No one who seriously considers the matter can think so. And in the next place Jesus did not enter heaven while his body lay in the tomb. For when Mary was about to lay hold of him after his resurrection, he said to her, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." John 20, 17. So when Jesus said "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise," he did not mean heaven, as is generally supposed, for he did not himself go there that day. This again indicates that the thief did not have reference to the future kingdom, or heaven, when he asked the Savior to remember him. And finally, he could not have understood this matter, for life and immortality were not brought to light till Jesus arose from the dead, and therefore the thief did not and, could not have reference to the matter regarding the future home of the blessed. Hence he did not make the prayer with reference to heaven, nor was the Savior's reply a promise of heaven as we understand it. The thief had probably heard that Christ had come to establish a kingdom, and he like the Jewish people generally, and even the apostles themselves, thought this would be an earthly kingdom. And in this case, he thought that Jesus might come down from the cross, and enter at once into his kingdom by miraculous power, and that in this case, Jesus could also save him from the cross, and thus save him from dying. This we think is likely the kind of a kingdom the thief had in his mind when he addressed the Savior on the cross. And the reply of Jesus to him amounted to saying to him, "No; I shall die to-day, and

go into the regions of the dead, and so will you, and be with me there." And so Jesus did die that day, and was buried—went into the regions of the dead, so did the thief. The dark shades of death closed over both of them that very day. This construction relieves the passage of all difficulty. While the idea that paradise in this passage means heaven, presents more difficulties than can be removed out of the way. Or, on the other hand, it may be, as some claim, that the thief spake ironically, and that what he said was only in derision. For we have the information both from Matt. and Mark, that both the thieves railed on Jesus. So if this thief was at all in earnest, then he must have humbled himself while on the cross, for he was certainly engaged in railery at first. But this, he may have done. We are not disposed to contend about that. But in either case, we do not think that either heaven, or salvation beyond the tomb is referred to in the passage, either by the thief or Savior. But while we are inclined to think that this is the true meaning of the passage, we can admit all that is claimed in regard to the matter, and still show that no one can be saved that way now, as is often claimed.

Many contend that the Savior pardoned the thief, and took him straightway to heaven, upon no other condition than that he seemed humble, and asked the Savior to remember him. Even to grant that he was thus saved, he stands as a solitary case and not another one in all the Bible saved that way. When Jesus arose from the dead, he proclaimed

a new law of pardon to the world ; one that never had been given before. And from the ascension of Jesus to heaven till the close of the New Testament, there is not one single instance of any one being saved except by the new law of pardon which Jesus gave into the hands of the apostles when he was about to ascend to heaven, Hence if we grant that the thief was saved, that will not do us any good. Enoch and Elijah were saved, but no one can be saved as they were. So Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, all lived and died the servants of God, and will live eternally in heaven. But we cannot possibly serve God now by living as they lived. So also Caleb and Joshua lived and died the servants of God, and doubtless will find an eternal home in heaven. But whoever attempts to be saved now by simply doing what they did, will be lost ; for no one is now commanded to do what they did. Not one of those ancient worthies was ever commanded to obey the Gospel of Christ, and not one of them ever did it. But we are told that if we *obey not* the gospel, we "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The thief was not commanded to obey the gospel, and did not obey it. We are commanded to obey it, and will be eternally condemned if we do not do so. So it manifests an utter want of a proper understanding of the word of God, for any one to think of being saved now, as it is claimed the thief was. No sinner now has any intimation in the word of God that he can be saved except by obeying the gospel of the Son of God,

as taught by the apostles after Jesus ascended to heaven. As to whether the thief had ever been baptized or not, no one knows. He may have been or he may not. Whoever says he was *not* baptized, guesses at the matter, and so does he who says he *was* baptized.

As to the passages referred to in Revelation, the connection in which they stand explains them as well as we know how to explain them. We do not claim to be skillful in the interpreting the book of Revelation. Our study has been mostly the gospels and epistles. Some things in Revelations we think we understand, and others we are sure we do not. We think Christ is the one referred to as taking the book and opening the seals, and the multitudes in white robes are the finally faithful of all nations, who will live in heaven.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S: Please explain the 6th and 8th verses of the 5th chap of 1st John through the *AEVO-CATE*.

Yours in the one hope,

H. W. MILLER.

Lynnville Tenn.

The verse is as follows ; "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ ; not by water only but by water and blood, and it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is true. * * And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit and the water and the blood ; and these three agree in one." In the sixth verse, John is speaking of the Son of God, and says he came by water and blood. He was baptized

by John in Jordan, and was thus made manifest to Israel. John says, came baptizing that he, Christ, might be made manifest to Israel. It was at his baptism that God made the public demonstration that Jesus was his Son, both by sending his Spirit upon him, and by publicly declaring him to be his Son. So in this sense he came, or was manifested to Israel by water. Also when Christ was on the cross, just before he was taken down, a soldier thrust a spear into his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water. And John who records this says; "And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe." John 19, 35. So when Jesus had expired upon the cross, both blood and water issued from his side, at the opening made by the spear. Now we are not going to undertake to say whether the water referred to in the above passage refers to the baptism of Christ in water in Jordan, or to the water that issued from his side. Both in fact are connected with the testimony that proves Christ to be the Son of God. In both these respects he came by water, as well as blood. And the Spirit is said to bear witness.

The Holy Spirit, by miraculous demonstration, and by its words through the apostles, bears witness that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. And in this passage, John was speaking of the testimonies God has given of his Son. So Jesus came not by water alone, or blood alone, but by water and blood. In the eighth verse, John is also speaking of the testimonies that God has given of his

He says "There are three that

bear witness on earth, the Spirit, the water and the blood." And these three, he says, agree in one: that is, they agree in their testimony that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Then the water, in the institution of baptism, still bears witness to the truth that Jesus is the Son of God. Every time that any one is buried with Christ in baptism, and raised up to walk in newness of life, we have the testimony repeated, that Jesus was buried and rose again from the dead. But in the practice of sprinkling and pouring, this testimony is entirely lost. There was nothing that ever occurred in the life of the Savior, nor in his death that sprinkling or pouring represent, in any sense of the word. Not one single incident, either in the life or death of Jesus is represented by these acts of pouring and sprinkling. But nothing ever was more fitly represented than immersion represents the burial and resurrection of Christ. Paul in his letter to the Romans says; "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." Rom. 6, 4. And to the Colossians also he says; "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."

In immersion therefore, we have a very striking likeness of Christ's burial in the tomb of Joseph, and of his resurrection therefrom; so that in this action we have a continually repeated testimony to the truth of the claims of Jesus, as the Son of

God, as well as the testimonies concerning baptism in the word of God. For the existence of baptism at the present time cannot be accounted for, except by admitting the truth of the truth of the claims of Jesus as given in the New Testament. Viewed in this light, the testimony becomes very strong. But those who practice sprinkling or pouring for baptism, lose this item of testimony entirely. So also the blood of Christ is a strong witness in behalf of the claims of Jesus. Not only in the record in the word of God that his blood was shed upon the cross, but also in the Lord's Supper we have a continued recurrence of testimony to the fact that the blood of Jesus was shed upon the cross, and that he is therefore the Son of God. No man can account for the existence of the Lord's supper, except upon the truth of the proposition—the blood of Jesus was shed upon the cross. The wine is the emblem of the blood of Jesus, as he himself testified when he instituted it. Hence every Lord's day that we as Christians meet around the table of the Lord, and partake of the wine, the emblem of the blood of the Son of God, we have the testimony of him repeated.

In the ninth verse, we have the design of all these things expressed thus; "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son."

So the one grand design of these things is to prove to the world that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God.

This one grand truth is the leading theme of the Bible, the one great

end and aim of all of God's revelations to man. If Jesus of Nazareth is indeed the Son of God, the Bible is true, is the word of God. If Jesus be not God's Son, the Savior of those who put their trust in him, the Bible is a fable, and the story of the cross but the imagination of the same man's infatuated brain. But ah! who can doubt that Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea—was baptized by John in Jordan, raised Lazarus from the dead, and finally died upon the Roman Cross at Jerusalem, was buried and rose again the third day—that he has opened up a new and living way for us through the veil, that is, his flesh. And who can doubt that through him there will be a great resurrection morn, when all the dead shall be raised, and the righteous all taken home to live with God in heaven forever? We envy not the condition and gloom of the man who will not receive the wonderful accumulation of the evidence that God has given concerning his Son, Jesus Christ. This world is a dark world to him who denies the claims of Jesus, and the future world still darker.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S: Please give me your views of the 16th ch. of Mark 17th and 18th verses which read, "And these signs shall follow them that believe in my name. They shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." Are those believers spoken of in the above verses the believers that believe on Christ

through the apostles words, if so how are they to do the things mentioned above; please answer through the ADVOCATE and oblige.

Yours in the hope of eternal life,
John F. BISHOP.

Kennamer Cove, Ala. May 4th.
1874.

We think this language was used only with reference to the introductory age of the church. These things were given, these demonstrations made as confirmatory of the truth and as indicative of the power attending and approving the establishment of the church. When the church was fully established, then these confirmatory signs ceased, but were recorded for our instruction and confirmation. Through revelation they come to us and in this sense follow to all Christians in all ages.

D. L.

Am I Baptized into Christ or the church?

I wrote a note to you not long since, saying I felt relieved, which was true; but there is yet one doubt in my mind. I thought after reading your answer, that I had lived out of my duty so long that if I would join the church and live up to the commands of God I would again feel right, but sometimes my doubt seems to increase and now after living out of my duty for 15 years, if ever I start again, I want to feel assured that I am right. Perhaps I did not give so full an explanation as I should have done in my first letter. The Scripture says, "He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved." Now I believed, prayed to God secretly to

forgive my sins, and my whole desire was to love and serve the Lord. But in this is my doubt: Was I baptized into Christ or the Church? The Predestinarian Baptists believe that a person can as easily be saved without baptism as with it, and they will not receive one that has been baptized by another denomination. Now if my baptism is valid in the sight of God. I fear it would be an abomination to be baptized again. I think this is a serious subject. When I come to the Judgment Bar of God shall I answer that I have partly obeyed Christ and partly Sectarianism? God forbid. I fear that I should tremble on that terrible day. So with the help of God I intend do my duty if I can learn what it is. I have read and shall continue to read the Scriptures a great deal, but desire all the explanation I can get.

Yours in hope,

M. C. CARRUTH.

Vanalstyne, Grayson Co, Texas.

Our sister alone can solve this difficulty. If she was baptized to obey Christ, she was baptized into Christ. If she was baptized merely to satisfy the demands of the church, she was not baptized into Christ. But as she believed in Christ, was seeking to please Christ, and was anxious to do his will. I take it for granted her object was to obey and honor him. If not, if it was just to please some one by joining the church, it was no baptism. These questions, each can decide for him or herself alone. We are quite familiar with the primitive or Predestinarian Baptists.

We have a good deal of their blood in our veins. Think they have

many most excellent ideas, nullified by a few very erroneous ones.

In my mind the whole question as to the validity of the act in the sight of God depends on the question, were you baptized to obey God? If not the baptism is no baptism; if yes, you can do nothing more. All repetition is vain and presumptuous.

Having lived out of duty does not affect the validity of the act. If we have lived wrong, repentance, deep and earnest is the requirement.

D. L.

EASY WAY.

Dear Brethren: You are aware that many object to the Lord's way of receiving members into his fold, considering it "too easy," and declaring, the church is liable to be imposed upon unless the door be locked and unlocked by the use of human keys patented by some religious party. Our beloved brother, T. B. Larimore of Florence, Ala., who has served us so faithfully for the last four years, has often defended the Lord and his Father's word against these unjust attacks, always manifesting all the vigilance and caution that were compatible with a faithful soldier's duties.

During our last meeting two individuals eluded his vigilance, various circumstances conspiring together to throw him off of his guard, and caused us all much trouble. One man made "the good confession" in the morning and appointed 4 o'clock for the baptism. Notwithstanding the extreme heat, and the distance—two miles—many were at the pool at the appointed time. *The man passed by*

on his way to a frolic as we learned, and believed to be the case. That he won a hat by our willingness to receive him, is currently reported. He was a perfect stranger to us all. We feared there was some evil influence at work then, but hoped we were mistaken.

The last night of our meeting our spacious house was densely crowded, many not being able to procure seats. One man responded to the touching gospel call.

He was a comparative stranger to Bro. L. who, having inquired of a brother near by, was informed that he was a citizen of Colliersville. This was satisfactory with Bro. L. who is so attached to our little city, where he is respected and dearly beloved, not only by our own brethren, but by every religious party and the world that he can scarcely see our faults. He took the confession. The man then informed him, that he had been baptized, and was satisfied with his baptism. None speaking of the mistake, and no objection being offered, the "hand of fellowship was extended to him. Now, this man is very wicked and has never been baptized—having received a substitute from the fingers of a priest belonging to the church that invented the substitute, and in the "Larger Catechism" of which it is stated, that, "The Holy Scriptures teach baptism only by immersion. The dogma of the church is to sprinkle, and in this, as in everything else, we ought to be subject to the church."

These things were not done through ignorance. We have written this for the express purpose of eliciting a lengthy comment from you. The interests of

the cause demand it, and we have the utmost confidence in your ability to manage the complicated question.

Yours in the Lord,

DISCIPLE.

Colliersville Tenn. Aug. 31st 1874.

We think the brethren need not be astonished at the course of those wicked men who imposed themselves upon them at Colliersville. Just as long as there are wicked people in the earth, just that long will they do wickedly. Satan and all his combined powers will always be busy in trying to oppose the righteous. This has been true ever since man was created, and will continue while man continues on earth, and this wickedness will manifest itself in any way that will succeed in opposing truth. These men at Colliersville, certainly acted about as wickedly as Satan would have them act, but the sin is all their own, and if the brethren will go quietly and faithfully along, and do their duty, this wickedness will all recoil upon the heads of the perpetrators, and the cause of truth will be unharmed. The brethren there should just go independently along, and teach the truth as plainly and confidently as ever, and whenever any one presents himself, saying he wants to obey the Lord, just proceed as they have ever done, unless they have positive evidence that wickedness is intended by the individual. Better receive a half dozen wicked hypocrites than reject one honest man who wishes to serve the Lord. We are any of us liable to be deceived and imposed upon by designing men, and never find out at all that they were hypocrites. But

such things will never injure us, nor the cause of Christ, if we will all be faithful in doing our duties. Men that can do as those men did, are exceedingly depraved, but if the church there will do its duty, even those men may possibly be won to the truth. So do right and leave the result with God.

E. G. S,

From the Monitor.

OUR BIBLE CLASS.

BY E. GOODWIN.

Lesson, Phil. III. 18, 19.

The class will notice that our lesson is a parenthesis. The seventeenth and twentieth verses may be read in connection; thus:

"Brethren, be ye followers together of me, and mark them that walk so, as you have us for an ensample, for our conversation" (citizenship) "is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior," etc.

Now while the apostle was penning these words of instruction and comfort for the church, he remembered certain disorderly members, and his heart is filled with sorrow, great tears of sympathetic grief course their way down his care-worn cheeks and he throws in this parenthetical sentence:

"Many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you, even weeping, that they are enemies of the cross of Christ, whose end is destruction, whose god is their stomach, whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things."

In this sorrowful sentence we have an illustration of the tender regard

and deep feeling of interest that the apostle exercised for the purity of the church and the salvation of all her members. Though a prisoner at Rome, guarded by soldiers, not knowing what moment the sentence of death would be passed upon him, he does not forget his brethren, nor fail to send his apostolic admonitions to the churches, and he yet has a tear for the unruly members, who had not learned enough of Christ and his gospel to overcome their evil propensities and worldly-mindedness—who still loved the pleasures of the world more than the fellowship of saints. Similar feelings of sorrow are now experienced by the truly pious when they see professed Christians walking contrary to the gospel. But let us look more closely at our lesson.

The term cross here stands for the whole gospel system of salvation. On one occasion Paul said, he would only glory in the cross of Christ, by which he was crucified to the world and the world to him (Gal. vi, 14.) Here the cross stands for the death of Christ. Again he said, "When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." (Rom. v. 10.) And again; "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one who believeth. (Rom. i, 16.) From these expressions it is clear that the apostle employs the terms, the cross of Christ, the death of Christ and the gospel of Christ to indicate the whole system of redemption through the death of Jesus upon the Roman cross.

Then, to be an enemy of the cross of Christ is to be an enemy of the

gospel plan of salvation therein. This is surely a dreadful position for any human being to occupy. To stand out before heaven and earth as an enemy to Christ, who loved us and gave his life for us—who poured out his warm hearts blood for our redemption, is awful beyond the power of language to express; and yet it is said that some of the members of this church were just such enemies.

I do not suppose that they professed to be such enemies of the gospel; I do not suppose that they had boldly declared to the church and before the world that they were opposed to Christ and his gospel. Had they done this they would have been separated from the church, which was not the case, for Paul is speaking, not to the outside world, but to the church and of the church; it was the unholy conduct of these unruly members which filled his heart with sorrow. Their general course was such as to do the cause of Christ a serious injury and to bring a reproach upon the church, and therefore the apostle regarded them as enemies of the Christian religion. The same may be done now; it is possible for church members to act so inconsistent with their profession as to do the cause of Christ more harm than an infidel, or an open opposer of the gospel. These persons over whom Paul weeps while he writes manifested their enmity to the doctrine of the cross.

1. By making a god of their stomach, or appetite. From this statement it seems that they paid more devotion to their stomach than to their God. Such are ever saying, "What shall I eat, what shall I drink and where with all shall I be clothed?"

Some pay such servile devotion to their appetite that they destroy themselves, soul and body in its gratification. How many men, after having been baptized into the body of Christ, have bowed down to their appetite and worshipped their stomach by pouring into it strong drink until they have lost their standing in the church and become vagabonds on the earth! Their god is their appetite.

2. *They glory in their shame.* This was another indication of their enmity to the cross of Christ. I do not know precisely to what particular acts the apostle refers in this statement, but be it what it may, it was something of which a Christian ought to be ashamed, and yet they gloried in it. I fear this is true of many professed Christians in the present day. How many pay shameful devotions to *madam* fashion, and even glory in their ability to outshine their poor sisters in the church; they rejoice in things which the gospel condemned. Is not this showing enmity to the cross of Christ? They are opposed to the self-denial which Jesus taught, and as to bearing the cross for Christ's sake, it is not in all their thoughts.

3. Another evidence of their enmity to the gospel is thus expressed: "*They mind earthly things;*" that is they give their chief attention to these things; earthly things engage their thoughts; their private meditations and social conversations are all about earthly things; things that belong to the present world.

These earthly things cannot be the ordinary and legitimate affairs of this life. Paul did not teach idleness and inattention to business; on the con-

trary he commanded the christian to "labor, working with his hands that which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth," (Eph. iv. 28) and laid it down as a principle, "if any would not work neither should he eat," and by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, he "commanded and exhorted that with quietness they should work and eat their own bread." (2 Thes. III, 10, 12.) It is true that while Christians were thus laboring, they were to "set their affections on things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of Gsd," (Col. III, 1, 2,) and to "lay up treasure in heaven where moth and rust do not corrupt, nor thieves break through and steal." Matthew vi, 20.)

Things earthly, to which these enemies of the cross of Christ, gave their attention, were unrighteous things that tended to corrupt the heart, and destroy the spiritual life; things that lead the mind away from Christ and heaven, and prompt to the neglect of God's word, the worship of the Lord's house and the ordinance of the church. There are many of such things, even now, by minding which, the love of Christ will be banished from the human heart, and all taste for sacred things be lost. Let a young disciple spend his leisure moments in reading the light, chaffy literature which is now flooding our country and how soon will he lose all taste for solid religious instruction. The Bible is soon neglected.

If he takes a kind of mince-pie news paper, containing highly wrought love stories, scientific essays and a small sprinkle of moral and religious

instructions, thrown in for seasoning in order to catch thoughtless Christians, his taste will soon become so vitiated, that he will devour with greediness the story, touch lightly on the scientific and pass lightly over the religious leaving it unread; he is minding earthly things.

The ball-room and the giddy dance may be numbered among these earthly things. Did you ever see a dancing Christian? How much of heaven have such in their souls? How much do they think of Christ, the sufferings of Jesus for the sins of the world? All the tendencies of these exercises are earthly; they never lift the minds to things above, never cast a longing look over the dark river; all that is claimed for it is the sensual enjoyment of the present hour, or that it trains in the graceful movements of the body, in this world, not in heaven; it is all earthly and only earthly.

Those who seek enjoyment in these earthly things, call for positive Scripture commands against dancing. Why not call for commands against gambling. O, say they, gambling is demoralizing in its tendencies, and comes under the head of dishonest dealing, which is forbidden in the holy Scriptures. We admit it, and so is dancing destructive of heavenly mindedness and is forbidden under the head of reveling, which is numbered among the worst of human crimes. See Gal. v, 21; 1 Pet. iv. 3. The word translated *reveling* in these scriptures, is *komos*, which means, in N. T. a nocturnal revel, revelings with songs and music." *Greenfield*. In Rom. XIII, 23 this word is rendered *rioting* and positively forbidden.

The apostle Peter refers to the

course that Christians had pursued before their conversion, but their change of manners was such that their former associates "thought strange that they run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of them." (1 Pet. iv, 4.) The class will please notice that the apostle refers to this as praiseworthy fact in the conduct of these christians. Suppose one of our fashionable, pleasure-loving ladies should profess faith in Christ, be immersed and "join the church," but should continue to seek enjoyment in the frivolities which she formerly loved, goes to the dancing parties and joins in all the merriment of the occasion, and manifests as much interest in the dance as she did before her baptism, do you think that her worldly minded companions would speak evil of her because of any change in her conduct? No, indeed, but they would think strange that she went with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of her"—behind her back.

If Paul were here he would weep over all such vain and frivolous professors, because they are the enemies of the cross of Christ; they bring a reproach on the church, weaken the influence of the Gospel and are stumbling blocks in the way of sinners. O how the truly pious weep over such ungodly professors of religion.

But the fact that grieved the apostle most of all was the end to which these these unruly members were tending; "*Their end is destruction.*" He saw that they could never enter heaven while they thus walked in the vanity of their mind and their foolish heart being darkened; he could see the future in the light of the present; he saw them going from the blessings of the

gospel, pursuing the phantoms of a vain and thoughtless world, laughing on the road to death, tripping the fantastic toe until they make the last trip and stumble and fall into the gulf of everlasting despair. No wonder he said, "I tell you of them even weeping."

Now I hope no member of my Bible Class, who is a member of the church, ever indulges in those vanities, or manifest any of these signs of enmity to the cross of Christ. If you feel an inclining in that direction, let me call your attention to the tears of the great apostle to the Gentiles, and invite you to the cross of the blessed Savior while he hangs bleeding for a lost and ruined world; and remember that he suffered for you. I think no person who will spend an hour with Jesus in Gethsemane's Garden or on Calvary, near the cross on which Jesus died would feel like going from thence into the ball-room or of joining the dancing party.

The best cure for dancing christians (?) is to induce them to draw near to God in faith and prayer, and get their souls filled with the love of God, love that rejoiceth not in iniquity; but rejoiceth in the truth. The reason some disciples seek happiness in the dance is because their hearts are not filled with the spirit of the gospel; they desire enjoyment, and not having drunk of the water of life which Jesus gives, they are unsatisfied, and therefore they turn to the world for enjoyment. May the Lord have mercy on all such.

Truthfulness is a corner-stone in character, and if it is not firmly laid in youth, there will be ever after a weak spot in the foundation.—*Anon.*

CHURCH NEWS.

Dear Advocate: In a former article I should have stated, that the Presbyterians gave us the privilege of using their house at Milton. For this mark of courtesy they have our sincere thanks. From there I went near Statesville: spoke eight times. Next, I went to Union, Shelbyville pike. Spoke seven times, baptized one. From here, to Eagleville pike, spoke twelve times, baptized one. Thence to Millersburg, spoke six times, had three additions. From here I went to Mount Zion, spoke ten times, baptized twelve. Bro. Wm. Lipscomb was with me on Lord's day, and set in order the things that were wanting: at this place they number near 40. I am now at Beech Grove, and having a good hearing.

Yours in the common faith,

SMITH J. DENTON.

Murfreesboro, Tenn., Sept. 8, 1874.

Bro. Lipscomb: During a meeting at Liberty, Maury County, embracing the 3rd Lord's day of this month, which continued five days, twenty-one were added to the army of Christ, all by baptism.* Bro. G. A. Reynolds and I did the preaching. This is the only protracted effort I have made since you was down to see us.

Truly your brother,

JNO. M. MORTON.

Isom's Store, Maury Co., Tenn., Aug. 31, 1874.

P. S. Three have been added at Cathey's Creek recently. Bro. John A. Sidener did the preaching.

J. M. M.

Bro. Sewell: After four years of persistent endeavor to establish a congregation of disciples founded upon the teachings of the apostles and prophets, we organized ourselves, on the first Lord's day in September, into a body to be known as the Church of Christ at Knoxville, Tenn., with fifteen members. Through the efforts of Bro. N. R. Hall and myself, we have rented a nice room for meeting in a good locality, and seated it very comfortably. We have secured the services of a young brother—L. H. Stine, from Illinois, who acquits himself as an earnest defender and proclaimer of Primitive Christianity; he has been with us a month, has helped to gather together the little band of disciples, and has added one to the faithful by immersion.

May the Lord help him and us to uphold the cause of Christ in this place, and may much good result from our feeble effort to spread the cause of truth in this part of the moral vineyard.

Pray for us, and encourage us as babes in Christ, desiring the sincere milk of the word, that we may grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth: and that we may be the means of bringing many who are not out of the ark of safety in the fold, by the teachings of him who has cast his lot with us to proclaim the word.

Yours in Christian fellowship,

A. C. BRUCE.

Christian Review and *Standard*
please copy.

We are truly glad to see that the brethren, though few in number, have determined to keep house for

the Lord in Knoxville. This is something that has long been needed at that place. We have all confidence in the cause of truth, and the good cause is certain of success there if the brethren will work faithfully. Nothing can win the people to truth faster than Godly living—living according to the word of God.

Whenever even a few will meet together regularly, break the loaf, sing praises to God, read the Scriptures, and pray together, the Lord will bless and prosper them. "The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open to their prayers." Such is the teaching of the word of God, and we believe it. Then brethren, persevere in well doing, and you will not only save yourselves, but others will come in after while, and go with you. Without earnest and constant work, none need expect to succeed in the Lord's vineyard. The true spirit of Christianity is, "Be always abounding in the work of the Lord. We have long known Brother Bruce personally, and esteem him highly as a Christian, and we trust that he and those other brethren and sisters there will never allow the candle of the Lord to go out, in that flourishing little city, but that they will increase in strength, and zeal, and in numbers until the standard of truth shall be permanently established in Knoxville.

E. G. S.

Bros. Lipscomb & Sewell: I have just returned from Cheatham County. I spent the 1st Lord's day in Ashland City and continued till Wednesday

night. Had no additions, but think much good has been done by allaying prejudice. Several expressed themselves almost persuaded to be Christians. From this place I went to Sam's Creek—found the brethren doing well, had no addition. I preached three times. After the discourse on Friday I gave an invitation and after investigation there was but one in the house to obey, the work was so complete my last visit before this. I left Sam's Creek Saturday morning—went to Harper to a church house near Mr. A. N. Stroud's, began Saturday night continued till Wednesday with nine additions, one lady nearly 70 years of age, (Mr. Stroud's mother,) all the remainder were heads of families except one. Wednesday night I preached one discourse at a church house 4 miles higher up the river, with two more and Thursday morning baptized one of them and re-baptized bro. Tilman Harris, who had been baptized by the Methodists, but was not satisfied. The other was from the C. P. Church, and had been baptized. I left the water about 8 o'clock for home, where I arrived about night very tired. I leave home to-day for Belleview church in Dixon County.

W. F. TODD.

Goodlettsville, Tenn., Sept. 13, 1874.

SUCCESS OF THE GOSPEL AMONG THE
COLORED PEOPLE.

Brc Lipscomb: As you have informed the brotherhood through the Advocate of my work, and your willingness to receive and see properly appropriated and acknowledge

through the Advocate all contributions sent you for my support, I feel it my duty to make the following report of my labors, since my return from Kentucky. On the 26th of July, I went to Kingston Springs to preach old Sister Susan Ursery's funeral; she attained to the age of 93: lived in the Christian church 37 years—died June the 1st, 1873, in the faith. After preaching her funeral at 12 o'clock, I preached to a good audience at night in a Methodist church near by, called Pegram's chapel. I then returned to the city, but left again on the 29th for Trenton to attend the convention of brethren that assembled there on the 28th. I stopped while there with an old brother one and a half miles from town on the Brazil road. I soon learned the old Bro. and his wife and 3 out of 10 sons were all members of the Christian church, also two of his daughters-in-law, though none of them were enjoying church privileges. They having belonged to the church in Marshall County before they moved to West Tenn., but had not taken membership with the congregation in Trenton. I organized them into a church and exhorted them to worship regularly every Lord's day. Preached once there received the confession of another one of his daughters-in-law whom I requested another brother to baptize, as I was compelled to leave for another point before it could be attended to; though it was done the next day. Saturday, Aug. 1, I left Trenton on the Mobile and Ohio R.R. for Henderson Station, 18 miles south of Jackson, in Madison County—reached it at 11-30, and was conveyed three miles out in

the County of Henderson, and preached at night, and twice the next day, it being Lord's day. I found some excellent white brethren and sisters there, but not a single colored brother or sister. My hearers there were of both colors; many of the colored people expressed surprise at what they heard, and earnestly entreated me to come again as soon as I could and let them hear more of that doctrine which they said was not Campbellism but true Bible doctrine. I made them a promise and left. After reaching home and resting a few days, I went to Murfreesboro on Saturday the 8th, delivered six addresses to attentive audiences, but under very unfavorable circumstances. I am satisfied unless I can have a better chance to get at the colored people than heretofore nothing can be accomplished worth the effort. Aug. 22nd I left again for Trenton, reached there at 11-30 A. M., by going from Humboldt on a freight train—commenced a meeting with the little church organized in old Bro. B. A. Burnett's house on the 31st of July with 8 members. They had in the mean time fitted up a small house in which to meet and worship. It will seat comfortably about 75 persons. The meeting was well attended. The first night two made the good confession and next day at 4 o'clock I baptized them, the interest increased until the trouble and excitement that is well known to have occurred there that week. The meeting was only a mile and a half from the town. It was greatly affected in attendance and interest, but not otherwise disturbed. On Wednesday night we did not meet at all. I closed it Friday night—preached 7 sermons, spoke at the water's edge 4 times, baptized 6, one old man more than 60 years old and his daughter and grand-son and son-in-law. One united with the brethren, making 16. The church in Trenton intended to have me preach in their house of worship on Thursday night, but on account of the excitement thought it best not, then, but at some other time. They nevertheless gave unmistakable evidence of sympathy and interest by sending me a five-dollar bill which made me think of the Apostle's words, "let us not love in word and tongue, but indeed and in truth," and of the old maxim, "actions speak louder than words." I left Trenton the 29th, for Henderson Station, at which place I was met by an intelligent colored man, and conveyed to his house about three miles near the place to hold the meeting, an arbor having been made and seats arranged to comfortably accommodate some three or four hundred persons. I commenced the meeting that night, closed it on Wednesday night following—preached 6 sermons, baptized eight, received 3 from the Baptists, organized them and set them to keeping the ordinances. The white brethren promised to assist them which I am satisfied they will do; for I think I met some of the best white brethren and sisters there I have ever seen anywhere. They appear very anxious that the colored people in their neighborhood should receive the right kind of instruction. The arbor is on Bro. Wm. Brummer's land, and Bro. Wm. McGee, in whose house we organized lives on his land. We

call that church Brummer's Grove, and the one near Trenton Burnett's Chapel. After visiting Jackson and Brownsville, I returned home. Since my last report I have travelled 1004 miles, preached 34 sermons, baptized 14, received 4.—Received \$45.40, paid out \$39.00.

DANIEL WATKINS.

Nashville, Tenn. Sept. 10, 1874.

JUST ONCE.

There is danger in "just once," when posted at the entrance of a dubious path. There is no danger in "never," but safety. The latter leans upward to honor and virtue. The first leans downward, and often to irretrievable ruin.

A benevolent man, in visiting a prison, came suddenly upon a lad who, thinking himself unobserved, was bewailing himself in his cell—"O that just once—that just once! it has been my ruin." Through the grated window of his cell, the gentleman spoke a few kind words to the youth, and gained his confidence. He then told him that a desire to outshine his companions and own the handsomest watch of the clique, was the means of his fall. "I could not accumulate money fast enough," said he, "and a fine opportunity offering to obtain a watch—five dollars being wanting—in an evil hour I yielded to the temptation to abstract the sum from the money-drawer of my employer. I said, 'Only once;' this shall be the only time; but not being discovered or suspected, I felt emboldened to try once more, was detected, and now am here. O, sir, do warn all the boys whom you know, to beware of *just once!*'"

Take warning, young reader. These are all incidents of truth. Make up your minds never to do a wrong thing, even for once. Never do even a small wrong, for it invariably leads to a greater. Be bold and courageous in resisting evil, whether the temptation be an indulgence of curiosity, or love of show, or a foolish and mistaken idea of being manly. Is there any true manliness in smoking, in drinking, in riding fast horses? Nay; true manliness is seen in resisting evil with firmness and constancy. Every such resistance adds to your moral strength; but every indulgence tends to weaken and to detract from true manhood, and makes it easier to sin again.

Not long since was carried to Blackwell's Island a gentleman in appearance, a felon in reality; soon to exchange his fine broadcloth suit for the striped jean of the criminal, his palace for a grated cell. A desire for gain and to outshine others was his ruin. He did not become a knave all at once. There was a time when he stepped aside from the path of innocence. Had he stopped at "just once," and said "never," he would have risen in true worth, and had a name among the good and honored in society.—*Mary P. Hale, in School-day Magazine for August.*

"There are but three ways of living: by working, by begging, or by stealing. Those who do not work, disguise it in whatever petty language we please, are doing one of the other two. The ten commandments and a handicraft make a good and wholesome equipment to commence life with. A man must

learn to stand upright upon his own feet, to respect himself, to be independent of Charity or accident. It is on this basis only that any superstructure of intellectual cultivation worth having can possibly be built. It hurts no intellect to be able to make a boat, or a house, or a pair of shoes, or a suit of clothes, or hammer a horse shoe; and if one can do either of these he has nothing to fear from fortune. Spinoza, the most powerful intellectual worker that Europe has produced for the last two centuries, waiving aside the pensions and legacies that were thrust upon him, chose to maintain himself by grinding object-glasses for microscopes and telescopes.—*Froude.*

Our Own sins.

How men dislike to have their hearts probed where the deepest sin is lodged! The besetting sin is about the last one acknowledged; that is the one most unwillingly submitted to the Healer for treatment. It is easy to indulge in virtuous indignation against sins which are loathsome to the sight. It is easy to berate the drunkard, or to cudgel the prostrate wretch whom everybody cuffs and kicks. It is fashionable to hate the abandoned. But when it comes to looking home—to taking measurements of our own inclinations—to analyzing the sin that approaches ourselves, then the question takes on a new and terrible significance. The insinuating evil that approaches us, dressed in the garb of expediency, recommended by some specious advantages, or defended by some plausible circumstances, is the

peril which must be felt to be escaped.

It is easy to keep out of the range of other men's sins, to stand clear of certain crashing crimes which scathe the moral nature; but to stand guard over one's own tendencies, to fortify the soul against the silent and secret attacks of the tempter—this requires the grace of God and the soul's best courage forever. Unless the heart be fully consecrated to the Savior, and all the impulses and influences of the life controlled by the Spirit, a mere profession of religion is nothing more than a bandage for a withered hand, or a sling for a helpless arm.—*Selected.*

A NORTHUMBRIAN SERMON.

Two were Baptists, one a Swedenborgian, one Irvingite, and one stood alone, calling himself a member of the Church of Christ. What was very remarkable, the society of these pious fishermen, who, divested of their religion, were nothing more than poor, ignorant men, was sought by some of the most eminent divines of the mother country, including Cummings of London, Lee of Edinburgh, Cairns of Berwick-on-Tweed, Mursell, the Manchester Spurgeon, and hosts of others. Ignorant of every other class of literature, these men were thoroughly conversant with the Holy Scriptures and the best theological works. So extensive was their knowledge, so vast their comprehension of truth, so subtle their reasoning, that the most learned divines were humble before them, and listened to them in wonder. The Rev. John Cairns, D. D., a man as

remarkable for his profundity as for his eloquence, had a handsome church built his congregation. When it was finished, he invited one of these fishermen—he who called himself a member of the Church of Christ—to examine it. Arm in arm the doctor of divinity and North Sea fisherman walked through the richly carpeted aisles, examined the gorgeous pews, gazed upon the carved pulpit, the lofty ceiling, the stained glass windows.

“What do you think of it, brother?” asked the doctor.

Tue rugged North Sea fisherman raised his eyes to the ceiling, drew his rough fustian jacket closer around him, and folding his arms upon his breast, said in reverential tones:

“Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands.”

The divine gazed upon the fisherman, an expression of admiration on his face, and laying his hand affectionately on the latter's shoulder said.—

“Brother, you have preached the first and the grandest sermon that will ever be heard within these walls.”—*Atlantic Monthly*.

Short Notes.

From the *Examiner* we learn that the Church at San Marcos Tex. had 52 additions in a recent meeting.

The new Christian Church at Lebanon will be completed in a few days. It is the handsomest public edifice in that city, and reflects a vast deal of credit upon the energetic gentlemen who, in the face of many difficulties have pushed the good work

through to completion.”—*Republican Banner*.

M. Sweeney reports 20 additions at a meeting held by him near Mexico Mo.

W. J. Ball writing from Opposition, Ark. says that there is a fine opening for a good physician in that town.

Bro. M. Kendrick of Corinth Miss. reports 13 added to the church as the result of his recent labors.

Pray and Work.

“Faith without works,” says the apostle, is dead, “being alone;” so prayer without the use of all legitimate means for the attainment of the object prayed for, is futile and unavailing. A sinner prays to God for mercy: we teach him that he will never obtain mercy until he renounces his sins, and commences to lead a new life. The people of God pray for a revival of religion: will it be consistent for them to expect answer to prayer while they continue to encourage worldliness, contentions and various self-indulgences?

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Supposed contradictions in the Bible....	863
Difficulties of a Devious Way.....	865
The way men obtain pardon.....	867
Queries.....	869
Am I baptized into Christ?.....	874
Easy Way.....	875
Our Bible class.....	876
Church News.....	880
Just Once.....	884
Our Own Sins.....	885
A Northumbrian Sermon.....	885
Short Notes.....	886

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 38.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SEPT. 24, 1874.

Change in Religious Denominations.

We closed our first article on this subject by taking a look at some arguments used to sustain the position, that the kingdom of Christ was set up before the day of Pentecost. The Baptists, as a people, once having cut loose from John the Baptist, as the founder of the Baptist Church, have sought out and thoroughly canvassed all the prominent acts in the life of Christ, for a beginning, and but a few of them at the present day are willing to state their faith on this point, wishing only to make it appear, that it was prior to the day of Pentecost; while, on the other hand, we have many teaching us the doctrine, that it had its origin at that time. Before we add the testimony of any one, we will make one statement, viz: If, in all our Lord's teaching while with men here on earth, outside of what is written in the four evangelists, such men as the apostles and disciples of Jesus could not understand that the church was established sometime between the advent of John the Baptist and the death of Christ—having

the advantage of many things which to us are unknown, as well as what we do know by its being written—how can these D. D.'s tell now by the word of Jesus recorded in the Evangelists?

That the disciples did not understand this in the light of our friends is certain, from the following: "Joseph of Arimathea, an honorable counselor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus." Mark 15: 43. Again, the apostles themselves did not know that it had been established, if such was the case. "When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" Acts 1: 6. This certainly shows what the apostles and early disciples thought on this subject.

We will now introduce a few prominent writers on this subject. Mr. Orchard, History of the Baptists, page 7, speaking of the transaction of the day of Pentecost says: "This Christian assembly as it was the first so it is the mother church in the Christian dis-

pensation." If then this assembly was the mother, we need now look no farther back, according to Mr. Orchard. Again he says: "This church so constituted is the acknowledged pattern by which the Christian churches were formed. Since the law was to go forth out of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Mr. Orchard not only states that it was established on the day of Pentecost, but is kind enough to add a reason to sustain his view.

Mosheim (Archi. McLain edition) Page 12. "The first Christian church founded by the apostles, was that of Jerusalem, the model of all those which were afterward erected during the first century."

One more witness. P. Schaff Church Hist. Page 191. "Next to the incarnation, death and resurrection of the Son of God, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the birth of the church is the momentous fact in his story." Again. "Upon this living foundation, besides which no other can be laid, the apostles under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, erected the building itself. On the day of Pentecost, at Jerusalem A. D. 30., the building was begun." Schaff Church History, page 135.

We have introduced the above witnesses to let the reader see what is going on in our present literature, although some may date back of the present generation, yet they are worthy of credit in matters of fact—to show what men of thought have given to the world, as the result of their investigation.

We will stop long enough while presenting mens thoughts about this thing, to clip one from our Methodist

friends *Christian Advocate*, Nashville Tenn., May 11th 1872. "Is it true that John Wesley never designed or expected to establish a church? No, it is not true. When he began his evangelical work he had no such intention; but when he found it necessary to establish a church in America he established it. And if he had lived a little longer he would have done the same thing in England. As it was he got together the material for it, as David for the temple and left the conference his legal successor to establish a church, and a good one they established. It must gladden his glorified spirit in heaven to look down and see how his churches have prospered since his translation."

Mr. Wesley then did something he did not intend to do! He established a church in America? Was this the Church of God or Christ? If not, where in all the records of time do we find a description of Wesley's church? Where is the prophecy which has predicted its organization, America and Jerusalem are wide apart!

If this be the true church of Christ its organization falls short of the prophetic time near seventeen hundred years—if of the Abrahamic—near three thousand seven hundred years—besides a complete failure in all the essential points in the Abrahamic covenant.

For many years it has been proclaimed from almost every Baptist pulpit in the land, that our Baptist neighbors could trace their succession from the days of the apostles to the present time. In the popular literature of this church, we notice well graded steps of descent from this

lofty height to the plain on which the religious denominations of to-day must stand, or trace their succession through Popery. Let us hear a few of their sayings.

Gardner on communion p. 159 says, "In the language of a recent writer, we say: "It is not a *confederation* of Baptist churches, nor a continued *succession* of Baptist churches, but every local independent body of baptized believers, holding the doctrines of the Gospel and having the ordinances of the Gospel, that now exist, or has at any time or any place existed, is and was the Baptist church in the only sense in which there can be any such a thing as the Baptist Church." Again, on Page 146-7. "Or, in that bold and strong language of Dr. J. Wheaton Smith to Albert Barnes, we say, that "Whatever is found in the New Testament is as worthy as if you had traced it there." It is only a doubtful practice whose thread must be traced thus carefully through the labyrinth of history with painful uncertainty, lest you reach its end while yet a century or two from Christ. Why, sir, if between us and the apostolic age there yawned a *fathomless abyss*, into whose silent darkness intervening history had fallen, with a Baptist Church on this side, and a New Testament on the other, we should boldly bridge the gulf and look for the record of our birth among the hills of Galilee. But our history is not thus lost. That work is now in progress which will link the Baptists of to day with the Baptists of Jerusalem." If it makes a practice doubtful—what can be said in defense of that church whose thread must be

traced through the labyrinth of history with painful uncertainty—yet such is precisely the condition of the Baptists of to-day. Yea, it is worse for some of their learned Doctors, have told us, that the succession cannot be traced back through the labyrinth of history to the apostles.

Let us hear them. From Gospel Advocate 1873, p. 776, taken from *Central Baptist* St. Louis. Rev. Heman Lincoln, D. D. "I have never known but one Baptist of large learning and sober judgment who held a different view, the late Dr. J. Newton Brown. He believed that a succession of true Baptist churches could be traced in a direct line from the apostolic age to our own time." Dr. William Williams: "As history now stands (what future researches may develop we cannot tell) it is impossible to trace any chain of Baptist churches from the days of the apostles until now." This point then has been fairly yielded and we are left in doubt about the words of Dr. J. Wheaton Smith. Why has not this step been boldly taken before this? We are left to suppose it was for the want of proper effort, and the failure that has been made, themselves being judges. Well might those easy steps have been taken by which to descend from that lofty eminence which seemed to defy all efforts of their religious neighbors. We now hear the soft words of Dr. Riley, "A church that came into existence yesterday, in strict conformity to the New Testament principles of membership, far away from any long existing church or company of churches, and therefore unable to trace an outward lineal descent, is a true church of Christ—

for Christianity is not a religion of circumstances, but of principles; while a church so-called, not standing on the apostolic principles of faith and practice, and yet able to look back through a long line up to time immemorial, may have never belonged to that body of which Christ is the head. Gardner on communion p. 160.

A church that came into existence yesterday in strict conformity to New Testament principles of membership * * * * is a true church of Christ. This is the true rule certainly by which such things should be tried. How many Baptists would have recognized the infallibility of it fifty years ago? We wish to offer a few thoughts on the material we have before us now, but must wait for another time.

P. D.

Query on Repentance.

Brethren L. & S: You will please give a full explanation of the nineteenth verse of the third chapter of Acts, for the benefit of myself and some others.

Yours in the one faith,

R.

The verse reads as follows: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." This language was addressed to those people, to teach them how to become Christians. And by comparing this passage with a similar one, in second of Acts, and by examining carefully the meaning of all the words, it is

not difficult to be understood. Evidently faith must be understood as coming in before repentance. For "without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. xi: 6. Inasmuch as nothing is pleasing to God without faith, repentance would not be acceptable without it, even if men could or would repent without it. But such a thought as men and women repenting who do not believe in God or his Son, is perfectly absurd. No one ever has, or ever will do so. Understanding therefore these people were believers already, when the above language was addressed to them, we will enter upon the investigation of the words used by Peter in the above passage. First, we will examine the meaning of the word *repent*, as it comes first. It is from the Greek word *metaneoio*. It is used thirty-four times in the Greek Testament, and always rendered *repent*. This word primarily refers to a change of mind, or will. But as genuine repentance always results in a change of life, as well as of mind or will, the word *repent* sometimes embraces both the will, or determination to turn to God, and also the actual turning the life to the service of God. The word is used thus in Matt. xi: 20, where Christ upbraided the cities, or rather the people, because they *repented* not. Here the word is certainly used to signify not only the *will*, or determination of mind to turn to God, but the actual turning also: for the plain intimation is, that if those people had repented, the woes would not have been

pronounced against them. And God always requires the whole life to be turned to him, in order for his blessings to rest on any one. Also when Jesus tells the Jews that the Ninivites repented at the preaching of Jonah, we certainly must understand that the word *repented* embraces the entire change, both of mind or purpose, and of life also. For God saw their works, that they turned from their evil ways, and spared their city. And when Jesus says they repented, he embraces the determination of purpose to *turn* from evil, and the actual doing the same. But in some instances the word *repent* only signifies a change of purpose, will, or determination to turn to the Lord. Such is the case in the passage before us. The turning is expressed in plain, definite language. *Repent, and turn.* In this case the change of will or purpose, is expressed by the word *repent*, while the words "be converted," (*turn*), express what pertains to the life or actions. In this change of determination or will, in this resolve to change one's course of life, is also involved sorrow for the past course of life. For without this, the sinner would not be very likely to turn, or even resolve to turn. So we think in this passage, the word *repent* means a sorrow for one's past course of life, coupled with a firm resolve to turn therefrom. This kind of definition might not pass current in an altar scene, where "get religion" is the order of the day, as it does not require time enough—it does not keep the sinner agonizing long enough over his sins. The repentance spoken of in this passage may be done in an hour, as well as a

month. The jailer repented, and did all that was necessary to make him a Christian the same hour of the night. Whenever a sinner with sorrow in his heart for past sins, resolves in his heart that he will be a servant of God, he has then repented in the sense of this passage, and is then ready for confession and baptism. We do not say that this is the full meaning of the word *repent* in every passage where it occurs, as we have it given in some places where it embraces the entire turning to God of the whole life. So we will have to determine the extent of its meaning in any given passage, by its connection; by its office or position in the sentence in which it occurs. The words "be converted," are from the one Greek verb *strepho*, and that too, in the active voice. This verb occurs thirty-nine times in the Greek Testament, and is always in the active voice, and usually translated by the word *turn*. We will give a few instances of its use. Mat. ix: 22; "Jesus *turned* him about," x: 13, "*Let* your peace *return* to you," 12: 44, "*I will return* into my house," xxiv: 18, "*Neither let* him *return* back." Luke i: 17, "*To turn* the hearts of the fathers to the children." Gal. iv: 9, "*How turn* ye again to the weak and beggarly elements." I Thes. i: 9, "*How ye turned* to God from idols." In these quotations, the words in italics are all from the same verb, and in the same voice that "be converted" is from in the third of Acts. What reason our translators ever found for rendering this active verb passively, we are wholly unable to tell. There is certainly no good reason for it. The same reasons that would lead

them to render it passively in one instance, will hold good in every instance where the word occurs. But

me of these passages it would make nonsense to translate it passively. To be consistent then, it is better to translate it actively, in all places where the word occurs, and in this way it will always make good sense. So then a correct rendering of this passage would be, Repent, and turn, etc. From the rendering, "be converted," some have concluded that conversion is some sort of an inward secret work wrought in the heart of the sinner by some sort of direct work of the Spirit of God. But to translate it by the word *turn*, relieves the passage from all mystical idea, and represents the matter of conversion as something the sinner has to do by the direction of the word of God. The Bible Union translation has rendered this word by the word *turn*, in every instance in the New Testament where in the common version it is "be converted." It is the same in all the new translations we have noticed. We are perfectly justifiable therefore in affirming that it is right to render this verb by the word *turn*, in the active voice, putting the obligation upon the sinner to do the work that this verb embraces. The word *turn*, is a more elegant word than the word *convert* would be, in the active voice. It would not be very elegant to say, repent ye therefore and convert, &c. While it might convey the correct idea, it would be very awkward. But not so with the word *turn*. It is both elegant and correct. And the word *turn*, in this passage embraces all that stands between the word

repent, and the promise of blotting out, or remission of sins. And as the word repent in this passage embraces sorrow for sin, with a determination of heart to become a servant of the Lord, the word *turn* embraces confession of the name of Christ, and baptism; for these things both come in before baptism. Both these are required, and in the case of the conversion of the eunuch, both were connected together. He confessed the name of Christ, and was immediately baptized. In the third of Acts therefore, those people in complying with the command to turn, had to confess Jesus and be baptized. This being done, their sins were blotted out, and they had the promise of times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; that is, as we understand it, the promise of the reception of the Holy Spirit, and all the refreshing and encouraging promises of the word of God to Christians. This passage is therefore the same in meaning as when Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Wherever the apostles went, they taught the same things. First they proclaimed the gospel of Christ, and the people were required to believe, repent, and be baptized, upon which they were promised the remission of their sins. This whole matter of a mystical influence in conversion and that conversion is itself a mystical something that cannot be understood or explained, is untaught in the Scriptures. But on the other hand, every step in conversion is a plain, tangible matter that

every one can understand. To believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, to repent of one's sins, and to confess the name of Jesus, and to be baptized, are all plain matters, easily understood, and easily done, whenever the sinner gets the consent of his mind to deny himself, take up his cross and follow Jesus. If all the isms and opinions of men were taken away, so that sinners could come directly to the word of God, and read and obey what that says, the process of becoming a Christian would be so plain, that all could understand it.

E. G. S.

Dr. Brents's "Gospel Plan of Salvation."

Bro. Lipscomb : These lines will inform you that I received the copy of Dr. Brents' "Plan of Salvation" for which please accept my sincere thanks. I consider it a prize work. It is simply powerful. It will take a high position among the standard productions of the literature of the Current Reformation, and will live when the present generation has passed away. I am generally parsimonious, very parsimonious in my recommendations of latest productions, but I can afford to be liberal in what I say of this work, which **treats** of the subjects discussed in it with a masterly hand. I arrive at the same conclusions with our talented brother on every topic, especially on what he calls "Adam's sin." on which I may hereafter write an essay if I am spared and feel able, as I am now poorly, and have been for several days past. If I did not possess a copy of this work, nor had the money to purchase it, I would labor and earn the money, and place

it in my library, for he has routed the Pedobaptist forces, horse, foot and dragoons from their hiding-places. I will now make some statements relative to the baptismal controversy. But first I hope our brotherhood will consider the time, expense, labor, research and learning necessary to the production of such a work, and not only feel grateful to brother Brents, but lessen the expense by taking a copy of the work, as well as to compensate him in some measure for his great mental and bodily labor, and be grateful that they have such a champion of truth in the South. I have tried hard to find out the cause, why the Pedobaptists have spent and are spending annually so much time, labor, money, energy of body and mind for what they are pleased to term "an indifferent thing" a non essential, a mere circumstance, etc. In the first place this course is unwise, men do not act thus in the common affairs of life, the labor and money expended are always proportioned to the reward expected, and they never make large outlays of money and labor on small and unimportant matters. Their deeds and theory are therefore contradictory and do not correspond with the course pursued by men generally in the things of this world. In the second place the weakness of their defenses and sophisms and quibbles serve to expose them in every combat as well as the admissions made to the advocates of believer's immersion. They have admitted enough to ruin any other cause in the world in a court of justice, except pedo-rantism. They have admitted almost everything, except that infant baptism has no found-

dation in Scripture which the papists, the fathers of the institution have admitted, and told the Protestants so. In the third place the Scriptures and reasons produced against the advocates of believer's immersion fail to produce conviction in the minds of all sensible, candid and pious minds; and hence the pedobaptists lose in every battle with the great Baptist family, of which we compose a part. In the fourth place, if pedobaptism does for its subjects what their creeds and defenders say it does—they ought to know, then that all the infants who died before its invention and since, without its benefits, are most certainly damned, this is the legitimate sequence of their teaching, that baptism saves from the original sin of Adam—whether they admit the deductions from their teachings or not, they inevitably follow: for all children are born with this original sin in or upon them, and if baptism washes it away, then all infants who do not have it washed away with baptism are damned, and there is no escape from this conclusion. Tertullian who lived from 196 to 216, an African lawyer, according to Du Pin, a doctor of the Sorbonne of Paris in France, says it is an acknowledged rule, none who die unimmersed can be saved, founded especially on that sentence of our Lord who said, unless one be born of the water and Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. John iii: 5. "No baptism, no salvation, but inevitable damnation was the language held by all the teachers of the first four centuries and more." Wall's History of baptism Vol. 1. 70 to 76. "All who die unimmersed by their

own fault, are damned." Gregory Naziezen, Vol. 1, page 44. "Infant immersion and the whole Trinitarian system originated in Egypt, in Africa, a dark corner of superstition and monkery." In the New Testament as great stress is laid upon the immersion of believers as upon faith and repentance, as any person can see by reading Matt. 3, Mark 1, Luke 3, John 1, Matt. 28: 19, 20, Mark 16: 16, John 3: 5, Acts 2: 38, Acts 22: 16, and in all the epistles, Galatians 3: 27, and others. The same authority that ordained I should believe and repent in order to the remission of sins, ordained that we should be immersed for the remission of sins—only the modern protestant sects who were born since the protestant Reformation in 1517 to 20 have cut off immersion from the "gospel plan of salvation." Let us, brethren, in our writings, preaching and conversation, use the words immerse, immersion, instead of baptize, for we do immerse, whether it is right to immerse or not is another question, and let our opponents use the words they practice.—"I sprinkle or pour water upon you." In the fifth place, instead of immersion being a non-essential, as its advocates falsely teach, its issues and consequences are tremendous and fearful—they are no less than Christ and Antichrist, whether the Pope of Rome is the Head of the body of Christ, or Christ himself, whether immersed believers constitute the kingdom of Christ, or sprinkled unbelievers, whether immersion is the action ordained by Jesus Christ, or pouring and sprinkling ordained by the Pope of Rome—if immersion is the action ordained

by Jesus Christ, then all pedobaptists are not in the church of Jesus Christ, they are in the world where all unbaptized persons are, they have no immersion, no pardon of sins, no Scriptural names for their sects, no Holy Spirit, no promise of eternal salvation, all their denominational pride and sectdom are at stake, all their official acts and dignity are gone, their money, their influence, their power over the people and their *religious all* in this world is gone and gone forever as they well know. If all infants are rantized, then there is no world, for all the human race will be in the pedobaptist churches, and there will be no world, then the wall of separation between the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the kingdom of Antichrist, which is the immersion of believing penitents, will be broken down, and there will be no wall around the kingdom of Christ to keep out the wild beasts of the forest. The Roman Catholic hierarch, the foundation of Antichrist, claims to be the "Mother Church." This is false. The first church of Jesus Christ was composed of Christian Jews, and of them only. Acts 2. After the birth of this Jerusalem church, there were many churches founded among the Greeks before the church at Rome was founded. See Acts of Apostles, and especially, xxviii: 30-31. The Greeks spoke the Greek language, and the apostles spoke to them in the Greek language. The New Testament was written in Greek. The Greeks believed the gospel and were immersed. The apostles preached to the Jews who used the Greek language as well as to the Greeks themselves. Then there

was only one Lord, one faith, one immersion for the remission of sins. The Greek church extending over a vast territory, in a great variety of climate, in all her history, from the conversion "of many of the Greeks, and honorable women not a few" recorded in the Acts of the Apostles have always practiced immersion, and *only* immersion. The founding of Greek churches by the apostles themselves and their continuation till the present time proves conclusively that the apostles and their converts understood baptism to be only immersion, and is an argument which has never been answered and never can be. The authority for sprinkling and pouring and the change from immersion to sprinkling is papistical, only papistical, and nothing but papistical. All the protestant sects who practice sprinkling are the offshoots of the papal church. All the sects among the Greek church understood baptizo to mean immerse, and only immerse, and the Greek church and all her sects declare that papists and their sects have no baptism. If this is not enough to settle the meaning of the word baptizo, baptize, immerse, all research is vain, all lexicography is foolishness. The main leg on which pedobaptism stands is that the old and new covenants are one covenant, the law and the gospel are one religion, to prove that two things are one thing is rather a tough job, according to my arithmetic. Their own great witnesses, Luther, Calvin and Wesley are against them, to say nothing of the eighty odd produced by brother Brents. No amount of testimony will satisfy an incredulous person.

Yours truly,
JACOB CREATH.

To Our Readers.

Another year wafts toward its close. We desire more earnestly than ever to call your attention to the importance of extending the circulation of the GOSPEL ADVOCATE. It is now nearing the close of the sixteenth volume, and the twentieth year since its publication was commenced. It is an older paper than any now published by the brethren. Owing to the four years of suspension during the war it numbers one volume less than the *Review*. This is the ninth year of our connection with the paper. We can with some degree of pride say, whatever its faults, whatever it blunders, (it has not been without either) it has never yet in a single instance advocated a scheme or policy that it afterwards felt necessary to repudiate. It never advised a single individual into a course, that he could afterward say led him to influences and surroundings that were of doubtful propriety or that tended to a separation from God. We have never encouraged the building up a single institution or practice that can fail.

In this we claim no superior skill or sagacity. But it rather arises from a consciousness of lack of wisdom on our part. We have no confidence whatever in our ability to prove and operate any institution connected with the church, that can benefit any human being in the world.

We have just as little confidence in any other human being's ability to accomplish that work. Lacking faith in human wisdom, we have followed more closely the provisions of Divine wisdom. In following this we cannot

go astray. We cannot fail. Our labor in the Lord cannot "be in vain."

Our experience in these matters strengthens our faith. With renewed confidence in the right of our course, we shall pursue it in the future as we have done in the past. Everything will be brought to the test of God's word. Any practice or institution that cannot stand this test will come to naught. The sooner the better. Every institution or practice that calls the service of his children away from his church, his kingdom, will meet with our constant disapproval.

The word of God alone, the kingdom of God alone, and an undivided loyalty in that kingdom, as a means of securing the Father's richest blessings upon a lost and ruined world, is our motto, for the guidance of the Christian, the salvation of the world.

In the adherence to this principle we feel constantly assured we have effected good, much good. We could have done much more good in the past had it not been for a cramping of our efforts, a limiting of our influence by a small circulation and a meagre and pinched support of the GOSPEL ADVOCATE. This same hindrance to our usefulness still exists.

We now make an earnest appeal to the readers of the ADVOCATE to aid us in extending its circulation.

Shall we not begin the tenth year of our labors with a largely increased list of readers? This end can be gained only by more earnest effort on the part of the readers of the ADVOCATE to obtain new subscribers. This is the most favorable season of the year for seeing the people and

obtaining subscribers. There is more of religious interest in the community at this season than any other.

To aid our friends in the work, we propose to give the last ten numbers of the present volume as a premium and inducement to new subscribers. To all sending us two dollars by the first of November we will send ten numbers of the present year and the volume for 1875, an extra copy for a club of ten. Under this proposition we hope to get a large list. Send them in early that we may know how many extra numbers to publish. Brethren give us a vigorous lift now.

D. L.

THE HIPPODROME.

Twenty thousand dollars are offered for premiums at one of the State fairs for 1874. How liberally is agriculture endowed by its friends and votaries! How agriculture and the arts connected therewith must flourish under such patronage! If with such encouragement farming no longer pays, then all faith in the efficiency of agricultural exhibitions as a means to that end must be abandoned. As the details of this liberal appropriation, however, come to be examined we find, alas! there are branches of the agricultural art that are grossly neglected by farmers, and that their unpardonable neglect will totally deprive them of nearly all share in this grand appropriation. One moiety of it is discovered to be offered as premiums for fast trotting horses. Ten thousand dollars at one fell swoop slips through the farmer's fingers. For what farmer has given

attention to this vital portion of his business? Where has been his blooded mare, his speedy colt, his sulky and his half-mile track? All these he has neglected, and has taken up his time with such trifles as plowing and sowing, making hay and cultivating ignoble turnips and corn! all of which go for nothing, and for the very greatest excellence of which he could not get a ten-cent scrip with the soul-inspiring portrait of a patriot upon the sinister half. Nay, had he a few bottles of wine there would be at least \$25 to aspire to, or a barrel of beer even, with "tap and spigot ready to draw off the contents for the judges," might have brought him at least a repudiated promise to pay \$5. But the farmer in his mistaken pursuit of happiness "cares for none of these things." Perhaps, poor easy man, he drives along the toilsome road to the fair the pride of his yard and the adored of his wife and daughters, the choicest heifer of his drove, the pet of his flock, or the fattest product of his pen. Alas! for no purpose. Popular prejudices prevail in favor of a mammoth cow whose pedigree is long but whose frame is so built up with fat by long feeding with oilcake and meal that she has no semblance of a cow left, nor can she fulfill the uses of one, neither bearing calves probably from overfeeding, nor producing milk sufficient to feed a calf could she bear one. This is the prize cow and the modest heroine of the stall which can produce her own weight in milk in one month is passed over in contempt. The agricultural fair he finds is everything but agricultural or fair, and he has no business there. It is

a show, a "hippodrome" in fact, where the fast horse leads and knavery deceit and sham follow. A temple of which Pluto and Mercury are the gods, and in which the worshipper of industry and the products of labor has no place. Ten thousand dollars go to the fast horses which exist only for the ring and as excuses for gambling and the tricks of the blacklegs. The other ten thousand go in great part for things which have no connection; however remote with agriculture, or for animals which represent no branch of agriculture, but whose breeding is a business more akin to collecting specimens of old crockery or "examples" of the old masters. Trotting horses and fancy stock are hardly to be identified with agriculture. Then what is left for the farmer? Alas, how little!

We give the foregoing from the agricultural department of the *N. Y. Tribune*, as indicative of the working of what is improperly called Agricultural Fairs. We have for a number of years insisted that the farmer the mechanic, the man who made his living by honest labor, had no interest in these Fairs. They have been wholly subverted to the ends and services of the gambling fraternity. As such no Christian should countenance them.

We present these thoughts at this juncture, because the drought and other influences, especially the disgust of moral men at their immoral tendencies have well nigh destroyed the Fairs and the interest in them. While the community is in this state of mind, we would like for every christian in the land to look soberly

at the question, and determine from principle to have no more to do with them. They have become mere training schools of young horses and young men for the race-course. Christians ought to act from fixed principles and not from momentary passion and impulse:

D. L:

Co operation Meeting:

The Lynnvile congregation of disciples desires the sister Churches in Giles county to meet with her for co-operation and consultation. Since the war the 'disciples have made no co-operative effort for the propagation of the gospel. There is a general awakening as to the importance of our uniting our scattered forces and concentrating our means and influence, for the promotion of our Masters work. In union there is strength. We think that we have the ability, if all would "pull together" to sustain an Evangelist, so that he could give his entire time and talents to the evangelists work.

Bro. Meeks has shown himself to be a workman who needeth not to be ashamed, and we hope to secure his valuable labors for our County, if we will do our duty and offer him a liberal support. What think you brethren? We propose a grand mass meeting of disciples at Lynnvile beginning Friday before the 1st Lord's day in October. Will not every brother who can, in the County and out of it, but especially in it come to this meeting and enjoy a "season of refreshing from the Lord" and help us in this good work? We cannot get Bro. M. or any other

brother to enter this arduous and self-sacrificing work unless we pledge ourselves to sustain him. We are able to do it. "Will we do it"? is the question. Some will croak "hard times!!" but the way to make them easy to us is to lend to the Lord in full assurance of faith. Let every congregation in the County appoint a committee which shall all also act as messengers to this meeting, and let this committee see every member of the church and take his or her subscription for the amount he or she is willing to give for the above-named purpose, the aggregate of which is to be reported at this meeting. And now brethren let us not be afraid of doing too much or more than our proportional part" Don't put down the least possible amount to save your credit as a "cheerful giver," nor refuse to give liberally because your brother over yonder in that fine house with his thousands at interest (stingy soul) will give only a small sum. His covetousness makes it all the more important for you to give liberally to make up for his lack of service. May God open all our hearts, incline us unto his ways, and prepare us to do a great work in his glorious name! The brethren here will take pleasure in entertaining all who come.

Committee. { H. C. WILFORD.
WM. LOOKE,
C. E. ISAACS.
Lynnville, Sept 11th 1874.

Business Christianity.

BY A YOUNG DOMINE.

I was once talking to a friend about the fierce competition in busi-

ness. "It seems to me," said I, "that no man now regards his neighbor. The motto of the trader of to-day is something like this, 'Every man for himself and God for us all.'" My friend rejoined, "It's all true but the motto. The way business goes now-a-days proves the motto to be, 'Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost.'" The revelations of the last two months confirm much of my friend's cynical speech. It really looks as if in many minds all the principles of prudence and piety have been forsaken in business hours, and that the *auri sacra fames* had devoured all the stores of conscience and judgment. The country has the same wealth in it that it had before the days of prostration. Its granaries are bursting with the grain which meets hunger, its warehouses and mills are stocked with the clothing which covers nakedness, its mines are pouring out the fuel which supplies warmth. The gold and the silver are all here, and millions more are added to the store week by week. But those who control this gold and silver have had their confidence shaken in their fellow men, and we are looking back to the days of barter. Of course this cannot last. Credit has to be given, and as faith begins to rise, trading will again flourish. But while the story of these past days is fresh in mind, credit will search more carefully for character, and tainted and wild methods will be passed by with dread by every man who feels the value of securing the fruits of hard-won toil. There will be always gamblers in trade, but for months and years to come they will find it harder to delude men into the paths of sudden fortune.

Surely at this time the pulpit should send out no uncertain sound. Faith between men cannot flourish, unless Christian principles exert their power over individual hearts and lives. A man who drops his belief in God on Monday morning and goes into the street to endorse notes with no idea of how they are to be paid, to seek banks which will certify his checks without regard to his deposits who buys much more than he sells and beats his neighbor by giving more time to weak customers, that man will some day find the book of Proverbs excellent reading, and his past life affording woeful illustrations of its truth. Jehovah's laws ought to be expounded and applied now to men as in the days of old. Power, position and property are held by a feeble tenure when God is forgotten. "The Lord's voice crieth unto the city, and the man of wisdom shall see thy name; hear ye the rod and who hath appointed it." Speculation which is the venturesome extension of credit, luxurious living beyond one's means, the selfish idea of positions of trust, these have led to the lying advertisements, the fraudulent use of funds, the wild expansions of business, whose sudden disclosure has shocked the community. The flash which has lit up the dark offices where men have plotted to rob their neighbors in "strictly business ways" has, alas! paralyzed honest trade. But God's stroke will not harm the latter permanently. It is for His servants to speak the words of sympathy which will give courage and new resolution to those who have been overthrown for the moment, but at the same time to intensify the blow which the wicked have received. Let speculation be stripped of its fine coat and be shown up as gambling. Let the trader on trust funds be called a thief, not a defalter. Let back-pay be called robbery by a legislature, as it really is. Let "seeing" a judge or lawmaker be branded as bribery. We want now that Christians should be trained in the meaning of the law which the Redeemer has given them to observe. Love for Christ saves a soul, but love for Him obeys law, and law needs to be taught and preached home in such times as these. I am one who believes that the sneers of infidelity against Christianity are not warranted. Only here and there a nominally Christian merchant has been found to have been a practicing hypocrite, while the masses of rogues have never made the slightest profession of love and trust in Christ. Some Christian men who are charged with crime again and again have proved themselves victims of the wilful slander of their foes. But while this is so, the disciples of the Master should be so guarded that they give no occasion to the enemy to blaspheme. Misfortunes cannot always be avoided, for in business the innocent are linked with the guilty. But personal offences against honesty, prudence, and truth can be avoided, and must be shunned by every man who wears the name of Christ, and in such teaching the pulpit should surely take an ardent part in these days when all are inclined to hear.

There is said to be a custom among the Friends to ask every member of the Society, when assembled at their quarterly-meeting, about his debts.

If he cannot affirm that his assets exceed his liabilities, he is suspended from membership till he can answer. We cannot, perhaps, go so far in our inquisition, but we may be sure that those who suffer from the non-payment of rightful claims will pass severe sentence as to the common honesty of their debtors. And if a Christian is dishonest in the eyes of any one man, all the other virtues he may claim will be rated low by that man. When the prophet Micah in the last of his prophecy told the Jews that God was angry with their "wicked balances" and "deceitful weight," we are amazed that the people did not heed. The rich men were full of violence and spoke lies, though they did not advertise the bonds of railways. They hunted every man his brother with a net; the princes and the judges asked for rewards, though there were no congresses in those days. The most upright were sharper than a thorn-hedge, and the son dishonored the father. Therefore God declared "I will make thee sick in smiting thee, in making thee desolate because of thy sins." Can it be possible that such times of evil should occur in these enlightened days? If so, then as the two sides of the triangle reveal the third, such evil on earth reveals the feeling of heaven. Just as far as men repent and regard God's law in their business, just as soon as they say, "We have sinned," and start on the course of truth, and prudence, and diligence, then and then only will the land revive. Says Mr. Froude in one of his addresses, "Many a hundred sermons have I heard in England, but never

during these thirty wonderful years, never one that I can recollect on common honesty or those primitive commandments, 'Thou shalt not lie, and thou shalt not steal.'" Our American pulpit, I am sure, can have no such reproach cast on it. But Christian men should hear these themes often proclaimed, and no time is better than this when our business would seem really to be beginning a new lease of life after a season of darkness and death.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

General Convention.

The General Christian Missionary Convention will assemble in the Richmond Street Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 20, 1874.

All delegates and members who will be in attendance are requested to forward their names and address to A. I. Hobbs, chairman of Committee of Entertainment, No. 167 Barr Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, and they will have cards sent to them designating the place at which they will be entertained during the Convention.

C. WILES, Sect'y.

Committee of Entertainment.

CHURCH NEWS.

Bros. L. & S: I send you a brief account of a meeting which commenced at this place on Friday night before the 5th Lord's day in August, and continued eleven days. We had a large audience all the time, who gave profound attention to the truths presented.

Bro. T. A. Crenshaw, Pres't of the Female College at Hopkinsville, Ky.,

did the preaching from one Friday night till the next; preaching day and night with the exception of one discourse delivered by Bro. H. Booth.

We had three discourses on Lord's day. Bro. J. R. Farrow preached one in the evening. Bro. Farrow left us on Thursday to hold a meeting in Mississippi. Bro. Crenshaw's business compelled him to leave on Saturday, still the interest of the meeting was increasing. We continued the meeting till the following Monday night. Bro. R. B. Trimble of Mayfield, Ky., who was visiting his relatives here, preached Lord's day and at night. The immediate result of the meeting was 56 additions to the church, 53 by immersion, 2 reclaimed and one from the Baptists. I have been preaching for the church at Alamo once a month for most two years. We have had two protracted meetings during the time and 85 additions to the church.

We have a prosperous Lord's day school. The congregation meets every Lord's day to break the loaf. May the Lord help us in the good work, and to him be all the praise.

M. S. MOSER.

Alamo, Crockett Co., Tenn., Aug. 10, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: Bro. S. M. Rollett in connection with myself commenced a meeting at what is known as the Blue Spring on Saturday before the fifth Lord's day in August. There was no organization at that place. We found about ten brethren and sisters in that vicinity. They came together and covenanted with each other to keep house for

the Lord. The result of the meeting was sixteen added unto them—twelve by confession and baptism, three from the Baptist, one from the Methodists.

I also commenced a meeting, in connection with Brother J. J. Dotson at the Hill school house on Saturday night before the first Lord's day in Sept. continued five days with thirteen additions; five by confession and baptism, three from the Baptists, one from the Methodist, four by relation. Thank God, Sectarianism is crumbling and falling in this country and our blessed master's kingdom is being built upon the ruins thereof. Let us give God the Glory, and labor on in our master's cause until death, for great is our reward in heaven.

Yours in hope of eternal Life,

J. T. CROW.

Castorville, Mo. Sept. 12th 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: By request I send you a report of a meeting at Sardis Church, Molino Miss., by Bro. W. H. Stewart, of Utica, Miss. The immediate result of the meeting, was three by obedience to the faith, viz: two sons and a daughter of Bro. T. A. J. Wade.

We think a great deal of good was accomplished by the meeting. Bro. Stewart preached seven very plain and elegant discourses. On Lord's day the congregation was very large, and the house would not hold the people, so we moved out of doors, and had preaching under the trees.

Brother Stewart went from here to Pilgrims Rest, a Baptist Church, to hold a meeting, beginning the next Friday night. Brother Stewart says he is getting old, and his time is precious

and he wants to devote the remainder of his days in preaching the Gospel to warn sinners, of the evil of their way, and encourage and strengthen the Christian. He is doing a noble work in this part of the Lord's vineyard. The brethren in this part of the country have pledged themselves to support him, and let him go and preach all of his time. He will be back to hold a meeting at Damascus Church 1st Lord's day in October next.

Yours as ever,

H. L. ROGERS.

Guntown, Miss. Aug. 21st 1874.

Brethren L. & S: The Church at Mount Vernon in connection with our beloved young Brother T. M. Foster, Pastor, assisted by Brethren W. T. Lowe, Dr. Doster and N. W. Pridgeon, commenced a meeting last Lord's day closing last night with 18 additions; 15 buried with their Lord in baptism, 2 from the Methodists, 2 from the Baptists, and a deep impression made on the congregation generally, while the church has been made to rejoice in the Lord greatly. Good order prevailed all the time.

During the whole time there was not the least confusion.

The prospect for the cause at Mt. Vernon is bright, and brightening every day. Thanks to our kind heavenly Father for all his goodness to us.

A. J. McGAUGHEY.

Monroe, Walton Co. Ga., Sept 5th. 1874.

Brother James H. Morton reports four accessions recently at South Harpeth Tenn.

Obituaries.

Fell asleep in Jesus August 14th 1874 near Pains Station, Madison Co. Tenn.; at the residence of (my father) G. L. Morton, my dear mother, Emily J. Morton. She obeyed the Savior under the preaching of the lamented Joshua K. Speer. I know she loved the pure word of God. Often while reading its sacred pages and lecturing her children, it was not uncommon to see tears find their way down her cheeks. She lived to see two sons preachers of the gospel, I feel that whatever good I have done in preaching "Christ and him crucified" to the people, I owe much to the Christian influence of my mother.

Rest dear mother in the silent tomb till the Lord shall descend with the voice of the arch angel and the trump of God to awake thy sleeping dust. Then shall you and all the faithful be crowned with glory honor, immortality, eternal life. As children, we miss our dear mother, all seems dreary and desolate here. Let us look up out of tears and trust the same Savior who attended her through the dark valley and shadow of death. She has made a safe entrance into the paradise of God Oh! how it fills my soul with joy when I think of her home by the side of the river of light.

Dear Brothers and sisters our dear mother has gone, we will never meet her again in this world, may the Lord help us to live the life of the righteous that we may meet her in the home of the blessed.

JAMES H. MORTON,

BERLIN, TENN. SEPT. 1st 1874.

Brethren L. & S: It is my painful duty to announce the death of Marietta Bennett, daughter of J. D. and S. M. Bennett. Her death was caused by the explosion of an oil can. Age four years four months and two days.

She was indeed a lovely child, winning in voice and manners. Our hearts are filled with grief at the thought of giving up one so lovely. The angels missed her from their band and came to cull the precious flower and transplant it to a heavenly clime, better suited to the purity of childhood.

She has left many friends and relatives to mourn for her, but every true lover of God's word may read and be comforted: "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

May it teach the living to be more prayerful that they may at all times be ready to obey the masters call.

That little step so light and free, is no longer heard, that voice, so dear to parents, awakens a sweeter strain, known only to those who inhabit that blissful clime.

"Over the river, the boatman pale
Carried another, the household pet;
Her fair hair waved in the gentle gale,
Darling Mary! I see her yet.

She crossed on her bosom her dimpled hands
And fearlessly entered the phantom bark,
'We felt it glide from the silvery sands,
And all our sunshine grew strangely dark.

"We know she is safe on the further side
Where all the ransomed and angels be:
Over the river, the mystic river:
My childhood's idol is waiting for me.
J. M. ALSUP.

Died very suddenly near Wayne Furnace, Tenn., Aug. 19th 1874, Sister Susannah Duggar aged about fifty-one; wife of Joacim Duggar. She has left an affectionate family, a husband and six children, besides many friends to mourn her loss. Sister Duggar had been in delicate health for several months, but was improving and going about attending to her domestic affairs, and ate her dinner apparently as well as usual, and in a few minutes fell from her chair dead. Truly it may be said, In the midst of life we are in death.

Sister Duggar was a zealous Christian, and her two oldest daughters are followers of the meek and lowly Lamb of God.

"Sweet is the scene when Christians die,
When holy souls retire to rest;
How mildly beams the closing eye,
How gently heaves the expiring breast.
M. D G.

WAYNE FURNACE, SEPT 8, 1874.

Died, at her home in Maury County Tenn., March 10th 1874 in the 72nd year of her age, sister Betsy Kennedy, consort of G. A. Kennedy. Kennedy had fought as a soldier of the cross for more than fifty years, when her captain called her to her reward.

"She is dead but she yet speaketh." She lives in the memory of all who knew her, many of whom testify that she has given to them the helping hand in time of need. She died in the "one hope," perfectly resigned to the will of our Creator. The manner in which she passed away is sufficient to elicit the exclamation, "Let my last end be like hers."

J. M. M.

ISOM'S STORE MAURY CO. TENN.

Elizabeth Crawford was born in South Carolina Dec. 3, 1798, moved to Limestone Co. Ala. 1806, joined the church of Christ in 1829, and was immersed by Bro. Levi Nichols. She died as she had lived in the one faith of our blessed Redeemer, the 18th of July 1874 aged 75 years and 7 months.

J. M. CURTIS.

Sister thou wast mild and lovely,
Gentle as the Summer's breeze.
Pleasant as the air of evening
When it floats among the trees.
* *

Yet again we hope to meet thee,
When the day of life is fled
Then in heaven with joy to greet thee
Where no farewell tear is shed.

S. F. SMITH.

DECATUR ALA., SEPT. 4, 1874.

For the comfort of the disconsolate parents, you will please record in the Advocate the death of Albert Sidney, son of Bro. J. G. and sister A. M. Mohandro. He died of Brain Fever on the 8th day of August 1874, after an illness of three days. Aged 5 years.

Weep not dear parents for the lovely one,
So quickly from thee taken,
He was a flower too good for earth
Transplanted into heaven.

For a comfort unto you it should be,
To know that the Savior has spoken.
"Suffer little children to come unto me,
For of such is the kingdom of heaven."
D. G. NELMS.

POCAHONTAS TENN. SEPT. 4, 1864.

Excuse Me Parson.

How common it is, for wretched men to swear, in the presence of ministers of the Gospel, and then turn to the preacher, and with a complacent smile say, "excuse me parson, I was not aware of your presence." Now, it has always occurred to me, that a man should think us think as much of himself, as of the "parson." If ashamed to swear in the presence of the preacher, he should be ashamed to swear in his own presence. Above all, if ashamed to swear in the presence of the preacher—a mere man—how shall he appear, in the presence of the Great Judge of all the earth? Let shame, and confession take hold upon all who take the name of the Lord in vain.

J. T. P.

Co-Education.

A short article under this head, appeared in the Advocate a few weeks since, that is liable to make a wrong impression as to its authorship. Some draw the conclusion that one or both of the editors wrote or endorsed it. I presume the article was written by Bro. Giltner. It is an expression of his views, not ours. I wish the proper understanding of this subject because I dissent wholly and widely from the sentiments of the article. I do not believe in educating boys and girls together in the same room or building, when they are large enough for the development of the animal or sexual impulses, especially when away from the restraining influences of home. I believe it has an evil influence on both sexes. It does not refine the boys. It does not inspire the girls to more thoroughness in study. It cultivates and excites the passions, without the prudence to restrain, and invites to too much familiarity at an age when familiarity is not safe. When a girl or girls and women become common to boys and men their refining influence is destroyed. The constant association at this age, makes the girls coarse and bold, destroys their modesty and shyness, and makes the boys rude and familiar.

After an experience of many years in the city of Brooklyn, although the radical idea of the people tend in the direction of women's rights, the school commissioners have after mature deliberation and thorough investigation decided and published their conviction that for grown youths of both sexes to study in the same

room had tended strongly to produce looseness in manners and lewdness in morals.

It seems to me that any thoughtful person must see this, of necessity, would be the case. I have heard of cases of lewdness in some schools where this system is practiced among our brethren in this section of country. Girls have gone to these schools pure, we suppose, to be tutored in Christian purity and refinement, and have returned prostitutes. Where the evil is not so gross as this, the tendency must be to that commonness and familiarity between the sexes that produces coarseness and leads in the direction of looseness and freedom of manners.

On the other hand, no school that has adopted Co education as it is called, has ever maintained so high a character for thorough scholarship for either sex as those differently conducted. I think they never will, because I believe it impossible. Men who advertise the plan as a success merely from the experience of a year or two, show their incompetency to judge of the fitness or unfitness of any system.

Much of the fruit of such a system must be of slow growth, but it must evil. Much of the florid, puffy style of advertising schools, is an advertisement, it seems to me, of the managers and teachers as quacks and charlatans. Wisdom and true worth are always modest and unpretentious.

Girls and boys have a great amount of flesh and blood and are not noted for prudence and self-restraint. This system in my estimation is the first departure in the road that ends in free-love. These are my sentiments.

and I wish to be understood aright on this question. Radical reformers will pronounce this old fogysim. Be it so, I do not wish to hinder anybody's school. I am slow to take a single step in the direction leads to so much of evil. Others whose judgment I respect, differ. But I give my own convictions.

D. L.

QUERY.

Brethren L. & S: I wish you would give me the meaning of the first chapter of Phil'pian, from the 15th down to the 18th verses, and you will oblige me and some others. I expect to remain a subscriber for your paper and do all in my power to get others to subscribe for the next year.

Yours truly in Christ,

F. C. TAYLOR.

New Franklin Tenn., Aug. 9, 1874.

The verses are, "The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, thinking to add affliction to my bonds. But the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defense of the gospel. * * Whether in pretence or in truth, Christ preached, and I do therein rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." Paul's positive and decided course, his earnest and often unpolished manner, the freedom with which he spoke of the wrongs of false teachers made him many enemies, even among the professed teachers of the church. These were so bitter that they rejoiced at his imprisonment and gladly added to his sufferings. Some it seems preached Christ out of this envy toward him. That is they become

much more zealous and active in their preaching, thinking, thereby to excite the greater prejudice against him and to increase his sufferings. In this preaching of the Gospel, whether envy of him caused it or not, he rejoiced. The same thing frequently occurs among religious teachers at this day, They preach Christ out of envy of one another.

D. L.

VARIETY IN TEXTS.

There are several thousand verses in the Bible, and yet how few of these do we ever have presented to us as a text for a discourse? We cannot say how the old book appears from the pulpit, but from the way it is used, we can imagine that from that stand point it looks like a great desert, with now and then an oasis—a symbol of truth—sufficient for the for the topic of a sermon, but as a general thing a barren waste, useful perhaps in its day, but of little consequence now. In thirty years the pew has heard more than a thousand sermons. But how few the different texts. Nearly all could be counted on the finger ends. And those few have been hammered over and over again until their very announcement causes a drowsiness to come over the pew like the effect of some sleepy drug. It makes but little difference who fills the pulpit; whether it be the regular pastor, or some great D. D., or Bishop, or a stripling with an exhorter's license, it is the same thing. He takes one of those texts that we have heard from the cradle with which to edify his hearers. Now then, the only rational influence that

can be drawn from this practice is, that there are but few clauses in the Bible fit for the basis of a discourse, and that the Holy Scriptures are like the dry barren plains and hill of Syria, with only here and there a green spring or a fountain of living water. If this is not so, why are so few passages used in the pulpit?

The unsophisticated pew has somehow got the idea that these ancient Bible books, instead of being like a desert, were like a land filled with ever living green, garnished with vines and pomegranates, and with no lack of fountains whose ever living waters flow on in music forever; that it is a land of milk and honey. Or more plainly; that it is a book filled with ideas so grand and rich that almost every clause from the beginning to the end contains volumes of meaning from which we might draw all our life long and yet learn something new. That God's written word in the Bible is like his unwritten "declarations" in the azure vault above, where we behold bright stars more or less in every part of the sky, with spaces between, it is true, that appear at first view to be vacant, but in which further research discloses other stars, and still others shew themselves as we continue, until the number that appeared at the first view seems insignificant, and still the astronomer counts his hundreds, and thousands, and millions of new stars; and new skies unfold upon skies, and firmament opens beyond firmament until countless worlds appear in firmaments unnumbered and the mind overwhelmed with countless millions of blazing worlds staggers and reels

at the thought, and cries out, Stay, stay, it is enough!

So the pew has sometimes thought of God's written word in the Bible, and the pew is right. Were there less preaching from stock texts, the pulpit would not be so often dull. — *Methodist.*

September.

A whispering silence broods o'er all around,
As in cathedral when the praise and prayer
Are lingering pulses on the waves of sound,
And naught disturbs but muffled heart-throbs
there,

Yet all is bright—the sun scarce past the noon
And stealing out from dusky, darkling wood,
Comes forth a matron shod with mossy shoon.
From off her brows she lays the binding
snood—

When lo! her chestnut locks float on the breeze
Like silken algæ on cerulean seas.

The flowers have hung their heads; but all
gay things

That buzzing fit, on busy, gauzy wings,
To chant her beauties, gratefully remember,
And hail our princess, timid, grave September.

SALLIE A BROCK, in *Galaxy*,

MAXIMS FOR A YOUNG MAN.

Never be idle. If your hands can not be usefully employed, attend to the cultivation of your mind.

Always speak the truth.

Keep good company or none.

Make few promises.

Live up to your engagements.

Keep your own secrets, if you have any.

When you speak to a person, look him in the face.

Good company and good conversation are the very sinews of virtue.

Good character is above all things else.

Never listen to loose or idle conversation.

You had better be poisoned in your blood than in your principles.

Your character can not be essentially injured, except by your own acts.

If any one speaks evil of you, let your life be so virtuous that none will believe him.

Drink no intoxicating liquors.

Ever live, misfortune excepted, within your means.

When you retire to bed, think over what you have done during the day.

Never speak lightly of religion.

Make no haste to be rich, if you would prosper.

Small and steady gains give competency with tranquility of mind.

Never play any kind of game.

Avoid temptation through fear that you may not withstand it.

Earn your money before you spend it.

Never run in debt unless you see the way to get out again

Read some portion of the Bible every day — *Council of Life.*

A CHILDS FAITH.

A correspondent of the *New York Evangelist* relates the following instance of child faith: Last year, coming from Pittsburg East in a sleeping car, my apartment was next to that occupied by a gentleman, his wife, and their little daughter, perhaps four years old. The lady was excessively timid—not to put too fine a point upon it, terribly nervous. The Horseshoe Curve seemed to be her especial terror, and my sleep, and I presume that of others, was disturbed by her talking to her husband of the peril. The engineer might be asleep, or the switchtender might be asleep, and then the train would certainly be plunged down the abyss. But it was

worth while to be awake, when I heard the sweet rebuke, not intended, but real, of the little one: "Ma, God takes care of us, and does God sleep?" Was not this the ordaining strength out of the mouth of babes? Happy for the mother if it proved strength to her faith!

THE FAITHFUL BOY.

Gerhardt was a German shepherd boy; and a noble fellow he was, too, although he was very, very poor. One day as he was watching his flocks which were feeding in a valley on the borders of a forest, a hunter came out of the wood, and asked:

"How far is it to the nearest village?"

"Six miles, sir," replied the boy, "but the road is only a sheep-track, and very easily missed.

The hunter glanced at the crooked track, and then said:

"My lad, I am hungry, tired, and thirsty. I have lost my companions, and missed my way. Leave your sheep and show me the road. I will pay you well."

"I cannot leave my sheep, sir," replied the boy. "They would stray off into the forest, and be eaten by the wolves, or stolen by the robbers."

"Well, what of that?" replied the hunter. "They are not your sheep. The loss of one or more wouldn't be much to your master, and I'll give you more money than you ever earned in a whole year."

"I cannot go, sir," rejoined Gerhardt, very firmly; "my master pays me for my time, and he trusts me with his sheep. If I were to sell my

time, which does not belong to me, and the sheep should get lost, it would be just the same as if I stole them."

"Well," said the hunter, "will you trust your sheep with me while you go to the village and get me some food and drink and a guide? I will take good care of them for you."

The boy shook his head. "The sheep do not know your voice, and—" here Gerhardt stopped speaking.

"Sir," said the boy, slowly, "you tried to make me false to my trust, and wanted me to break my trust to my master. How do I know you would keep your word to me?"

The hunter laughed; but he felt that the boy had fairly silenced him. He said: "I see, my lad, that you are a good, faithful boy. I will not forget you. Show me the road, and I will try to follow it myself."

Gerhardt now offered the humble contents of his wallet to the hungry man, who, coarse as they were, ate them gladly. Presently his attendants came up, and then Gerhardt, to his surprise, found that the hunter was the Grand Duke, who owned all the country round. The Duke was so pleased with the boy's honesty, that he sent for him shortly after, and had him educated. In after years Gerhardt became a very rich and powerful man, and he remained honest and true to his dying day.

Honesty, truth, and fidelity are precious jewels in the character of a child. When they spring from piety they are pure diamonds, and make their possessor very beautiful, very happy, very honorable, and very useful. May you, young reader, wear them as Gerhardt did!

Then a greater than a Duke will befriend you, for the Great King will adopt you as His children, and you will become princes and princesses royal in the Kingdom of God.

GENERAL NEWS.

A terrible calamity happened at Falls River, Mass., the Granite Mills, in which a large number of operatives were employed, mostly women, caught fire, and the flames spread with such fearful rapidity, that 30 or 40 persons were killed, by jumping from windows, or burned to death.

On Monday the 14th inst., the white citizens of New Orleans, under the leadership of Lt. Gov. Penn., rose in revolt and "ousted" Gov. Kellogg and his officials. The movement was followed by a similar one in other portions of Louisiana. They held possession of the State Government for three days, at the end of which time Kellogg was reinstated by United States authorities. Meetings expressive of sympathy for the white people of Louisiana have been held in Louisville and other places.

The cotton crop for the year ending the 1st of Sept., was 4,170,000 bales, which has been exceeded only three times in the history of cotton culture in this country.

At the Democratic Municipal Convention, which met in this city on the 15th inst., Morton B. Howell, a well-known citizen and active member of the Baptist Church, was nominated for Mayor.

Guizot, the eminent French Historian and Statesman, died at his home, Sept. 13th, aged 87. Many

of his works have been translated into the English language, among them one called "History of Civilization" which is used as a text-book in many of our Colleges.

For several weeks past, the "army worm" has been making fearful ravages on the growing crops throughout Middle Tennessee. The pastures are all ruined, and the millet, much of which been sown since the rain, has been entirely destroyed.

New Advertisements.

We call the attention the readers of the *ADVOCATE* to the new advertisements which appear in this number.

To those of our farmer or merchant friends who desire to purchase groceries grass seeds or furniture we can do no better than refer them to S. Cooley, whose card appears in this issue of our paper. His honesty and uprightness of character are almost proverbial among the merchants of Nashville.

Should any of our friends need legal assistance, they can obtain the same by applying to J. S. Frazer, whose card appears among our advertisements. We can cordially recommend him as a young man of probity and industry who will give careful attention to all business intrusted to him.

Short Notes.

J. P. Whitefield writes us that a meeting had just closed at Bethel-Spring-Fork, Jackson Co., resulting in 14 additions and a thorough re-

organization of the Church. The meetings was conducted by L. R. and G. W. Sewell.

W. F. Todd reports 27 accessions at a meeting conducted by himself at Belleview church, Dickson Co.; Tenn.

Dr. W. J. Barbee has accepted the professorship of Natural Sciences and Ancient and Modern Language in Christian College, Columbia, Ky.

That veteran of the cross G. W. Abell, gave us a call as he passed through the city last week on his way to La-Guardo Wilson, Co. Tenn., at which place he intended holding a meeting.—T. W. James under date of Sept. 2 reports a successful meeting at Rich Woods Dyer Co. Tenn. There were five additions. E. G. Stallings their regular pastor did the preaching.

J. M. Barnes of Strata, Ala., has been holding a meeting during the past week with the brethren at Hillsboro, Tenn. At last accounts there had been 46 additions with interest still increasing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Change in Religious Denominations...	887
Query on Repentance.....	890
Dr. Brents' Gospel Plan of Salvation..	893
To our Readers.....	896
The Hippodrome.....	897
Co-operation meeting.....	898
Business Christianity.....	899
General Convention.....	901
Church News.....	901
Obituaries.....	901
Excuse me, Parson.....	904
Co-Education.....	906
Query.....	906
Variety in Texts.....	906
September.....	907
Maxims for a young man.....	907
A Child's Faith.....	908
The Faithful Boy.....	908
General News.....	909
New Advertisements.....	910
Short notes.....	910

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 39.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCT. 1, 1874.

The Sin Against the Holy Ghost.

I have often read discussions upon the question, "What is the sin against the Holy Ghost," mentioned Matth. xii. 31, 32, and in the *ADVOCATE* of Sept 3rd. a Brother John H McDonald answers the question, not satisfactorily however to my mind. He takes the position that that sin could not be committed until after the glorification of Christ, for says he, quoting from John's, gospel, "The Holy Ghost was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified."

Now I think it is very plainly taught in the Scriptures that the Holy Ghost was present in the world, before the glorification of the Savior, and that it was present at the time that Jesus spoke those words to the Scribes and Pharisees, and that they had committed the sin at the time that he gave them that scathing rebuke.

We read that the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape upon the Messiah, (Luke xii. 22.) it came upon Zacharias and he prophesied, (Luke 1: 67.); John the Baptist was filled with it from his mother's womb,

(Luke 1: 15); by inspiration were given the Scriptures, (II Pet. 1: 21): by its powerful operations all miracles were performed, both by the prophets before and by the apostles and evangelists after the glorification of the Savior; it moved upon the face of the waters at the beginning of time. David says, "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth." (The CIV. Psalm, 30th verse.) The Spirit then is the Creator and renewer, but under the direction of the Almighty hand of Jehovah it controls and governs all the movements of nature. All the wheels of nature move harmoniously under the control of that almighty omnipresent Spirit that fills immensity with its presence. Hence we see that the Holy Ghost has ever been present, and in John vii. chap. and 39th verse, allusion is had to the outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh in its miraculous power, as spoken of by Joël the prophet, and by Peter in the 11th chapter of Acts. So we see that by the Holy Ghost as the finger of God, the Savior worked the mighty miracles that should have convinced the Jewish people that he

was the God of nature. Now it is evident that those who attribute the mighty works performed by this power, to the operations of the evil one, committed the sin against the Holy Ghost; that pure essence of the divine godhead, whose office is to cleanse, purify and sanctify every member of the human family that ever will be saved; and that offence will not be forgiven them, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.

Where the Scriptures are so plainly interpreted by the inspired writers themselves, it is certainly strange that men will differ so much in their opinion upon them. It must be because we study more the teachings of men than of God, and are led into error by following the traditions of our fathers, as did the Jews that rejected the Savior. They were led to do it by misunderstanding the words of the Scriptures, being led by the traditions of their fathers as interpreted by their elders. They had Moses and the prophets and the Savior and his mission was plainly described to them; besides Isaiah plainly tells them how to distinguish imposters. "To the law and to the testimony," says he, "and if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light." But instead of going to the law and to the testimony, they went to their traditions, which led them as far astray, as the sects men are now following, are leading them into the paths of uncertainty, error, division and strife. The true word of God will be taught in its purity and power, only when its teachers study the Scripture more than the opinions of men, the traditions of their fathers, less than the

plain word of God. May God speed the coming of that glorious day, when all shall speak as with one mouth the blessed truths we find so plainly expressed in all the Scriptures, is the sincere prayer of one who seeks to find and discriminate the truth.

JAMES W. BRYAN.

Elkhart, Tex. Sept. 10th 1874.

We appreciate, we trust, fully the lecture given us by our brother on the importance of studying the Scriptures and following them instead of the traditions of the Fathers and the testimony of men. We plead in this instance at least, not guilty of following the teachings of the fathers or the traditions of the Elders, nor the theology of the Scribes and theologians.

The first time we ever saw the position in print we put it there ourselves. The first time we ever heard it, we spoke it. Our brother himself follows the popular tradition or teaching on this subject. All the Scriptures he quotes are familiar to us. We have studied them often in reference to to this question. We try to have as implicit confidence in, and as high regard for this Scripture as any one. Yet we do not believe the Scriptures teach what our brother claims they teach on this subject.

Christ did not say the Scribes and Pharisees had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost; we do not think he intended it. He gave them this warning of the danger of reviling the Holy Ghost—because they reviled him. We believe his language is a clear intimation that they might receive pardon for what they had

done, but if such a course were pursued toward the Holy Spirit when he should come, no pardon would be possible. We repeat what we said last week in reply to Bro. Egbert. Notwithstanding all the Scriptures quoted, Christ repeatedly told his disciples he would send them another comforter, unless he went away that other comforter would not come, that he would guide them into all truth, nor was this merely the miraculous gifts. They had existed hitherto in this world. The prophets of olden time had worked miracles, the apostles had done the same, the seventy were empowered to work miracles. Then the promise of the Spirit, which could only come after the glorification of Christ, meant something more than the bestowal of miraculous power and gifts. He came to certain individuals and on specific occasions, but we do not believe he dwelled on earth when these promises of his coming were made. There had been a promise of a time when God would dwell with his people, and be their God, and they should be his people. The church would constitute his people. The church was builded together in Christ, for an habitation, (or dwelling place) of God through the Spirit. Eph. 2-21-2.

God was not dwelling fully with any people of earth. He proposed to do so, and he would do this in the person of the Spirit. This coming of the Spirit as the representative of Jehovah to dwell with his people, to rule, guide and direct them is evidently the coming here spoken of. Christ was the representative of God while on earth, who then ruled and governed for and in God's name,

When he left the earth, the Spirit came in a character, in a personal mission and with authority, he never exhibited before. He came as a divine personage to dwell with man in the temple or ark prepared by Christ. Christ created, the Spirit organized, gave law, guided and through this guidance procreated or multiplied the creatures created by Christ. He did this procreating work by bringing Christ in his mission, in his work into contact with the sinner's heart. While it is beyond doubt true that the Spirit of God made its advent into this world, moved upon the face of the waters, brought order and harmony out of chaos, by organizing matter, and gave laws to guide that matter and is ever present in every part of the universe, which is in harmony with that law, guiding and directing forward to the accomplishment of the end for which it is created; it is equally true that the Spirit of God does not dwell with or in any part of the universe that is not in harmony with the law of God.

When man rebelled and placed himself out of harmony with the law of God, he drove God's Spirit from him and from the whole realm over which man ruled. God cannot dwell in a defiled and polluted temple.

When God's spirit was driven out, the spirit of the evil one, took up his abode in this world. His spirit since man's rebellion has been the ruling Spirit of and in the world. A disturbing element in the government of the world was thus introduced that not only affected man but the physical world, briars grew, thistles sprung up, thorns, spiritual as well as material pierced with anguish, and

death followed to relieve animate beings from a perpetual heritage of sorrow.

That disturbing element affects the physical world—it produces inequalities of life and condition here, it brings drought, mildew and blast, it produces want, suffering, famine, death. What is needed to redeem man from this condition, is to restore harmony with the will or law of God that the Spirit of God may again dwell and rule and breathe his gentle influences among men and over this earth.

During the period previous to the kingdom of Christ, the restoration of God's rule had been very partial. The children of Abraham rendered a very half-hearted and forgetful service. Very soon they rejected him as their ruler, and chose another king in place of God. 1st Sam'l. 8. 1-7. Individuals were faithful to God. Harmonized with his law the dwelling of the Spirit with them was to individuals, partial and imperfect.

The great work of Christ and the church is to cast out this evil Spirit, to destroy all the kingdoms built under the inspiration and suggestion of the evil spirit; establish a new kingdom of God in which his Spirit could dwell, and bring the whole human family into this kingdom, under God's law, that in it God's Spirit might dwell and that it again may become the great leading, animating spirit of the world. When Christ came God's Spirit was abiding in no institution or kingdom of earth. He came to establish a kingdom or institution in which the Spirit could and would dwell, and in and through that kingdom would destroy all the

other kingdoms in which the spirit of the evil one dwells. To do this he must first conquer or overcome the evil one. He did this. He let the evil one exert his highest stretch of power over him. Through his kingdom and servants, he slew the Son of God. He buried him, put him in the prison house of the kingdom of hell. There in the inner chambers of death's dark prison house he alone struggled with the powers of death and hell. He conquered the Devil. The devil is the author of death and the founder of hell. Christ overcame him there and showed his power to overcome him in his kingdom on earth, and his own domains, the grave. Christ founded a new kingdom on earth, whose mission is to break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms of the evil one. In consuming them, the Spirit which dwells in them, is driven out. In substituting the kingdom of God in which God's Spirit dwells for these kingdoms in which the Spirit of the evil one dwells, God's Spirit is substituted for the spirit of the evil one as the ruling Spirit of this world.

But when Christ came, no people or kingdom was obedient to God. Hence the Holy Spirit dwelt with none. He came to establish a kingdom that would be obedient; his office was to create. He created the materials. The spirit came and organized them into a kingdom, gave laws to guide them in procreating and spreading that kingdom and took up his abode with, and in this kingdom. He is in it so long as it is in harmony with his laws.

The Spirit then entered on his mission with reference to the new

kingdom as the representative of God, only when he came after the glorification of Christ to organize, guide, and give law to the new kingdom. The Spirit could not be sinned against until he was the representative of God and law-giver to the people of God. The authoritative agent of Jehovah, we have not quoted much Scripture in writing this, yet we think there is Scripture that teaches these truths. We believe the language was a warning against committing the sin when the Spirit would come, not a denunciation for a sin already committed.

D. L.

Church Legislation.

J. T. Neal, in the *Galveston Christian Advocate*, Sept. 2nd. 1872, says :

"If every subject is to be legislated on, when will the end come. Let the Bible be brought to the front, and kept there. Let us not put upon the neck of the disciples, a yoke which Christ did not put there."

Sensible talk, but who of his brethren will hear it, and heed it? He dare not follow his own advice. When he says "if every subject is to be legislated on, when shall the end come" he expresses a sentiment, which now prevails in the hearts of thousands of the disciples of Christ.

Legislation has well nigh ruined the Church. Men have presumed by legislation in ecclesiastical matters, to change laws which Christ gave them no authority to change. Christ vested his church with executive but not with legislative power. The business of the Church is simply to execute the laws her king has given.

Let J. T. Neal and his brethren, cease their legislation—undertake to execute the laws of the king, and away goes every distinctive feature of the M. E. Church.

Bring the Bible to the front and keep it there, put your discipline in the back ground, and keep it there a little while, and away goes your "mourners bench," your "sprinkling" your "infant church membership," your high-sounding titles, of "D. D." Rev." &c. &c. Even your very name, "Methodist" must go.

The adoption of such a rule would demolish most of the churches now in existence. But we do not expect J. T. N. or any of his brethren to follow his suggestion. Party feeling is too strong. They will be Methodists, and follow the Methodist trail, right or wrong. Besides this, it is not now popular to take the Bible only, as a rule of faith and practice. The ground is too high for the "mighty"—the "noble." Something must be added by legislation. Man must change the law of God—make new laws of his own and bind upon the neck of Christ's disciples, a yoke which he did not put there—a burden which Christ removed. The commands of God are not grievous—but the commands of men are grievous, too heavy to be borne.

Let the professed followers of Christ cease to legislate—let them strive to execute only His laws, in the spirit of love and of Christ. Let it be their meat and drink, to do the will of the Father, as it was Christ's, and the Bible must go to the front, and stay there. Then shall men be able to point sinners to the Lamb of God, as the Savior. Penitents shall

no longer be left mourning, and groping in midnight darkness—seeking admittance into Christ's kingdom. The Bible—the light, that lights our pathway—will direct them into the kingdom the same hour in which they believe. The Bible will tell them what to believe. It will tell them what to do, and how to do it, to be saved. So that they can do all required, and pass at once from sin—from condemnation, to justification. Then the Bible will guide them safely through every trial—through all the difficulties of life. The Bible will direct, and thoroughly furnish unto all good work. Yes, bear it to the front. Let the people read it—it is perfect, converting the soul. Let the people feel it—it is sharper than any two-edged sword. Let the people see it,—it is a light unto our feet, and a lamp unto our way. Let the people understand it, it is God's power to salvation. It tells of the love of God. The death of Jesus. The gift of the Holy Spirit. Tells how to come back to the power, and peace of God.

“Let the Bible be brought to the front and kept there.” Amen.

When this is done, God will be glorified, the cause of Christ advanced, and millions of sinners saved.

JOHN T. POE.

QUERIES.

Brethren L. & S: Please give your views, at your earliest convenience through the Gospel Advocate on the language found in Matthew xii: 43, 44 and 45. Is it the unclean spirit or the man that walks through dry places? Is the man the swept and garnished house? What

wicked generation was referred to? Also Romans ii: 14–15. What things in the law did they by nature? (the Gentiles.) These are Scripture difficulties for us in our Sunday-School. Our opinion is somewhat split. Please let me hear from you at some length if you think these Scriptures require it.

Our congregation here—Enon—numbers 71; others will unite soon. Although prejudice runs very high here, the truth scales its walls and makes the ism tremble. Bro. A Kyle preaches for us once a month. He is a workman that needs not to be ashamed. Hoping to hear from you soon I am

Yours in Christian bonds,

G. M. HOLLINGSWORTH.

*Grapeland, Houston Co., Tex.,
Sept. 4, 1874.*

The 43rd verse reads thus: “When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none.” We think there can be no doubt but that it is the unclean spirit that walketh through dry places, seeking rest. As an evidence of this, in the Greek, in the 44th verse, the participles, that agree with the one that walks through dry places, are in the neuter gender. The word Pneuma, rendered Spirit is neuter gender, while the word for man is masculine gender. And if it had been the man that did the walking, the participles agreeing with it would have been masculine also. But as they are neuter, they are intended to agree with the unclean spirit. So it was the unclean spirit that walked through dry places. In the second place, the man is the

swept and garnished house. The unclean spirit went out of the man, and then returned to the same place whence he went out. This makes the point clear, that the man out of whom the unclean spirit went, was the swept and garnished house. The wicked generation referred to was evidently the Jewish nation. He was talking to the Jews, scribes and Pharisees, when he uttered the expression. And as he was talking to Jews, and said, "this generation" we think there can be no doubt but that they are the ones spoken of in the passage. And besides this, in the 39th verse of the same chapter, he calls the same people to whom he was talking in the 45th verse, "an evil and adulterous generation." And the Jewish nation was the point of illustration in this parable or figure. He had just been comparing them with the men of Nineveh, and with the queen of the South, and telling them the men of Nineveh shall rise in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it—this generation; that is, this nation, the Jews, for he was talking to them. These Jews had become very wicked and corrupt, and their religion then, was a mere matter of forms, and ceremonies, while their hearts were far from God. And he was intending to teach them that a terrible destiny was before them. They had already, at different times sinned against God, and he had punished them in various ways, but when they humbled themselves, he had restored them to their own land again. But at this time, they were consummating their iniquity, by refusing to receive Jesus as the Son of God. The Jews not only rejected Jesus during his personal ministry, but they afterwards refused to receive the gospel, the glorious plan of salvation which he had provided for them. This filled their cup of iniquity. This made the last state of that nation worse than the first. Hence the whole nation as such was destroyed in the year 70 of the Christian era, and their city and temple have ever since lain in ruins. And the destiny of that generation at the judgment seat of Christ will certainly be a terrible one. Jesus said, "he that believeth not shall be damned." They utterly refused to believe the gospel when it was proclaimed to them. So they will certainly be under this condemnation at last. This will be their last and final punishment, their eternal banishment from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power. And with such punishments as these awaiting that nation, no wonder that Jesus should say the last state of that nation would be worse than the first. The figure of the man and the unclean spirit, is a very forcible one. In the first state of the man, only one wicked spirit was in him. But in the last state, seven other spirits, more wicked than the first were dwelling in him. And then with this strong figure before them he said, in 45th verse, "even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation." This was a fearful condition to be in. An awful doom certainly awaits those Jews in the eternal world. The same principle also may be applied to every individual who apostatizes from the truth of God, from the religion of Jesus. When a man wholly abandons the religion of Jesus Christ, and goes

back to the world, and gives himself up to the world, he becomes a far worse man than before he became a Christian at all. When a man becomes a Christian, and does not fill up his heart with the love of God, and of his divine institutions, and a desire at all times to do his holy will, then the love of the world, and its vain and sinful practices will return and fill the heart. And not only such as filled the heart and life before conversion, but many others are always added in such cases. It is almost a universal principle that an apostate from the religion of the Savior, is worse than he was before making any pretensions. How important then that the Christian strive daily, to grow in grace and in his knowledge of the truth. That he seek to put on the whole armor of God, that he may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. As the man out of whom the unclean spirit went was soon ready to receive it back again, with seven other more wicked ones, just so any man, who embraces Christianity, and will not fill his heart and life with the good things of our holy religion, will soon have room in his heart for more of the world than was ever there before. And the last state of such will be worse than the first. Better never to have known anything of Christianity, than to learn and embrace it, and then turn from it. Such is the teaching of the word of the Lord. Regarding the passage in the second of Romans, men differ very widely, as to its meaning. We will here give the 14th and 15th verses. "For when the Gentiles which have not

tained in the law: these having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their heart, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." It is claimed by some that this passage teaches that God impresses his laws upon the minds even of the heathen, who have never seen or heard of his word. Hence many are claiming now, that God will convert and save the heathen by his Holy Spirit without the word. But the whole idea of people either finding God, or his laws, without revelation, without the word of God, is contrary to what is taught in the Bible. Paul says, "For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." I Cor. i: 21. Now we must not make Paul in Romans contradict himself in Corinthians. In Corinthians he teaches us that man's wisdom cannot find out God. And as man by his wisdom cannot find out God himself, it is not at all likely that he can find out the laws of God. We must remember that the law was given to the Jews, and not to the Gentiles. So in that sense, the Gentiles as such, had not the law. But many of the Gentiles always lived contiguous to the Jews, and by observing their manners and customs, and worship, learned many of the principles and requirements of the law, and sometimes lived a more upright life than the Jews did, who had the law.

And in this way, oftentimes a knowledge of the true God was im-

parted to the Gentiles ; and not only that, but the law was often written upon their hearts by what they saw and heard among the Jews. And when the Gentiles caught the principles of serving God from the Jews, and did by nature, that is by practice, by their course of life the things contained in the law, they had the advantage of the Jews who had the law, but would not obey it. For said Paul, "not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." So when the Gentiles who did not have the law given to them did the things contained in the law, they were justified before God, while the Jews to whom the law was given, but did not do the things required in the law, were to be condemned.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S. : Give through the ADVOCATE a correct rendering of Galatians 2 : 2-9, inclusive. I and others have long wished for light on these verses. We commonly read and understand them as follows: Words substituted where we differ from the common rendering.

2nd, "And I went up by permission and command of God" &c. &c. But * * Titus &c. &c. 5th. "To whom we rendered no submission, but withstood to the face as to Peter at Antioch) no not" &c. &c. 6th. But of those who seemed be of note in conference (whatsoever they were it maketh &c. or is of no consequence to me: God accepteth no man's person :) added naught to me: but contrariwise, when they saw that the preaching of the Gospel to the uncircumcised was committed unto me

as the same of the gospel to the circumcised" &c.

Yours in Christian Love,

JAS. S. A. ABBOTT.

P. S. If there are any of the preaching brethren who have time to spare and wish to preach and visit this section, if they will let me know it, I will spare no pains in trying to make their stay pleasant and profitable, and will assist them to the utmost extent in getting here and getting home again. We in this section have not heard a gospel sermon in two years. As is manna to the hungry soul, so (would be) the face of a disciple to us.

J. S. A. A.

Aurora Ala, or Red Apple Ala.

The language as it stands in our common version, is about as plain as we know how to make it. The word that is rendered "revelation," in the second verse, literally means revelation, and we know of no better word by which to render it into English. The literal meaning of the third and fourth verses, put into our English idiom, would be about the following: ("But Titus, who was with me, although a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised; not even by false brethren brought in unawares, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ, that they might bring us into bondage.") Evidently there were some false brethren there, who attempted to induce Paul to have Titus circumcised. But he refused to do so. Hence the meaning of the fifth verse is, (But we did not give place to, or submit to them for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might remain with you—that

is, that I may leave the truth with you unperverted.)

In those days it was very difficult to satisfy the Jewish Christians that Gentiles were to be made equal to themselves, in gospel privileges without submitting to circumcision, and observing the law of Moses. Paul most likely went up to Jerusalem at the very time referred to in order to have the question of circumcision settled. We have an account of this trip, and the result of it, in the fifteenth chapter of Acts. The assembly of apostles and elders at Jerusalem decided that circumcision and the burden of the law of Moses should not be placed upon the Gentiles at all.

But Paul and Barnabas had to relate what God had done among the Gentiles through them. Peter gave his testimony that God had chosen him from among the apostles, that through him the "Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe." James then showed from the old prophets, that the Gentiles were to be called also by the gospel of Christ. James, Peter and John, when convinced that the Lord had made Paul an apostle to the Gentiles, gave him and Barnabas, the right hand of fellowship, and encouraged them to go on in the work of preaching to the Gentiles, while they would still go among the Jews. The sixth, seventh, and eighth verses are as plain as we know how to make them. The greater part of this letter to the Galatians was written to convince the Jewish Christians in that section of country that the law of Moses was done away; and that in the gospel of Christ, all distinction between Jews

and Gentiles is done away, and that now all stand upon one common level.

But it seems that on one occasion, even Peter, who had introduced the Gospel among the Gentiles, had allowed himself to be led astray on the subject of the Gentiles, and so Paul withstood him to the face on account of it, declaring he was to be blamed. Paul's special mission was to the Gentiles; and hence we find him devoting much of his time in showing the equality of the Gentiles with the Jews in the kingdom of Christ.

E. G. S.

A Lad Just Beginning to Run.

Brethren L. & S: I send two dollars for the *ADVOCATE*, and this is the 5th subscriber I have obtained this year for your valuable paper. It may seem strange to you that I will ask others to take, pay for, and read the *ADVOCATE* and not a subscriber myself. This I will explain, after saying a few other things. And while I am writing this, I feel assured that I must soon try the realities of another mode of existence, beyond the river, to give an account of my stewardship here below, and receive a just recompense of reward according to my ways. This being true, while I write, I try (as all should do that write) to point my pen to the very center of truth. I am one that believes a man of my age ought to be a full grown man in Christ Jesus, and I have to acknowledge if a child of God at all, that I am but a lad, just beginning to run. There never was an effect without a cause, and there is a cause for this, and not only a cause, but a

fault. And I do not place it all on my account. I will say just here I went to preaching regularly when young, was taught many things that were true and good, such as this; that there was a way made possible for all men to be saved through Christ: that through suffering He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him, and that there was no other name under heaven whereby we could be saved. Also that we must come to Christ if we would be saved. I believed all this, and from 15 years old up I wanted to be a Christian. And as soon as they, (the preachers) found I was concerned about my soul's salvation, they began to tell me how to get into Christ. Now as I have not written what Denomination these preachers belonged too, the reader has no definite idea as to how I was told to get into Christ. Now if every preacher would but heed Peter's admonition there would be no trouble on this subject. Peter said, "if any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God." 1st. Pet. 4th 11. What do the oracles of God say in reference to getting into Christ? Let them speak. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me." Matth. 11: 28, 19. "Therefore if any man be in Christ he is a new creature, old things have passed away; behold all things are become new." 2nd Cor. 5. 17. "In whom we have redemption through his blood the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14.

In Christ then we are promised forgiveness of sins: how do we get into

Christ? "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death." Rom. 6: 3. "For as many of us as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3. 27.

The reader has not yet been told what kind of preachers I was taught by in my youthful days. I will tell you what they taught me. When I was a penitent believer, they told me I must come to Christ, *via* mourner's bench and by faith alone—by so many other ways that I never got there by any of their ways. But all that I heard tell how they got there, (for they were required to tell when and how they got there) all came by the feeling way—I was told I could and must get religion. They said I could get it on my road home and many other places, all contradicting James' definition of pure religion. James 1. 27.

They told me I was a sinner and belonged to the world. They would appeal to the Scriptures and say, ask and you shall receive. Never once telling me it was said in John 9. 31, that God heareth not sinners. They would pray that I might receive the spirit of truth. When I hear any one offer this position; (and you are sure to hear it if you go among the Sects,) I always think of the Savior saying "the world cannot receive it." John 14. 17. How any man can pray in faith, nothing doubting, for a thing that Jesus positively says cannot be, is strange to me; knowing whatever is without faith is sin. I was told to knock and it should be opened. I was told to do many things. I was told I could do nothing, saying "no man can come to me except the

father draw him." John 6. 44, never reading the next verse to let me know how the Father drew me. They have no more use for this 45th verse, than for the people they now call Campbellites.

They had it about as clear as mud to me. I, with an honest heart went to work according to their directions as near as I could. But the Savior's words held true with me. I never received it. They then told me my heart was not right, and said I was not willing to give up all my sins. Here I was indirectly called a hypocrite, just what all mourners are called, unless they will shout or say, I feel like and therefore believe my sins are pardoned, so I nearly gave it up. But still I went to church, and did truly wish I could be a Christian. Then they turned on me and tried to make me believe I was a Christian; using the Scriptures saying, "we know we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren," 1 John 3. 14. Then would say, don't you feel like you love the brethren? They handle this Scripture like they did John's other Scripture, when they were trying to make us feel like the Father was drawing us. Now let John tell how we may know when we love the brethren, and see if he places it on feelings. "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments." 1 John 5. 2, 3. I was taught if I was a child of God there was no chance for me to fall; never telling me that Paul said, "If any man thinketh he standeth, let him take heed lest he fall," nei-

ther did they say Paul kept his body in subjection, lest after preaching to others, he himself should be a castaway, 1st Cor. 9. 27. But to prove I could not fall they would read Romans 8: 35-39, never hinting to me that if this taught and proved their doctrine to be true, that it made this very chapter contradict itself: The 12th and 13th verses say, "Therefore brethren we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh, for if ye live after the flesh *ye shall die.*" So they failed to make me believe this with many other things they taught, and in this condition I stood for fifteen years, reading and learning as fast as I could without an education or some man to guide me. I soon satisfied myself as to the mode of baptism. Much was said, both as to mode and design of baptism. Finally I concluded to be baptized like Paul and the Romans were. "Buried with him by baptism." Romans 6. 3, 4. So I was immersed, and connected myself with the Methodist Church. Then I was taught that sprinkling was baptism, and that it was my duty to have my Baby baptized. But they failed to make me believe it. I was now very popular, all the preachers came to my house. The Baptists claimed me, the Methodists said they had me. One year after I was baptized, there was an appointment given out for a man who claimed himself to be a Christian to preach at our church. Everybody said he was a Campbellite. But he came. My preacher came too, and said he knew all about what he called Campbellite doctrine, just as well as he knew hog trails, and said it was a very dangerous doctrine. I believed all he said,

and of course had to begin with the new preacher with a prejudiced mind. But he began to preach, I listened at his arguments and proofs and thought he was wrong in many things. He preached seven times. He said enough to set the people to reading. I for one thought I could set his arguments that I did not like aside: the more I read the more I found in his favor. A few months after this about January 1872, I was taken down and confined to my house with spinal affection, and was not able to do anything but read. I began to study the Bible by subjects. Read several debates; read the Lipscomb and Griffin debate, both in the *Baptist* and *ADVOCATE*. Found that Griffin could talk as well in the *ADVOCATE* as he could in the *Baptist*, found that Lipscomb said as much again and more to the point in the *ADVOCATE* than he was allowed in the *Baptist*. If the editors of the *Baptist* who were having this debate published wanted their readers to know the truth as to the debate, why say three words for one man and one for another? I think any man that will read it both in the *Baptist* and *ADVOCATE* can find the reason, unless he has got a veil over his face, or his mind so befogged with prejudice that he don't know the truth when he sees it. I watch preachers and sorry I am that I sometimes lose confidence in some of them. I heard one of them say in his closing speech in a debate with a Baptist, that he was willing to discipline (at the same time holding up the little book) in the day of Judgment and there he would tell Jesus Christ to his teeth that in his commission he had authorized him to baptize every household in the land. About 12 months after he said this, he came round to kill Campbellism. He said he believed he was born for this purpose, and is known in Texas as the Campbellite killer. He commenced and soon got to the commission as given by Mark 16: 16 and he was standing in six feet of the same place where he said he would tell Jesus to his teeth that in this commission he had authorized him to baptize every household in the land, but to my surprise he now told us that in this commission was not a drop of water. Consistency is a jewel with me, and you can set me down as one that lost confidence. After much reading, I found the whole duty of man was to "fear God and keep his commandments." Ecclesiastes 11: 13. When Christ said he that believes and is baptized, shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned" and when the believer asked the question, asked what shall we do? the Holy Spirit said through Peter, "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 Ghost," Acts 2: 37, 38. And at the close of Revelations it is said, God is the beginning and the ending the first and the last and 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." Rev. 22: 13, 14. So I believe, as I read and so I try to act.

So I came into the Church of Christ. They opposed me, but I used the sword of the Spirit the best I could. I was but a babe, I could

not handle the sword like a full grown man, but thanks be to God who gave it will accomplish the purpose for which it was sent. Isaiah 55 : 11. The sword was sharp, and soon brought them to a halt. They then said go. He is gone crazy. He don't believe what he teaches, I was publicly told I was using Lipscomb's notes, when I with Bible in hand had given them chapter and verse. Then one of the preachers said: Brethren, we all ought to pray and try to get the brother out of the error of his way. What next? My name was on the church book. Some disposition must be made of it. Well they wrote, *he is gone to the Campbellites.*

I said I had got five subscribers for your paper. The reason I have got so few is, I have been confined to my bed the most of my time for near three years, never going anywhere unless I was hauled. If I was on my feet, I would get many more. I am willing to work for a paper that makes a man love and read his Bible more, but no other. I want every reader of the Advocate that thinks it is doing good to see how many new subscribers he can get from now to the first of January. And I say to Bros. L. & S. go on in the good work, but I don't want you to be like a Baptist preacher said while in the stand not long since. He said it was his business to preach the doctrines of the Baptist church. I think a man's business is to preach the doctrines of the Bible. I do not object to sending the gospel to the heathen land, but I do think from the signs of the times, there is yet much to be done nearer home. It has been but a few weeks since I heard a preacher while

at prayers thank God that there were so many different churches, and asked God for more. And on the first Lord's day of this month, at a Sunday-School, several preachers in the class, were speaking of Paul's blindness, when he was stricken down. One preacher answered sinful blindness, and it all worked well.

- HENRY J. PARKER.

Ministers of the Gospel Meddling in Politics.

We have never considered the duties of a minister of the gospel, and a politician, as at all congenial, or to be those that are susceptible of a harmonious and successful working together. If a man chooses politics as the channel in which he launches his boat he is certainly ill suited to instruct his fellow man as to Heaven, and heavenly things. If he is called to preach the glad tidings of salvation to a wicked world, he must depart far from his line of duty, to be caught in the whirlpool of excitement usually attending the popular elections of the present day. Then how humiliating, to the truly patriotic, and refined, to see men wearing the livery of heaven on their backs, with authority from God, to point out the way of Heaven to fallen man, mixing in the general rabble, and wallowing in the cess-pools of political rotteness; willing to barter off the blood-bought boon of American freedom for less than a mess of pottage, even for a little temporary office, that can only last a few years at most. When a man so far forgets his calling as to leave the pulpit for the stump, desert the altar and join in a clamor for

office, and in an attempt to obtain the office, resort to all kinds of frauds, strives to array race against race, and man against man, to plunge the whole country in a civil strife, and thus bring ruin upon the nation; we say a man who thus disregards the laws of God and man, is unworthy the office he seeks, disgraces the calling he has accepted, and deserves the scorn and contempt of the world, and the condemnation of a just God. These mischief making preachers are not always confined to the office seeking class; we often hear of them making political stump speeches all over the country attempting to create unnecessary excitement among the people, *connecting* colored people by a single link, to the *monkey, ourang-outang, &c.*, sometimes hear of them becoming so full of politics, that they have to boil over in Sunday school, and whisper to others so that scholars overhear them. When preachers who are not seeking office, become so much interested in politics, as to turn out to speech making they have certainly either lost their influence in the community in which they live, or *have become very obnoxious to their families*. In either case their political advice should, and generally does, have very little influence with the people.—*Florence Ala., Republican.*

From the New Observer.

WOMEN AS HOUSEBUILDERS.

BY A PEN.

"Every wise woman," says an old, wise writer, "buildeth her house." But by this we are not to understand that women are only wise as they are

house carpenters or mechanics. Many a man has a roof over his head, and rooms to sit in and sleep in, who yet has not an *house*, in the sense of this old writer. A literal habitation, or dwelling, is not what he refers to. He means *family*, or household. A wise woman buildeth up her family, blesses her household, doing them good, not evil, all her days. But "a foolish one," on the contrary, "plucketh it down with her hands."

This matter is so important that God has caused many Biblical allusions to be made to it, and also, in one instance, a whole chapter to be taken up with it. Looking at the loveliest form of a wife's and mother's influence, that of pecuniary economy, we see how a wise woman can, in this sense, "build her house;" being, like the merchant's ships, bringing her food from afar." Will there also be domestic tranquillity? Yes, "if she openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is the law of kindness." In her treatment of her husband, she is a queen over his happiness. Our English ancestors understood this when they used to say, "She either makes or mars."

As to the training of children, a mother's every movement, word, look or tone, is a vital lesson given. A child may be *schooled* in a room with benches and a rod; but his *training* goes on at home. Excuse the father? No; but the mother's permanent presence is like the constant dropping that wears a rock. It is a miracle when the well-being of a family can stand against the folly of the wife and mother.

Those of her own sex, or the other, who would drag her from her home

domain out into public life, in order, as they say, to elevate her to her true sphere, are sadly astray. Her true sphere is not building up nations directly, but indirectly, through the family. Families are what all nations are made of. Her position, then, is already many-fold more important than it would be at the polls. There she could vote only singly. But *at home*, if she is intelligent, discreet and wise, she can vote as many times as she has sons, in addition to her husband. She presides where all voters come from—the *house*, which bears the impress of her handy-work, from cellar to garret; from the lowest foundation stone to the highest coping or chimney top. So that it is not only required of a steward that a *man* be found faithful, but also of a stewardess, that a *woman* be found so, too.

FASHION.

While the Church is growing in grace, and in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, there are still some things in which (in our humble judgment) the will of the Lord is not as much regarded as it should be by members of the Church. One thing particularly strikes us as not being in accordance with the Spirit of Christianity; and that is the devotion of many members of the Church, especially of the sisterhood to the Idol, Fashion. But being liable to err in our judgment, we will give some of our reasons for thus thinking, and for desiring to see a reform in the church in this respect. And if we are wrong, we hope some kind sister or brother will show us our error, as

we do not wish to remain in error if we can help it. In the first place, then, when we come into the Church our state is changed from a state of sin to a state of holiness. Although before our entrance into the church we were the servants of sin, and were subject to the laws of Satan, on entering the church we become the servants of righteousness, and are subject to the law of God. Being then citizens of God's kingdom, all the actions of our lives should be governed by his laws. In his law we are commanded not to live after the flesh, but after the Spirit. "For (so reads the law) if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Again the law teaches us to "be followers of God as dear children, and to walk in love as Christ also has loved us, and has given himself for us as an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor." And again it teaches us to add to our "faith virtue, and to our virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness, charity. The law also teaches us not to let our adorning be that "outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and wearing of gold and putting on of apparel." Also that whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, to do all for the glory of God.

Again we are taught that we are not our own, but are bought with a price, even with the precious blood of Christ. Then, as we are not our own, our time, the powers of our minds and bodies and all the worldly

goods that have been given into our keeping, belong to God and should be used in his service. But when we use these things in serving or following the Fashion, we are not using them in serving and following Christ. We are not gaining other talents for our Lord with the talents he has given us, but are as that wicked and slothful servant who hid his Lord's talent in napkin. We do not do all things for the glory of God, when we dress according to the dictates of Fashion; for we disregard his law in doing this, and show to the world that we have more respect for the laws of their idol than we have for the laws of our king; for the law of our king is, "let not your adorning be plaiting the hair and wearing of gold and putting on of apparel." But the law of fashion is, let your adorning be outward in wearing of plaits and gold, and putting on of apparel. Your apparel must be such as will adorn you, or you cannot be one of my followers. We all know that in the present state of the church, this latter law is very binding on Christians, while the former is almost entirely disregarded.

Again, by following fashion, we are hindered in a great measure from obeying our king's law, which teaches us to add to our faith virtue, knowledge, temperance &c., for much of our precious time which should be used in adding these graces is wasted in making articles of dress which are entirely superfluous, the only purpose for which they are worn, being, to be in the fashion. Besides we could not add temperance to our knowledge while we wear all those superfluities which

are required to make us fashionable, but are otherwise useless. For we would then be dressing intemperately, for the word intemperance means, "excess, more than enough," and we know that the ruffles and puffs, flowers feathers, ribbons, false hair and jewelry, which make up the fashionable woman, are more than is necessary either for health comfort, or neatness. Therefore, those who wear such things are not temperate, in all things, for they wear to excess; but the apostle Paul teaches that they who strive to win in the race are temperate in all things. And if we expect to obtain the crown of life, we should be temperate not only in eating and drinking, but we should be temperate in all things. We will now try to see whether the devotees of fashion are followers of God, as dear children and are walking in love as Christ loved us. The fact that these persons always attire themselves with scrupulous exactness according to the rules of fashion; that they always have a very stylish look about them, that they always impress the beholder with the fact that they are *somebody, themselves*; that they have the means to dress, and the mind to understand what fashion requires of them, and the skill to arrange it all in a way to make the very best appearance, does not prove that they are following God. For we have no account that God or Christ ever did this or that they ever required any one else to do it. Nor does this course of living prove that they are walking in love, unless it is love for themselves and for the vanities of the world. But it proves they are not walking in love as Christ loved us; for he loved us

well enough to give himself for us a sacrifice to God. But where is the sacrifice that these stylish Christians make for any one? No doubt they are willing for their husbands and fathers to give money to assist in having the gospel preached to sinners after they have provided for every requirement of Fashion to be met. But do they deny themselves one of those things which are not even needful for their comfort, but merely gratify the lust of the eye, in order to help sinners to hear the gospel? The Lord has ordained that sinners shall be saved by hearing, believing and obeying the gospel; and the way they are to hear it is by having it preached to them. But we know there are many places even in our own country where the gospel has never been preached in its ancient purity; and if we are not willing to make any sacrifice to have it preached to those people, do we love them as Christ loved us? And what right have we to claim that we are walking in that kind of love? The apostle Paul in writing to the churches said "for some have not the knowledge of God. I speak this to your shame." Now if it was a shame to the churches in those days, when the gospel had not begun to be preached but a few years for persons not to have the knowledge of God, is it any less a shame now when we have had the gospel in the world over eighteen-hundred years? Surely not. But some may say, what bearing has this on our following the fashions? Women are not permitted to labor for the Lord, and what could we do? Paul, in one of his letters, entreated his true yoke-fellow to help those

women which labored with him in the gospel. And if they labored with Paul in the gospel it would certainly be right to so labor now. The husbands and fathers of some of the worshipers of Fashion, (we say worshipers because they devote more of their energies and meant to the advancement of the cause of fashion than to the cause of Christ, or anything else,) are rich enough to indulge them in all these vanities and still be able to give considerable sums of money to the church. But we believe they are by no means in the majority who are able to do this; and the example set by the wives and daughters of those who are able, incite the wives and daughters of those who are not able to dress in the same way. They wish to associate with the people of wealth and no doubt think that by dressing as they do they can obtain more of their favor than they otherwise could, and no doubt they think right in this. Therefore a majority of the members of the church are unable to give much to the church either to have the gospel preached to sinners or to defray its own expenses; and therefore the work of conversion goes on slowly compared to the way it might go on if all the members of the body would go to work heartily in the good cause, and would dress as Paul and Peter directed them to dress; and in so doing they would lay aside all that is superfluous.

Now we have no doubt that if we could ascertain the cost of all that is worn by the disciples that is superfluous we would find that the cost of what is worn by each congregation on an average would be ample to

support a preacher's family. Then the women of each congregation could send another preacher into the field.

Think then how many more preachers might be sent into the field by Christians doing their duty, as many more as there are churches already established; but as it is, we women act as if we had neither part nor lot in this matter. Not only could we do good in this way with the money which is spent to gratify the lust of the eye: but we could search for objects which need our assistance, and no doubt we could find plenty of them. We could help to educate orphan children, and find numerous ways to do good with all our money wasting it in superfluous dressing. Then we would make our money bring us something worth having that would last us forever. For we would be laying up treasure in heaven with it. But what will it avail us in the day of judgment that we have always had our garments cut in the latest style, even if it required twice the number of goods that other styles required; and that we always wore the most beautiful shades of ribbon, and the most charming hats or bonnets, and that our jewelry was always of the loveliest pattern? It will do us little good then; and God will call us to account for the way we have used his money while in this world.

But there is safety in dressing in a plain and simple style; as Paul expresses it, "in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety;" while there may be, and is danger, in the opposite way of dressing. Then why not be on the safe side? We know

that it is always safe to do the will of the Lord in any and everything, and we know that it is unsafe not to do his will when we know what his will is. And we do know what the will of the Lord is in regard to the way we should dress. Then why will we not do it? If Fashion were to require us to adorn ourselves in modest apparel with shamefacedness and sobriety; and not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array, who would be seen wearing their hair arranged in a way that any one could possibly think it was broided? or who would be seen in public wearing gold or pearls or arrayed in materials that any one could possibly think were costly? We are quite sure there would be few who would do so; for persons do less sensible things than wearing their hair in a plain simple way, and laying aside gold, and being clad in cheap materials, in order to obey Fashion. But when Paul and Peter require them to dress in this way, they seem to think it is not worth while to pay any attention to it unless Fashion says so too. For they were such plain old-fashioned men, and had such little taste in matters of dress. But they knew very well what kind of adorning was becoming to women professing godliness, and what kind was of great price in the sight of God, as old-fashioned as they were. Now we have given some of our reasons for believing it to be wrong for Christians to sacrifice the Lord's money, and time and talents on the altar of Fashion. And if any brother or sister can show any reason why they should do so, we hope they will give us the benefit of it, as we want

to do all the good we can; and if it can be shown that we can do more good in the world, and advance the cause of Christ more rapidly by following Fashion we want to be engaged in it. But if we hinder the progress of Christianity by our worship of this idol, why not cease to do so, and turn to the Lord and try to obtain forgiveness for our past follies, and live the rest of our lives to the honor and glory of God. What an easy matter it would be to do this if only two or three of the leaders of fashion, of each congregation would make a beginning, for we have not only followers of fashion in the church, but leaders, captains of fashion who have by distinguishing themselves in its service, been promoted to this honor. We do hope that the time will come when we will all be of one mind in regard to this subject, and that mind be the mind of Christ. But now there is division among us; for it is sad to the souls of some of the disciples to see their dear sisters come to the house of worship for the purpose of worshipping God, disobeying him at the same time they profess to be worshipping him; while others glory in it. Then may the Lord hasten the time when divisions will cease, and when we will all be enabled to keep ourselves from idols and serve the true and living God with all our hearts and with all our minds and with all our strength. Amen.

N. N.

CHURCH NEWS.

Dear Advocate: I again write you a note of my labors. I closed my meeting at Beech Grove with 4

additions, spoke 12 times. From here I went to Science Hill; spoke 11 times with 8 added to the congregation. From here to the "Curlee School-house;" spoke 10 times, baptized 12. One lady 86 years old, who said, "I am getting old, I can't die satisfied without being baptized." She had been a member of the Cumberland Presbyterian church 40 years. But on learning that Christ had established a "church" without the "C. P." to it, or any other "human appendage," and learning the truth concerning that "one body," she was willing to obey it. Oh! that all would learn the truth and obey it. To the Lord be honor everlasting.

SMITH J. DENTON.

Bros. L. & S: I held a few days' meeting at Napier's furnace embracing the 2d Lord's day in this month, which resulted in 3 accessions.

Yours in the hope of the Gospel,

H. J. BLAKE.

On Thursday night before the 3rd Sunday in August Bro. Linton of Montgomery commenced a meeting here with some assistance from Bro. Ferguson, of the same place, and closed on the following Wednesday night with twenty-one additions, eighteen by immersion, and three from the Baptists. He preached with the spirit and understanding. We meet generally every Sunday evening.

R. A. MILAM.

Cedar Bayou, Harris Co., Tex.

We remained one week at Jacksboro—baptized 10 and received one from the Baptists. One lady made

the confession, but her baptism was objected to by her husband and she was not baptized.

These with the few old disciples there, numbering all together 20, have banded themselves together for the purpose of the worship and work of the Lord's House.

The last night of our meeting we had two confessions; and, as we had to leave next morning early on the stage, we went directly to the water and in the beautiful moon-lit water, in the presence of a large crowd, buried them with their Savior in baptism.

We reached home without molestation from the Red Men, and find the dear ones well. We give thanks to our Heavenly Father for his mercies.

A. CLARK.

*Thorp's Springs, Hood Co., Tex.,
Sept. 2, 1874.*

REMARKABLE MARRIAGE CEREMONY.

(AN ILLUSTRATION OF ISAIAH LI. 23.)

It was promised to God's ancient people that no more should victorious foes say to her, "Bow down, that we may go over;" no more should the chosen race lay down their bodies "as the ground, and as the street, to them that went over."

This humiliating custom was practiced on Mangaia, Polynesia, formerly, but with a different signification. It was performed in families of distinction on occasion of the marriage of the first-born. For example, a pet girl had recently been wedded, and something must be done to render

the occasion memorable. To this end large quantities of native cloth are prepared, etc., etc. On the day appointed, at early dawn, nearly the entire population of the island assemble; some as relatives or friends, the rest as spectators. The feast, which had been gotten up the day before, is now divided out, and the cloth piled up in a single heap. The son-in-law is now formally sent for. Gaily dressed in the fantastic trappings of heathenism, he makes his appearance outside his dwelling, where he sees a continuous pathway of human bodies leading from his own doorway to the house of his father-in-law. The entire tribe, men, women, and children assemble to behold their dusky kinswoman, by her recently married husband to her, over their backs as they lie prostrate on the ground. As lightly as possible does this distinguished individual step over the "ara tangata, or "street of human bodies." Should the numbers of the tribe be insufficient to reach quite to the house of the father-in-law, those first trodden on rise up quickly and run through the admiring crowd, again to take their places in front. Meanwhile the near relatives of the bridegroom accompany him in his progress, of course walking on the ground, clapping their hands, and chanting songs in his praise, or reciting the deeds of his ancestors.

On reaching the goal, three elderly females, enveloped in the finest cloth, so prostrate themselves as to form a living seat for a living seat for the bridegroom. A fish is now brought forward, and, with the aid of a bit of sharp bamboo, cut up into dice upon a human body. It is pre-

sented to the bridegroom, who eats it raw. The piles of native cloth and food, already prepared, are now formally presented to the happy man. All parties now partake of the feast, and then the road of living bodies is again formed for this honored son-in-law to go back as he came to his home.

This grand display on the part of the wife's friends necessitates a corresponding one on the side of the husband. If possible, this second exhibition must surpass the first. Occasionally it would be deferred until the birth of the first child; usually it would come off as soon as practicable. In a precisely similar way to the first "initiator," the entire tribe of the bridegroom would prostrate themselves on a ground until the young bride had passed over their backs, and that way reach the dwelling of her father-in-law. There she would sit on a couch of living bodies, hidden in thick folds of cloth whilst she ate part of the feast, finally returning in the same dignified way to her home. Songs in praise of her beauty, etc. etc., would as a matter of course be chanted all the time.

This singular custom is said to have been handed down from time immemorial. The natives can give no account whatever of its origin. Christianity is unfavorable to the continuance of such customs, although never expressly forbidden.

Ten years ago I started off to church to marry a young couple, and, to my surprise, found the road filled with a row of living bodies extending from my own gate to the entrance of the sanctuary, a distance of one hundred yards. The intended

bride tripped merrily over the backs of the bridegroom's clan, not a little proud of the distinction conferred upon her. The mother of the bride followed, vociferating the praises of her daughter. Grieved at the revival of a heathen custom, I remonstrated with the parties chiefly concerned, and deferred the marriage until the day following—*Rev. W. W. Gill.*

Real Religion.

Nothing does so open our faculties, and compose and direct the whole man, as an inward sense of God; of his authority over us; of the laws he has set us; of his eye ever upon us; of his hearing our prayers, assisting our endeavors, watching over our concerns, and of his being to judge, and to reward or punish us in another state, according to what we do in this: nothing will give a man such a detestation of sin, and such a sense of the goodness of God, and to our obligations to holiness, as a right understanding, and a firm belief of the Christian religion: nothing can give a man so calm a peace within, and such a firm security against all fears and dangers without, as the belief of a kind and wise providence, and of a future state. An integrity of heart gives a man a courage, and a confidence, that cannot be shaken. A man is sure that, by living according to the rules of religion, he becomes the wisest, best, and happiest creature that he is capable of being: honest industry, the employing of his time well, and a constant sobriety, an undefiled purity and chastity, with a quiet serenity, are the best preservers of life and health; so that, take

a man as a single individual, religion is his guard, his perfection, his beauty, and his glory: this will make him the light of the world, shining brightly, and enlightening many round about him.—*Burnet.*

Short Notes.

Says the *Standard*: "Mars' Hill Academy, near Florence Ala., is to be changed (in name) to the University of Mercy, Love, Peace and Truth. The Gospel seems to have been preached at Mars' Hill again."

The cause appears to be gaining ground in Texas faster than ever before. We have received a letter from Eld T. M. Sweeney under date of Sept. 15, stating that he had just closed his meeting at White Rock with 50 additions. His address is Leona, Leon Co. Tex.

Our enterprising brother, Smith J. Denton was in to see us on Saturday last. A report of his recent labors will be found in this number of the *Advocate*.

Aug. 30, Eld. David Walk preached his fifth anniversary sermon to the church in Memphis, Tenn. During his connection with that church the membership has increased from 176 to 296.

The brethren at Dixon's Mills, Ala., have a Sunday-School numbering 125 pupils. They use the Bible alone as their text book.

Consultation Meeting.

I am authorized by the action of the Elders and Congregation of Disciples worshipping at Murfreesboro,

Tenn., to state, that a consultation meeting will be held, the Lord willing, at said place, commencing Friday before second Lord's day in October. We expect to make arrangements for reduced fare on the different roads persons would probably travel, and all God's people are respectfully and cordially invited to meet and participate with us in our deliberation. *Christian Examiner*, Va. *Christian Weekly*, Ala., *Christian Standard and Review*, Cincinnati. and *Apostolic Times* Ky., please copy.

G. W. ABELL,

Pastor Christian Church, Murfreesboro.

Gen

At the municipal election in this city on the 26th inst. Morton B. Howell, the Democratic nominee, was elected by 810 majority. The city voted an appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of buying a new engine for the water works.

There is a movement on foot among the ladies of Nashville to establish a home for fallen women.

Ex-President, Andrew Johnson purposes stumping the State. It is his intention to be a candidate for the U. S. Senate, before the next Legislature.

The Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Louisville and Nashville Expositions are in full blast. There was 25650 people in attendance at Cincinnati on Saturday last.

At latest accounts, quiet reigned in La. The White Leaguers yielded peaceably to the U. S. forces, who reinstated Kellogg and his officials.

There is a general effort being made to secure an honest election in November.

Gov. Moses of S. C. telegraphed to Grant for more troops to aid in enforcing order in Edgedfield Co. His request was denied.

The Republicans of New York have nominated Gen. Dix as candidate for re-election to the office of Governor. Samuel J. Tilden is the Democratic nominee.

Near Franklin, Minn., a steam Thresher exploded, killing four persons and wounding several others.

FOREIGN.

The River Segura running through the province of Valencia in Spain, overflowed, causing great damage and property serious loss of life. In the town of Sagunt, two hundred houses were swept away and many persons drowned.

A rumor is afloat that Bismarck is making negotiations for purchasing the island of Porto Rico.

New Advertisement.

S. Powers & Son have their card in this number of the ADVOCATE. They have, as stated, about the finest stock of clothing in the City, and we hope our readers will give them a liberal share of their patronage. We would take it as a favor, when any of our friends purchase anything from seeing an advertisement in the ADVOCATE, that they would state the fact to those from whom they buy.

Religion is not confined to devotional exercises, but rather consists

in doing all we are called and qualified to do, with a single eye to God's glory and will, from a grateful sense of his mercy to us. This is the alchemy which turns everything into gold; and stamps a value upon common actions.—J. Newton.

“My notion of a wife at forty,” said Douglas Jerrold, “is that a man should be able to exchange her, like a bank note, for two twenties.”

ORDERLY PEOPLE.—There are some persons who are never easy unless they are putting your books and papers in order—that is, according to their notions of the matter—and hide things, lest they should be lost where neither the owner nor anybody else can find them. This is a sort of magpie faculty. If anything is left where you can find it, it is called litter. There is a pedantry in housewifery as well as in the gravest concerns. Sir Walter Scott complained that whenever his maid-servant had been in his library, he could not set comfortably to work again for several days.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The Sin Against the Holy Spirit.....	911
Church Legislation.....	915
Queries	916
A lad just beginning to run.....	920
Ministers of the Gospel Meddling in	
Politics	924
Women as Housebuilders.....	925
Fashion	926
Church News.....	930
Remarkable Marriage Ceremony.....	931
Real Religion.....	932
Short Notes.....	933
Consultation Meeting.....	933
General News.....	933
New Advertisements.....	934

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 40.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCT. 8, 1874.

The Sin Against the Holy Ghost.

Brethren L. & S: To show what the sin against the Holy Spirit is, Bro. McDonald, No. 35, quotes Mat. 12: 31, 32. This shows him "it was committed by speaking." He refers to John 7: 37, 38, 39 to show that "a man could not sin against the Holy Spirit, when the Savior was here in person, for says he, the Holy Ghost is not yet given." He refers to Acts 2: 36 to show "the Holy Spirit was given on the day of Pentecost." He says—"Now to deny that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is to sin against the Holy Ghost." He also says—"Now when a man accepts one of these conditions" (in Acts 2: 38) "and refuses, or neglects the use, and teaches men so, he is sinning against the Holy Ghost."

"Brother Lipscomb says—"the foregoing article in its general position is correct. It could not be committed before the Spirit came."

It seems to me our brethren are both in error on this subject. This sin against the Holy Ghost was committed by the Scribes and Pharisees on the day in which Jesus Christ ut-

tered the language quoted by Bro. McDonald, Mat. 12: 31, 32. They said "This fellow does not cast out devils but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils." Saying this was committing the sin against the Holy Spirit—read what Mark has recorded ch. 3: 22 to 29, inclusive, in connection with what Math. says, 12-33. on this subject. Mark says Jesus Christ used this language to the Scribes and Pharisees "because they said he hath an unclean Spirit," for they had said—"He hath Beelzebub. and by the Prince of the devils casteth he out devils",—saying this was the Sin against the Holy Spirit, according to Mark.

If to deny that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is the Sin against the Holy Spirit, then Paul committed this Sin, for he denied this fact for many years, and persecuted those who believed he was the Son of God, even unto death.

If to reject baptism for the remission of sins, (one of the conditions in order to remission of sins, in Acts 2: 38;) is the sin against the Holy Ghost, then all the Presbyterians, Methodists and Bap-

tists that we have inducted into the kingdom of God, have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, for they have all been taught to believe this design of baptism was not in said verse 38, nor any place else in the New Testament. To deny, and teach this false notion may be a sin against God, but not *the* sin against the Holy Spirit." The difference between *the* sin against the Holy Ghost," and "all manner of sins and (all manner) of blasphemies" besides, is this: the one can never be forgiven, but the others may all be forgiven upon the terms prescribed by the lawgiver. When Paul, "caused Elymus the sorcerer to be blind, not seeing the sun for a season," if any one had accused him of doing it by Satan in him, instead of by the power of the Holy Spirit; in him, he would have committed the sin against the Holy Spirit, and could never be forgiven. But if any man commits any other sin, and persists in it to the end of his life, he will as certainly be lost as if he has committed the sin against the Holy Spirit, but at any time he would have been forgiven, if he had complied with the law of pardon, because "all manner of sins and blasphemies shall be forgiven but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost."

John 7: 37, 38, 39. The language in these verses does not teach that the Holy Spirit was not given till after Jesus Christ was glorified, for Paul says "God at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the Prophets," and Peter says these "Holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." John the Baptist was inspired by the Holy Spirit,

and was a prophet. Simon and Andrew, Elizabeth, Zacharias, and the twelve apostles, were all inspired by the Holy Spirit, before the glorification of Christ. Also the seventy possessed gifts of the Spirit. They cast out devils, and had "power to tread on serpents and scorpions" given to them by Christ.

Up to the time when Christ was glorified, only now and then, and here and there, were a few men inspired by the Holy Spirit, "at sundry times and in divers manners" to speak to the fathers;" but "in the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried saying—"If any man thirst let *him* come unto me and drink" (in the Holy Spirit when I am glorified). "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture has said, from his inner self flow rivers of living water." The promise then seems to be to *any* man not to a few now and then, as was the case before the glorification of the Savior; consequently the one hundred and twenty "were *all* filled with the Holy Spirit, and begun to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." So then from the inner selves of *all* flowed rivers of living water—the living word of God, and the astonished Jews that were there, said: "we do hear them speak in our own tongues the wonderful works of God."

If the assertion, "This fellow casteth out demons by Beelzebub the prince of the demons" (instead of by the Spirit of God,) was not the sin against the Holy Spirit, no one can ever tell what it was, for this was all the Savior reprimanded the Scribes and Pharisees for saying on that occasion. He also warned every one against

committing this sin, when he said : —the guardians of their religion did. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," and Mark adds : "but is in danger of eternal damnation." The great men of all parties and kind are the detectors of heretics, and are generally very severe in their denunciations and condemnations, of their teachings.

There are various notions as to what this sin is, and how it is committed. But we can never know any more on this subject except what Matt. and Mark say about it. Luke gives an account of the accusation made by "some that he cast out devils by Beelzebub the chief of the devils," but he says nothing about this unpardonable sin, committed by the Scribes and Pharisees. They were always finding fault, and accusing the Savior of doing wrong. But, "There was a man of the Pharisees, a ruler of the Jews, named Nicodemus. The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi. we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do the miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." I am glad to see they had one head and chief man among them who admitted he did not perform his miracles by Satanic power. I am inclined to think but few have ever committed this sin, since the glorification of the Savior. I hope Brother McDonald and Bro. Lipscomb will not think hard of me for taking issue with them on this subject.

I am inclined to the opinion, I say again, that but few have committed the sin in question. Perhaps none of the common people among the Jews. Perhaps many of the leaders among them did. Perhaps none of the Gentiles ever did, unless it may have been that some of the chief men

I am respectfully and truly yours,
DELANCY EGBERT.
Crab Orchard, Ky., Sept. 15, 1874.

We certainly feel no offence at bro. Egbert or any other brother for differing from us on any point, especially on this one, inasmuch as we were aware that we were taking ground that is new, and that we differed from the religious world on this subject. Bro. Egbert has given the position generally maintained by our brethren on this subject. We had thoughtfully for years examined and re examined time and again all written in the Bible on this subject. We think there is a misapprehension of this matter.

In the first place we were all perfectly aware that the Holy Spirit inspired all of the prophets in olden time, that he had descended on Christ. Yet there was some meaning in and reason for the language of the Savior when he says, "If ye love me keep my commandments and I will send you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever. Jno. 14-15, and again, "But when the comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." Jno. 15-26. Again "Nevertheless I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you, but If I depart, I will send him

unto you." Jno. 15 : 7. and "howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come." Jno. 15 : 13.

Now this shows plainly that the Holy Spirit would come in a sense and in a way, that he had not come; and in which he could not come before the ascension of Christ to heaven.

Without stopping to inquire what sense that was, we will simply say, it involved the recognition of the Spirit as the law-giver, guide, divine ruler to the church, and the representative through which God dwelt in his habitation through the Spirit and through which he revealed his law to the world. In that character he could be reviled, blasphemed, sinned against. Blaspheme, is simply to revile; to rail at &c, to reject and despise. The word translated blaspheme is much more frequently translated to revile, rail upon &c.

In the next place, does Mark or Jesus say these people sinned against the Holy Ghost. The Scribes said, "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the Devils." Christ shows a house divided against itself falls, then adds, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies, wherewithsoever men shall blaspheme; but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation; because they said he hath an unclean spirit." Now does that say they had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. We cannot see anything like it. Indeed

if they had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, we cannot possibly see how they could sin against Christ without sinning against the Holy Ghost. The Scribes had said not a word about the Holy Ghost. They had reviled Christ, they despised his claims, and rejected his authority. Because they did this he tells them, these sins against me are pardonable if you repent, but, if you thus reject the Holy Spirit, when he comes you shall find no forgiveness, but are exposed to eternal damnation. A good reason for this we can see. The Holy Spirit would give the full, complete testimony, the perfected, finished testimony of God. Until he comes and bears his testimony, the view of the Divine will which the world obtains is imperfect and partial. So long as this be true, you can escape the guilt of sin, by turning from it, when the perfected will is brought to view by the Spirit.

He who deliberately rejects the full perfect will, is without further means of salvation. God's provisions for saving man are exhausted; the man who rejects them is lost. We think no man ever sinned the Sin against the Holy Spirit until he came into the world and spoke to the world. We believe all who reject or despise his teachings, revile or ridicule his testimonies sin against him. The condemnation is not final until the rejection is deliberate and final. We believe it to be the willful sin of Paul, the sin unto death of John.

D. L.

Silence is a figure of speech, unanswerable, short, cold, but terribly severe.

Go Forward.

When the Israelites had left their old task-masters, the Egyptians, and had come out as far as the Red Sea, they found that the Sea impeded their course forward. On either side was an impassible mountain—so that they must either go back, or press forward into the sea. Close behind them followed their enemies—the Egyptians. In this condition, they began to cry out against Moses because he had brought them to this place to be slain, or to be recaptured—taken back into slavery and the work, and affliction doubled. But the command came from the Lord Moses “Command the children of Israel that they go forward. And they went forward and were baptized to Moses in the cloud and in the Sea, their enemies, attempting to follow were destroyed in the Sea. There arose, at this time, thousands standing—the anti-type—at the Red Sea, who need only to obey the command “forward” in order to be saved.

Baptism the dividing line between the world, and the church—the kingdom body of Jesus Christ. Of course those who have not passed the line, are still in the world, and not in the kingdom of Christ. (We want it distinctly understood, that we do not speak of infants, idiots, or any irresponsible beings. These are not lost, never were, and consequently need not saving.) Now as long as any are willing to stay in the world—keep out of Christ—the great enemy of souls, will care but little how much they pray, repent, or how much faith they have, only

so they do not leave his dominions. If he can succeed in making them believe that it is unnecessary to pass the Red Sea, that baptism is a non-essential, then he has them as safe as he wishes. When they are baptized, they are baptized into Christ—in Christ they are safe, out of Christ none are safe, therefore, if the great enemy of man can keep us away from baptism—out of Christ, he has accomplished his purpose. If any shall read this who have already believed—who repent of sin, let me say to such “go forward.” Consider nothing as a non-essential which God has commanded to be done. The path of duty is the path of safety.

JOHN T. POE.

Correspondence.

Editors Gospel Advocate: Accept my thanks for the two specimen copies of the Advocate you sent me. I am a member of the Methodist church—baptized into it in infancy. My parents and all my relatives were Methodists—hence I was reared within the pales of that church, and am a Methodist not so much from choice as by inheritance.

Since I have become a man, and have read the word of God for myself, and compared my experience and observation with that word, or rather, the doctrine of the Methodist church with the word of God, I have become dissatisfied with my church relation. I believe the Scriptural mode of baptism is by immersion, and that a proper subject is a believing penitent. I also believe, that if the subject is *truly a believing*

penitent, that immersion will be attended by remission of sins, and renewal of the Holy Spirit. I fully endorse the name by which you are called, "Disciples," "Church of Christ," or "The Christian Church." I think you have the *only Scriptural name*. But there are some doctrines of your church that I do not fully endorse, from my present understanding of the Scriptures. The first, and that of the greatest importance to me is, "The Operation, or work of the Holy Spirit." I understand your church to teach "that in the act of baptism the Holy Spirit is given to the subject to change his heart, and renew the Spirit, but after that, He never acts directly upon the heart, the *Word*, then, is substituted for the Spirit." Now I have always been taught that the "Spirit *itself* bears witness with our Spirits"—not the "word," which is only the *sword of the Spirit*, but the "*Spirit itself*." "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead *dwells in you*, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that *dwelleth in you*." Rom. viii: 11. "Likewise the Spirit also *helpeth* our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the *Spirit itself* maketh intercession for us," &c., Rom. viii: 26.

In 1st Thes. v: 19, we are told to "Quench not the Spirit." "If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give the *Holy Spirit* to them that ask him." From the Scriptures above noticed, and many others that might be cited, I have been taught to be-

lieve that the Holy Spirit dwells in the heart of a true Christian, guides, directs, consoles and *comforts* him, while traveling through these low grounds of sorrow.—Therefore we often pray for the "Love of God to be *shed abroad in our hearts*, by the Holy Ghost which is given to us." We also pray for his enlightening, quickening and sanctifying influence,—to aid our infirmities—that we may be enabled under *all* circumstances to order our course aright before him, &c. I feel that without the direct influence of the Holy Spirit upon our hearts, we could not *enjoy* religion, or do anything holy and acceptable in his sight in other words, we believe that we must be *strengthened* by His *Spirit* with might in the inner man" to enable us to "do his will upon earth, angels do it in heaven" and to "glorify him in our bodies, and in our Spirits which are his."

Now Messrs Editors, it may be that I do not understand the Scriptures, or the teaching your church on this important subject,—and the object of this communication is to present you my views and respectfully request you to give such light and information on a subject as you can—as believed and taught in your church—through the Gospel Advocate, and send me a copy containing the same. I have no other object in view but to learn the *truth*. If I can with you, see eye and face to face, I will endeavor to "mind the same things," and I change my relation, I want to be able to give a "*reason* for the hope that is in me."

* *

We are highly pleased with the

spirit and frankness of the above. If all religious people were as independent, and open hearted, all would soon learn the whole truth on the subject of Christianity. As to the matter of becoming a Christian, our correspondent seems to be pretty clear. The Scriptures certainly teach that when a sinner believes the gospel, repents of his sins, and upon the confession of the name of Christ is immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, his sins are then pardoned. And whenever any one has obeyed these requirements, he is certainly entitled to the name Disciple of Christ, or Christian. And such a one belongs to the Church of God, the body of Christ. The expression, "The Christian Church" is in very common use among our brethren, but at the same time, as it is not found in the Scriptures in that form, we would prefer the expression, "the Church of God," as it is found several times. There is always safety in using the exact language of the Bible, and especially since Peter says, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." 1 Pet. iv: 11. There are enough of Scriptural titles by which to designate the church, and there is great beauty in using the very words that we find in the word of God. As to the matter of pardon, or remission of sins, our correspondent has been misinformed in regard to our teaching. We do not teach that the Holy Spirit is given to the subject of baptism in that act, to change his heart. We do not believe that the Holy Spirit pardons sin at all. Pardon, as we understand it, is an act of God himself, as we learn from 8th of He-

brews. He says in reference to that, "and their sins, and iniquities will I remember no more." Upon our obedience to the Gospel, God promises to pardon us, to cease to remember our sins against us. But the Holy Spirit is promised to all who obey the gospel. Peter said, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." In this case, remission of sins was promised upon their repentance and baptism, and the Spirit was then to be received, not to pardon them, but to dwell with them as Christians, as men already pardoned. The language above quoted shows that the order is, first, obedience; second, remission of sins, and thirdly the promise of the Holy Spirit. Paul said to the Galatians, "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father." So according to Paul, the Spirit is given us because we are sons, not to make us sons. And our evidence that the Spirit dwells with us, is the same as our evidence that we are pardoned. We are told that if we will do certain things, we shall be saved or pardoned, and when we do these things we must believe that we are then pardoned. And the same word of God also promises that we shall receive the Holy Spirit. And if we believe the one, we must believe the other, for both stand recorded in the same sentence, and by the same authority. The Holy Spirit through the apostles gives the law of pardon, according to which we are to be saved, and when we obey this law, God pardons or

saves us, as we showed above from Hebrews. As to the expression, "change of heart," or to "change the heart," we find it nowhere used in connection with the subject of conversion, or becoming a Christian, in the New Testament. It is generally used as synonymous with pardon of sin, as it is in the above article. It is not so used in the Bible however. When any one obeys the gospel of Christ, the whole heart and life are turned to God. But this turning or change is not wrought by any direct work of the Holy Spirit upon the heart, but by the individual yielding himself to the gospel of Christ as presented in the words of the Spirit, as taught by the apostles. We believe that sinners are made Christians by the Spirit of God, but this work is not done by any secret or abstract operation, but the Spirit speaks plainly to us through the apostles, and we have its words on record in the New Testament. And when we follow these words and are made Christians by them, we are made Christians by the Spirit, for the Spirit dictated these words. The apostles spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. And when we read their words, we are reading the words of the Holy Spirit. So when we are turned to God by these words, we are turned by the Spirit of the living God. But there is not a single instance on record where the Spirit ever made a single Christian, except by speaking to them through the inspired apostles or evangelists of Jesus Christ. When any one hears the gospel, believes it with the heart, and resolves to embrace the gospel, his heart is then changed, is then turned to God; but this turning is done, not by some secret or direct work of the Spirit, but by the individual giving his heart and affections to God, through the Gospel of his Son. And this turning the heart to God, is not pardon of sin. It is only the beginning of a preparation to obtain pardon. It is the beginning of our obedience to the gospel of Christ. This obedience in its fullness, embraces faith, repentance, confession of Christ, and baptism. When all these are done, the individual has the promise of pardon. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," is the language of Jesus. So then a change of heart, if it be proper to use that expression, is one thing, and remission of sins is another. Change of heart takes place first, and remission of sins afterward. We also believe that the Spirit of God dwells in the Christian. In addition to the promise in second of Ac's, that those who would repent and be baptized should receive the Holy Spirit, which we think is applicable in every instance of obedience to the same command, we hear Paul say in eighth of Romans, "If the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Again to the Corinthians he says: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" But we do not understand that this Spirit that is promised to dwell in the Christian has anything to do in directing or guiding him in the path of righteousness. We are to look to the word of God, the word of the

Spirit, as given through the apostles, for our guidance, in all we say and do. God never has, in any age, guided men by secret influences, as he expressly says: "Come ye near unto me; hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning." Isa. 48: 16. But on the other hand, God has ever warned men against secret influences. But then what about that passage that says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." The passage says, the Spirit bears witness *with our* spirit. Our spirit then is a witness in the case. How is this witness given? Answer: The Spirit of God presents the Gospel to us in word, and tells us we must believe, or be damned. Our spirit tells us when we do believe. The Spirit of God tells us to repent, or we shall perish. Our spirit tells us when we do repent. The Spirit of God also tells us to confess the Savior, and be baptized, and our spirit tells us when we have done this. And when these things are done, the Spirit of God says we are pardoned, and our spirit believes this promise, and rejoices in it. In this way the Spirit of God intelligibly bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God. We certainly ought not to want more evidence to establish that we are pardoned than we do to establish the truth of the gospel. We are all willing to believe, upon the testimony of the word of God, that Jesus was born in Bethlehem. Upon the testimony of the same word, we believe that he was baptized by John in Jordan, that he performed many miracles, that finally he was crucified at Jerusalem, buried in the tomb of

Joseph, and that he arose from the dead the third morning, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. All of this we are perfectly willing to receive and believe upon the testimony of the word of God. Now we can just as easily understand when we believe, when we repent, when we confess the Savior and are baptized, as we can understand the gospel, and the Spirit tells us plainly when we have done these, we are pardoned. And if we can receive the truth of the whole mission of the Son of God simply upon the testimony of his word, why can we not also believe Jesus when he says: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and why can we not believe Peter when he says repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins? If we believe the one, we must believe the other also. We have therefore the same evidence of our pardon, that we have that Jesus died for us and rose again. All these things stand or fall upon the word of God. If that be true all are true alike. But if that be not true, all amount to nothing. Such is our teaching and our faith on this important subject.

As to praying for the enlightening power of the Holy Spirit, as we do not believe the Spirit enlightens and guides us save through his words, we do not pray for it to enlighten us otherwise. But when we read our duties as contained in the word of God, we may certainly pray to be enabled to do them faithfully, and thereby enjoy the rich blessings of heaven. Our prayers to be acceptable, must be according to his will. When people obey God, he promises

them his Holy Spirit. Outside of obedience to him, we need not pray for his Spirit. But when we are doing his will, we may then pray for him to bless and strengthen us, and keep us from evil. And he promises to do this for his people. So we believe as strongly in the Holy Spirit as any people in the land, but we believe it operates through the word and appointments of God, but not secretly and abstractly, or independently of the word, as some religious people do. We hope that our correspondent will be able soon, to understand and embrace the whole truth, as it is in Jesus. We shall be glad to give him any aid we can in the matter.

E. G. S.

Defense of a Dogma.

"God has proposed a covenant of peace and pardon to guilty mortals through the blood of his Son Jesus. Baptism was appointed to declare the shedding of that blood—the death of the holy victim. (Where did you learn this, Bro. W.? W. G. S.)"

In reply to the query of Bro. E. G. S., I simply quote Rom. vi: 3-6: "Know ye 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 in the *likeness of his death*, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

Though not much inclined to dogmatize we are inclined to accept the

foregoing Scripture as teaching that baptism declares the death of Christ. As a likeness portrays the countenance of an individual, so the planting in baptism—being "the likeness of his death"—portrays the death of Christ. We are furthermore persuaded that John's baptism was appointed to declare prospectively the death of the Son of God and the remission to be enjoyed through his blood. For those who accepted his baptism for the remission of their sins, were enjoined to believe on the Messiah yet to come. This was the symbol of the atonement for sin, even the death of the Son of God. And we are persuaded that the symbol derived all its efficacy from the fact symbolized.

The disciples of John were required to look forward to the prospect; we look back to the fact. There was a hope resting on prophecy, ours is an intelligent conviction, based upon the reality. We believe that Christ died for our sins and rose again for our justification. Our faith in him destroys the love of sin in our hearts. Our "old man," "the body of the sins of the flesh," are "crucified," are put off, in obeying the form of his death.

Let us therefore cultivate and inculcate an intelligent faith as to the fact of our Savior's death and the gracious results of the same. Inasmuch as he died to redeem, let every one that would participate in the redemption, avouch for its cost by an intelligent submission to the ordinance of baptism. So doing we not only declare that he died and rose again for our justification, but that we have died to sin, and have risen to walk in the justified state. In this

there is joy and peace. In the full apprehension of the same there is great spiritual strength. It is not extravagant to say, it introduces us to the highest spiritual circle accessible to sojourners in the flesh. It brings us into joyous communion with the Father, Son and, Holy Spirit. It is *into* this glorios community that we are baptized. We become joint-heirs with Christ. What a heavenly relationship! Then indeed is our faith and hope in God.

From contemplating this happy state of the gospel grace, we are made to inquire: Is the same attainable without a degree of intelligent faith? And our mind at once rests on the case of those who had received only the baptism of John. They evidently accepted John's baptism as a command of God, and thereby pledged faith in the expected Messiah. But Christ had already come. The covenant was not consonant with the facts. Theirs was not an intelligent faith. They had not so much as "heard that there be any Holy Spirit." Being enlightened upon this subject; they were baptized *in the name of the Lord Jesus*—that is, by his authority—into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Thus they became members of a consistent and legitimate covenant, the new and better covenant.

In view of this precedent, it is thought admissable to ask. Is baptism, (*in the name by the authority*) of the Romish, Episcopal, Methodist Presbyterian, Baptist, or any other, religious establishment, into (*unto* or *in order to*) fellowship in such establishment, an ordinance of God? Christ in the great commission said, "Bap-

tizing men into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." To this fellowship those twelve had not attained; into this therefore were they baptized, by the authority of the Lord Jesus. If into this, Baptist converts are brought without baptism, unto what then are they baptized? Into Sectarian fellowship, or what? It is to us a thought full of fear that the command of God is made void by the tradition of men.

J. R. W.

We cannot see how the passage quoted above from 6th of Romans will justify the declaration of our brother that baptism was appointed to declare the shedding of the blood of Christ. The language is nowhere found. And we think it always better to express our ideas of the teaching of the Bible, in Scriptural words, and then there can be no difficulty. Upon the principle of argument adopted by our good brother, "Total Hereditary Depravity," and getting religion are proved. They all admit that these things are not expressed in so many words, but those who teach these things claim that they can be plainly deduced from what is said. And to avoid all confusion on the subject of baptism, it is better just to speak of it in Bible language, and then there can be no room for difficulty. It is certainly not proper to assume positions that have to be proved by the Bible, by means of deductions and inferences, but just express Bible ideas in Bible words, and that shuts out all room for misunderstanding, and for controversy.

E. G. S.

Materialism.

That all classes of sceptics will combine their forces in defense of Materialism is quite certain. In the beginning of this century, Deism was the popular form of infidelity. It borrowed most of its doctrines and its precepts from Christianity, while it denied the fundamental facts and truths of the Scriptures. Its battles were of necessity fought mainly on historical ground. It can hardly be denied that in that field revelation gained a most decided triumph. The old-fashioned Deism has, in a great measure, retired from the controversy. The existence, prevalence and power of Christianity cannot be accounted for on any historical hypothesis which denies the resurrection of Jesus from the dead.

Materialism has replaced Deism. The combat is to be transferred from the field of history to that of science. Very well; we do not object to the change. In our view, no form of scepticism is more vulnerable, and less likely to meet popular acceptance than Materialism.

Of the existence of matter, we have no doubt; though Robert Hall affirmed that no man ever thought profoundly without questioning its reality. The argument for a pure spiritualism, we think, is more plausible than that for a pure Materialism; but we accept the testimony of our senses that matter exists. It reveals itself to us—to our minds—through all our bodily senses. Its existence is incomprehensible. Whether it is eternal, or whether it was created, reason, science, philosophy cannot answer; nor does any sane

man suppose that they will ever be able to answer.

When we survey the celestial regions we find order, harmony, beauty and stability; and the more carefully they are examined by telescope and spectroscope, the more we are impressed by the marks of intelligent design by which they were marshaled. When we direct our attention to the earth, on which we dwell, we find it filled with the most wonderful organisms, vegetable and animal, sensitive and insensitive, rational and irrational; and the more these organisms are studied, the more they disclose a profound wisdom and far-reaching system. All things and all beings are fitted together by the most astonishing adjustments.

Whence came this regularity of the celestial worlds and these diversified and marvelous organisms of earth? Whence came order, life, intelligence? Momentous questions these, and worthy the profoundest thought.

These wonders are accounted for, in modern times, on two very different theories. One is the materialistic theory. According to this all order, organisms, life and intelligence come of matter. In the past, we have done her great injustice. She has in herself the promise and potency of life. The celestial orbs fashioned and arranged themselves. The sun, of his own accord, kindled his fires and took his place in the centre of the planetary system; and all the planets with their satellites, at respectful distances, rendered voluntary obeisance to their august monarch. On earth, dead, unconscious matter put forth her energies and produced innumerable forms of life and beauty; and

above all man, endowed with reason, conscience, and aspirations for immortality.

Now this theory requires us to believe, not only what is incomprehensible, unsupported by evidence, contrary to all experience and all history, but what is, as it appears, to our mind positively absurd. Matter, in its organic state, has no intelligence, no consciousness, and no vitality. How could it organize itself? How could it contrive adaptations, evincing a forethought, wisdom and ingenuity, which the profoundest human intellects after centuries of laborious study, do but imperfectly understand? Those who choose may adopt this theory; may deify matter; but it is revolting to our reason; and, if it were not embraced by men renowned for their scientific attainments, we should pronounce it stupid nonsense.

The other story is that God—the infinitely wise and powerful Spirit—created all things—called matter into existence, gave it all its forms of life and beauty, imposed on it the laws by which it is governed in its organic and in its chaotic state, on earth and in the starry regions. The existence of God, as of matter, is incomprehensible. Creation is incomprehensible. These subjects are all infinitely above our reason; but they do not contradict our reason, our experience, our observation or our deep-seated instincts. They confound us, overwhelm us, fill us with awe; but they do not stultify us. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," must stand, through the revolving ages, and among the noblest intellects, as the most sublime of all announcements, commending itself to

the understandings and the consciences of candid, thoughtful and pious minds.

The two theories are as widely apart in their moral tendencies as are the heavens and the earth. If Materialism is true, man is a brute; endowed with more than usual sagacity, but still a brute. His origin is ignoble. He can trace, or at least, if he had the records, he might trace, his ancestry through a long line, descending from the monkey, by regular gradations of inferior animals, to the far off protoplasm, which no eye of man ever saw, and no imagination of man can fully conceive. To men adopting these views, the path of duty is plain, and it was marked out long ago; "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." As they acknowledge no superior on earth or in heaven, they can have no law but inclination or necessity. Their end is according to their origin and their lives. Death terminates their being; and their only hope is that their bodies, returned to their fruitful mother, will enter into the future composition of future plans and animals.

If the doctrine of creation be true, then man is a being of sublime importance. His origin was divine, his powers are noble, his obligations are solemn, and his destiny is momentous. He has before him an object worth living for. To know, to love to obey, to resemble, to worship and to enjoy his infinitely wise and beneficent Creator, is an aim worthy of his powers, and fitted to sustain, refine and ennoble him. If there is no spirit, no conscious immortality, dame Nature has practiced a cheat

on her children; has endowed them with angelic powers and heavenly aspirations to end in disappointment and interminable night. Unconscious matter has displayed the most consummate wisdom only to indicate her claim to the most stupid folly. But if in the universe there is spirit as well as matter—spirit to organize and govern matter, or to be educated and ennobled by it—then every where there are marks of superior wisdom and unbounded goodness operating for the accomplishment of noble ends, securing the permanent happiness of intelligent creatures and worthy of the infinite Author of all things.

If Materialism is true, it is a truth so degrading to man, so gloomy, cheerless and demoralizing, that the discoverer of it, if endowed with a particle of philanthropy, would cheerfully sacrifice his life to conceal the frightful doctrine from his unfortunate race.—*Religious Herald*.

CHURCH NEWS.

Bro. Sewell: The meeting at Leiper's Fork Tenn., appointed for Bro. Barnes of Ala. and yourself, embracing the first Lord's day in Sept., and opened by Bro. W. T. Lee on Friday night before, continued seventeen days, preaching day and night about half the time—the remainder, night only.

There were twenty-eight discourses delivered, the result of which was about 50 additions to the church at this place; about 45 of whom were baptized, 2 reclaimed, one from the Baptists, and 2 who had been isola-

ted by the fortuities of life, took membership with us.

In addition to this, the brethren were much strengthened and encouraged in the divine life, and made to feel that times of refreshing were proceeding from the presence of the Lord.

After you left, besides the encouraging presence and counsel of Bro. Lee, who preached but one discourse, Bro. Barnes had, from time to time, the assistance of Bro. E. B. Cayce of Franklin, and Bro. F. H. Davis of our congregation, who, by the way, did not get home from a preaching tour till near the close of the meeting.

Of the number above alluded to, some five or six were of Methodist, Presbyterian and Baptist families, who, we humbly trust may be the means of the Christian religion as more perfectly taught and practiced, being carried into circles, it hitherto has not been.

Our congregation now numbers about two hundred, spreading over a section of country with a radius of three or four miles. Oh! how fearful the responsibilities devolving upon the ruling members of this congregation, when contemplated from the true, Bible stand-point, in becoming familiarly acquainted with all its members, (several that were baptized during the meeting were strangers to most of us) speaking words of encouragement to them, and warning them of the many temptations that environ their pathway. May our heavenly Father so incline them, that they may not be altogether unworthy of the trust imposed upon them.

In the Christians faith and hope I am your brother,

W. J. MOSS.

Hillsboro, Tenn., Sept. 26th. 1874.

Brethren L. & S: Dear Brethren, as you are always pleased to hear of the success of the truth, I will inform you that on Saturday before the 5th Lord's day in August, Bro. T. E. Stirman began a meeting at Shady Grove, in the western part of this County, which closed at twelve o'clock Wednesday following, with 32 additions, 24 by confession and baptism, some 4 or 5 from the Baptists, the others reclaimed.

Bro. S. did all the speaking. I feel sure, as a proclaimer of the "Gospel of Christ" I have never heard his superior. He has no death-bed scenes, or heart-rending stories to tell, to get up an excitement, but depends entirely on the mighty power of truth. May he long be spared to plead the cause of our Lord and Master. If we only had more faithful proclaimers of the word in this county I feel sure great success would attend their efforts, as the people seem more disposed to hear than I have ever known them before. May success attend your efforts is the prayer of

Your Bro. in the one hope,

J. T. HOLLOWAY.

Pleasant Hill, Upshur Co., Texas
Sept. 14, 1874.

Bros. L. & S: Bro. J. F. Hawkins has been assisting in a meeting at Liberty, in this County, commencing Saturday before the 3rd Lord's day in this month. Up to this time there have been 23 additions, most of them

from the world. It has seldom been my privilege to see so many grown men and women turning to the Lord. It is especially a meeting of great rejoicing, since the church has been in rather a sleeping condition for several years.

I have been preaching and praying for them this year and the Lord is greatly rewarding us for our labors. Our County meeting will be held with the Brethren at Liberty, commencing next Lord's day.

We anticipate a glorious meeting. We don't expect to come together to discuss plans or make any startling development of *progress*; but to find out our wants and try and supply them. This is the third time we have met in this County in these meetings, and they have done us a great deal of good. I will write you more fully soon.

Your Bro. in Christ,

V. M. METCALFE.

Hopkinsville Ky., Sept. 28 1874.

Brethren L. & S: Brother W. F. Todd commenced a meeting at Belle-view meeting house in this County on Saturday night before the 2nd Lord's day in this month, and closed on Thursday night following, preaching a discourse each day and night during the time, which resulted in 38 accessions to the army of the Lord, 25 from the world, one by letter, and two from the Methodists. Brother Todd made many warm friends during his short stay among us.

Truly Your Brother,

F. M. BINKLEY.

Charlotte, Dickson Co. Tenn.

Bros. L. & S.: I have had some interesting meetings. I am laboring in the counties of Prairie, Lonoke and White. There have been 32 added to the good cause under my charge this year, seven from the Baptists, four from the Methodists, one from the Presbyterians, twenty from the world. To God be all the praise.

Your brother,
VIRGIL Y. WOOD.

Beebe Station, Ark., Sept 30, 1874.

Answer of J. Creath to F. J. Tyler.

No. 1.

Editors Gospel Advocate: In the Advocate of the tenth inst., a writer who signs his name F. J. Tyler, Lynnville, Tenn., Sept. 3, 1874, undertakes to answer some queries which I propounded at the end of my essay on John's immersion and ministry, showing the absurdity of sectarian teaching, that God has had only one way of pardoning men's sins from Adam till 1874, and that is by faith alone; and this writer has affirmed or re-affirmed that proposition, without one proof from the Bible, or one Scriptural quotation. I do not know the writer of this article, but I presume he is not a brother of ours, as he styles me Elder and Mr. Creath as well as from what you said in the postscript. All that is necessary for me to do in answer to him, in view of my whole argument is a simple denial of all that he has said in support of his affirmation, that all men from Adam till 1874, are pardoned by "faith alone" or that Christ has had but one "mystical body" since Adam, or simply to cite James letter

second chapter, from verse 14 to 26. "What does it profit my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and hath not works." Can faith save (or pardon) him? I prefer the word deeds or obedience to the word works because of the Sectarian use which has been made of the word works by Calvinists and Armenians. Where no proof is offered in support of an affirmation, none is required in refutation, but a simple denial of it. If Mr. Tyler or any other man will give one proof from the Bible of that "wholesome doctrine and full of comfort to all sects, of pardon of sins by faith alone," that ought to settle the question forever with all Christians. The question asked by James, "Can faith alone save or pardon him" is the strongest denial of its truth, and yet every sect in Christendom answer yes, "faith alone" can pardon him as their creeds and preaching testify; and this Mr. Tyler attempts to support the affirmation. All prove that they contradict James, and then quote Paul to prove that James was in error, or that Paul and James both assert that men are pardoned by "faith alone" from Adam, till 1874. And in this way all sects are proved to be of God. Luther, the father of the absurd dogma, that we are pardoned by faith alone, invented it to cut off at one stroke all the mummeries of papistical works to obtain pardon, and thereby cut off one of the principle sources of their money getting, confession of sins to priests instead of immersion for pardon to believing penitents. Luther called James letter to the Jewish tribes or Sects *epistola straminea*, a strawy or chaffy epistle, and this is the best way to

support that dogma of the sects and to get clear of believing and immersion for remission of sins; strike out the letter of James from the canon of the New Testament, that will save any further attempt to reconcile Paul and James on justification. Do our Baptist Brethren see that this dogma of faith alone for pardon of sins effectually cuts off believers' immersion, and substitutes infant baptism in its place. If they do not see it, it is time they would open their eyes to see it. John the immerser preaching faith in him that should come was equal to saying he had not come. His preaching that the kingdom or mystical body of Christ was at hand or coming—was just saying it had not come. Paul's affirmation. Heb. 11. 6. that "without faith it is impossible to please God, cut up by the roots, the dogma of infant baptism, and the dogma of Baptists repentance before faith, if true, it does not please God and is not therefore worth one fig. It is useless to quote Romans 5: 1, "Therefore having been (the Greek says) "justified by faith all have peace with God," to make Paul say that we are pardoned by faith alone. In that passage and in the sixth chapter he speaks of their burial in immersion and the mould of doctrine into which they had been cast, and had been made free from sin whom they had obeyed. Verse 16. And in chap 1: 5, and 16: 26, he speaks of the commandment of the everlasting God made known to all nations for the obedience of faith—which is, he that believeth the Gospel and is immersed shall be pardoned or saved. Acts 2: 41 to 47. The Lord added the saved or pardoned to the church daily.

That sins were not actually nor really bestowed before the exaltation of Jesus Christ to the right hand of God, Peter testifies in Acts v: 3. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior to give repentance and remission of sins to Israel or the Jews." John's ministry was preparatory, "he came to prepare a people for the Lord." No man was pardoned under the commission which Christ gave to the apostles for "obedience" to "all nations" before that commission was given, (for the simple reason that no man can be pardoned or condemned by a law before its existence or publication) which says, he that believes and is immersed shall be pardoned or saved. If John had preached that Jesus had died and was raised from the dead before these facts took place, would he have told the truth, or the prophets either? Isaiah said, unto us a child is born, a son is given. Chap. 9: 6. Was our Savior actually born of the Virgin Mary, when Isaiah wrote this? Did John's "initiatory step of baptism" bring his converts into the one kingdom or mystical body of Christ or of believers "which began nearly six thousand years ago?" Was God's or Christ's one kingdom built upon the apostles and prophets and Christ himself being the bottom corner-stone, nearly six thousand years ago?" Yours truly,
JACOB CREATH.

Let us have Fair Play.

"Bro. Lipscomb of the *Gospel Advocate*, is still battling against co-operations and organizations other than the individual churches. In reply to a letter on the subject, written by bro. E. B. Cayce, he writes a long article from which we make the following extracts:

"The heaven appointed agencies are

the agencies found recorded in the Bible. If our brother is a teacher in Israel and has not yet learned what the agencies and organs connected with the church are, we are hopeless of informing him in anything we may write. They are the church, simple and pure, with all its ordinances observed and its members, each working in his proper position and with true diligence in the church of Christ. There is not a single consultation meeting or organization between the churches, or over the churches, or under the churches in all these appointments. Not one. Nor can they be added without treason to the Master.

I am plainly, religiously, conscientiously, opposed to all consultation meetings, to devise plans as to how we shall do any work of God, how we shall effect co-operation among the churches or people of God. We believe that one and all such are treasonable, are as productive of evil, as destructive of all order and harmony, all law and authority as would the determination of all the different companies in an army, instead of obeying the commander, and trusting him to preserve harmony, concord and co-operation in their movements while obeying him, to determine they would call a meeting to consult how they could co operate and preserve harmony in their movements

We never expect to attend or participate in such a meeting, unless it be to protest against the treason to our Master in such movements."

It is certainly a new and strange conception of treason against Christ for a company of his disciples to as-

semble in consultation "as to how we shall do any work of God." We feel like exclaiming with Patrick Henry: "If this be treason, make the most of it!"

We have ceased to expect a fair representation from bro. Cave of the *Apostolic Times*. This has so much more the appearance of it that we are almost disposed to thank him, although he does misrepresent us here. Does not Bro. Cave know there is a difference between devising plans to do God's will and learning what his will is that we may do it? Yet when he undertakes to tell what we believe he drops out all reference to the devising of plans, (the very item that we emphasized) and makes us call a consultation as "to how we shall do any work of God," treason.

Now we expressly drew the distinction between investigating the word of God to learn his will, that we may know how he has indicated we should do it, and a meeting to devise or adopt a plan of our own to do it. Bro. C. does us injustice in his representation.

Again, he says, he "feels inclined to exclaim like Patrick Henry, if that be treason make the most of it." We make due allowance for the "gushing ways" of the old Virginians in reference to their talented ancestry of the old State. But with allowance for this, we cannot conceive how a Christian who understands the import of Henry's language can possibly adopt it in such a connection. Patrick Henry's language was a declaration of indifference as to whether he was a traitor or not and a defiance to the king and his friends. Certainly bro. C. did

not intend to apply such language to the God of heaven, or to fling defiance at him, in the event that he should regard as treason this devising of plans to do his work. But if not there is neither point nor sense in the application. We uncouth westerly fellows like sense, not "gusto." By the by, if that whole article were not ours, we would suggest, that it would be most refreshing reading to the subscribers to the *Times*. Nineteenth parts of them, in the bottom of their hearts would endorse it as true. But we are thankful that you gave even a short extract from it, although perverting it in your comment.

D. L.

Query.

Bros. L. & S.: Allow me to ask you a question through that noble instructor, the GOSPEL ADVOCATE; for truly it is such. In the report of the success of a meeting by our good bro. J. T. Crow in No. 36 p. 851 he says: "The meeting closed on Tuesday night with 15 additions, six by confession and baptism." Now the question with me is, If faith, repentance, confession and baptism is 'THE way,' what is 'THE other way;' or to be plain, how were those others added? Please answer and oblige many good brethren.

Yours in the one Faith,

B.

Cainsville, Wilson Co. Tenn.

We suppose brother Crow can answer the above, satisfactorily, at least so far as those cases are concerned.

E. G. S.

The Needed Comforter.

We cannot take a single step in our gloomy path without finding some trace of Him, the Comforter we need! For he is an afflicted man, the most afflicted of all the human race, a Man of Sorrows. If he wishes to sympathize, he has only to recall the past. We can not light upon an affliction through which he has not passed before us; from that which affects our bodies to that which withers our souls.

O, ye who lie upon beds of sickness tortured with cruel pain. he knows the nature of the physical suffering which rests on your inner life through the delicate cords connecting soul and body! O, ye who eat the bread of charity, and are distressed by the cares of penury, he knows what poverty is! O, ye who have been overwhelmed with reproach, calumny, insult and mockery, he knows it as you can never know it! O, ye who bend and shudder over the open tomb, he knows what sorrow is, and his hot tears fell into the tomb where his friend was laid! O, ye who mourn not only for a friend, but also for a friendship, ye from whom life and not death has taken a heart on which you leaned; ye who have been forsaken; ye who have seen your brother's hand raised against you, he knows what abandonment and betrayal are; he knows these things as you can never know them, he who was sacrificed by a people whom he had loaded with his benefits, forsaken by his disciples, denied by one apostle and sold by another; I defy you to point out a suffering which he has not known and traversed before you.

—*Presence.*

A Lad Just Beginning to Run. No. 2.

Bro. R. B. Trimble of Mayfield Ky. page 844, speaking of the Christian Church says, "We are becoming too popular as a people to be as successful as we were forty years ago, and that we need to be persecuted more, to give the truth palpable success." If Bro. Trimble knew how some of our congregations in Texas are persecuted, especially the one I belong too, he would be expecting to hear of scores being added to Zion's host. For we are called by all sorts of names from Campbellites to Simon Maguses, represented as going into the water dry sinners and coming out wet sinners, misrepresented by many saying that all we require is baptism and nothing more, and that we have as many gospels as we have preachers, and many other things too numerous to mention. But I hope this sin will not be layed to their charge. They may be acting in all good conscience, not knowing they persecute Christ. But Christ said to the disciples it is impossible but that offences will come; but woe unto him through whom they come. Luke 17: 1. But while we are misrepresented, despised, and persecuted, and all that is said, we are still a little band that is determined to "stand the storm; it wont be long," and so as Peter said, "suffer as Christians." 1 Pet. 4: 16. We earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, teach the world to believe that Jesus is both Lord and Christ, and that repentance and baptism in his holy name for remission of sins. Acts 2: 37, 38, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he has com-

manded, and the truth still trails along through the dust and occasionally finds an honest heart that is willing to be taught of his ways, reform and bow in humble submission to his Lord and Master and walk in his paths. And may the people soon learn that not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my father." Mat. 7: 21, "for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the *doers* of the law shall be justified." Rom] 2: 13. "But be ye *doers* of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." James 1: 22. "But wilt thou know O vain man that faith without works is dead." James 2: 22. And may the people learn not to deceive themselves, nor suffer any man to deceive them by teaching that a man must be righteous before he can do anything, and spending half of a lifetime in waiting for God to send down his Holy Spirit into their hearts to convict and convert them.

Galatians 4: 6 says: "Because ye are sons, (not to make sons) God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba father. May all appreciate the fact and believe. "He that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he was righteous." 1st John 3. 16. "For blessed are they that *do* his commandment that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22. 14.

And may our preachers preach the word, and study to show themselves approved unto God, workmen that need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth, and be in-

stant in season, out of season, reprove rebuke, with all long-suffering and doctrine: for the time has come when (some people) will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears and turn away their ears from the truth, and teach for doctrines the commandments of men.

H. J. PARKER.

Wadeville, Texas Sept. 24, 1874.

Gospel Success.

Embracing the fourth and fifth Lord's days in August, a meeting of much interest was held with the church at Hartsville Tennessee. One confession and baptism, and the brethren greatly encouraged in the good work. They seem to be alive to the importance of working in the vineyard of the Lord. We have hope of a successful future for them.

Including the second and third Lord's days of Sept., a meeting was held with the brethren at McMinnville Tenn., which resulted in eleven accessions to the church at that place, and the brethren there working vigorously and perseveringly for the advancement of the cause in their midst. And besides working in their own congregation, they have two or three brethren that go out, and preach and aid in building up the cause elsewhere; something that every old congregation ought to be able to do. Bro. I. N. Jones is working vigorously to build up Waters and Walling College. If those brethren will continue to work thus earnestly, the good cause will certainly move on successfully there.

A meeting was held with the brethren at Altoch meeting house on Stone's River Rutherford County Tenn. We were assisted in this meeting by L. R. Sewell, son of J. L. Sewell. We have seldom attended a meeting where there was so much interest manifested both on the part of the brethren, and the community generally. There were seventeen baptized, two or three reclaimed and some who had been members elsewhere, took membership with these brethren, making quite an addition to the number of that congregation. The brethren seemed fully alive to the importance of meeting every Lord's day to worship the Lord, and study and teach the Scriptures. They expect to get all the members possible to join in a regular Bible class to read and study the Scriptures, and we hope they will persevere in this. They have some young brethren there that can make useful men in the cause, if they will develop their talent, and get them to work. Would that churches everywhere would do more of this sort of work. Many more young men might be enlisted in the work of preaching and other public work in the church if the brethren would take more pains to instruct and develop the talent of the younger ones. They also expect to start a regular Sunday School at this place, and thus instruct their children, and their neighbors children in the way of religion and truth. And we do hope they will carry these things out in full, and we know if they do, there is a bright and happy future for them.

E. G. S.

JUST A FEW STITCHES.

Dot is a four-year-old household pet, who from her babyhood had been taught to take all her little cares perplexities, joys and sorrows to Jesus. She does this in such a simple faith that her mother hears little more of her prattle than He who said, "suffer little children to come unto me."

Dot had been strictly taught to keep the Sabbath holy; but one Sunday she was discovered sewing on her doll's clothes.

"Why, Dot! don't you know it is wicked to sew on doll's clothes on Sunday? Jesus will be sorry."

Dot paused her in her work—here was a struggle between the flesh and the Spirit—dolie needed that garment very much. The small brow was wrinkled and clouded as she poised her needle in a thoughtful attitude—only a moment; then the brow cleared. Dot was human.

"I dess he won't be andry. Anyhow, nezer you mind, I'll fiz it."

She threw down her sewing, and ran to the window, peeped up into the sky, as was her custom when talking to Jesus—heaven and Jesus are real to Dot—

"Jesus, you nezer mind; it's dest a few stitches."

Oh, little Dot! Crystal mirror for all humanity.

A Christian broker dips just a little into Wall street gambling pools "Never mind, Jesus—."

A Christian father gratifies his appetite with what is "not good for boys." "Never mind, Jesus, —."

A Christian mother ambitiously pushes her daughter into irreligious

but "good" society. "Never mind, Jesus, —."

God's children, great and small, presume on his love, and spare the little foxes. "Never mind, Jesus; it's just a few stitches."

It is very interesting to observe how, in a time of calamity and fear, notwithstanding the cavils of learned philosophers, the hearts of the devout and even of the undevout turn to Him who sitteth in the heavens, in earnest appeal for relief. Men may ridicule as they please the idea of the direct interposition of God in the affairs of the natural world, but when pestilence comes, or famine, or their frequent precursor, extreme drought, they look instinctively to God for help. There has been much public prayer for rain of late in many of the churches, and those whose prosperity depends upon it do not laugh at the thought; they join heartily in the petitions. Nor is there any material blessing that is more distinctly referred in the Word of God to his direct interposition.

"Are there any among the vanities of the Gentiles that can cause rain? or can the heavens give showers? Art thou not he O Lord our God? therefore we will wait upon thee, for thou hast made all these things."—*N. Y. Observer.*

ITEMS.

In a private note from Dr. Brents, dated Oct. 2, he says: "I have just closed a meeting at Richmond, Tenn. with 20 additions—the brethren much encouraged."

Through a mistake the articles on "The sin against the Holy Ghost"

were published in the wrong order. DeLancey Egbert's should have appeared first, followed by that of James W. Bryan.

There is a new department in the Oct. No. of The Christian Monitor entitled, "Anecdotes and Incidents of the Reformation." It is conducted by Elder Jesse H. Berry.

The last No. of the *Review* reports 286 additions to the church.

Regent Bowman has withdrawn the suit for libel which he has been prosecuting against Eld. S. W. Crutcher and Bro. McMichael, one of the Deacons in the church at Lexington, Ky. By request of the Regent all the depositions which have been taken are to be destroyed.

Says the *Christian*: "A saloon keeper at Berea, Ga., recently quit the business and obeyed the gospel. The brethren raised him some money for his immediate wants and poured his whiskey into the street.

Eld. M. H. Heard of Arkansas called to see us as he passed through the City on his way to Lafayette, Ga. He reports money scarce, and a complete failure of the crops in many portions of Ark.

"B," our correspondent at Cainsville, Wilson Co., reports 4 additions to the church at Hebron, one of them a Methodist preacher who had been a minister for five years. Bro. T. J. Shaw conducted the meeting. In a previous meeting at the same place the daughter of a Presbyterian preacher was baptized.

General News.

NDW YORK Oct. 5.—A number of

Texan steers last evening while passing through the lower part of the City became infuriated by the noise and lights, and eight of them broke from the drivers, rushing in all directions. Before the steers were shot nearly fifty people were injured, some seriously.

The finest wedding that has been in Washington City for twenty years took place on the 1st inst. Miss Maria Ewing Sherman, daughter of Gen Sherman, was married to Thos. W. Fitch of the Engineer Corps of the United States Navy. Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, a personal friend of Mrs. Sherman performed the ceremony.

The gambling fraternity is well represented in this City at the present time, in consequence of the Fall meeting of the Nashville Blood Horse Association which comes off this week.

In the Knoxville district a colored preacher, the Rev. Geo. W. Levere is in the field as a candidate for Congress. His opponents are Brownlow, Thornburg, Henderson and Mabry.

Nearly all the Manufacturing establishments in Rhode Island have adopted the two-third schedule, in order to reduce supply and thereby increase demand. Some in Maine are cutting down their time one half.

Twenty thousand little folks attended the opening of the St. Louis Fair on the 5th. Oct.

Silver City, Nev. reports a terribly affray growing out of mining claims, in which four men were killed and a fifth is dying.

The chief engineers of the fire de-

partments of various cities are in convention at St. Louis.

FOREIGN.

LONDON Oct. 5.—There is a panic at the Stock Exchange in South America in consequence of the insurrection in the Argentine States.

Four persons were burned to death at a fire last night in Pasely, Scotland.

The Nile is exceeding its usual overflow, and threatens serious damage.

The Old Catholics now have thirty-five congregations in the Jura, Switzerland.

Brevities.

"Mary, my love, do you remember the text this morning?"

"No, papa, I can never remember the text, I have such a bad memory."

"Mary, said her mother. "did you notice Susan Brown?"

"Oh, y'es, what a fright! She had on her last year's bonnet done up, a pea-green silk, a black lace mantilla, brown gaiters, an imitation Honiton collar, a lava bracelet, her old earrings, and such a fan!"

A Helena (Moutana) divine who has spent the best part of the summer in Christianizing a Chinaman, thought he was getting along nicely until John made a proposition to him the other day to "put in" with him and start a faro bank.

At a State Congregational Association of ministers down East, once on a time, the question of small salaries being under discussion, a rather impulsive and ardent young minister

advocated that they combine together, and stand by each other, and that if they could not secure what was fairly their due, they should all strike together for higher salaries. Instantly came the reply from another brother: "The apostle Paul says that a bishop should be no *striker!*" This raised a shout of laughter, which extinguished the argument of the incipient ministerial trades-unionist.

To pass away the gloomy hours in prison Bunyan took a rail out of the stool belonging to the cell, and with his knife fashioned it into a flute. The keeper hearing music, followed the sound to Bunyan's cell; but while he was unlocking the door the prisoner placed the rail in the stool, so that the searchers were unable to solve the mystery; nor during the remainder of Bunyan's residence in the jail did they ever discover how the music was produced.

A Brooklyn man has named his rooster Robinson, because he cru-
soe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The Sin Against the *Holy Ghost*..... 935
 Go Forward..... 939
 Correspondence 939
 Defense of a Dogma..... 944
 Materialism..... 944
 Church News..... 948
 Answer of J. Creath to F. J. Tyler..... 950
 Let us have Fair Play..... 951
 The Needed comfort..... 953
 A lad just beginning to Run. No. 2... 954
 Caspel Success..... 955
 Just a few Stitches..... 956
 Items..... 956
 General News..... 957
 Brevities 958

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 41.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCT. 15, 1874.

Is it right for Ohristians to aid in the
Manufacture of Strong Drink?

Brethren L. & S: Please answer through the ever faithful Advocate the following questions:

1. Is it right for a Christian man to hire to a wicked man of the world to make brandy or whiskey?

2. Is it right for members of the church to sell their apples and peaches to be converted into brandy?

3rd: If "no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God," is there any promise for the drunkard maker?

3. Does not the man who furnishes the material out of which liquor is made, become an accomplice in the crime of making drunkards, and thus assist the enemy to manacle the souls of men, for their everlasting destruction?

A DISCIPLE.

Pleasant Home, Ky., Sept. 18, 1874.

That the manufacture, sale and use of ardent spirits is as great an evil as ever afflicted any community, we think admits not of a doubt. In every sense in which it is viewed, it

is an evil. While it enriches a few, it impoverishes the many. It hardens the heart, corrupts the morals, depraves and blunts the mind of all who make, handle or use it in the general way of use. That it can be made, sold and used as any other poison we have not a doubt. But otherwise we think no Christian can do it. As an ordinary medicine it is an evil. The men who use it, use it while well. They first use it and then seek a reason for it afterwards. Men treat no other medicine thus. It is an evil then. It injures and corrupts, demoralizes and depraves society. If it is not an evil, we know not what would be so considered. It destroys ten thousand lives, under circumstances that spread the greatest evil in society, where the murderer or assassin destroys one. It impoverishes, despoils millions of dollars where the thief takes one. It destroys the virtue of a thousand women, where the seducer without its influence would not despoil one. It is the fruitful mother of disease and death, dishonor and dishonesty, poverty, want and shame. If it is not evil, no evil afflicts humanity.

But Paul tells the Christians to labor working with their hands the thing which is good. He limits their labor to that which is good. They cannot labor either for themselves or others at that which is evil, which produces evil. Paul tells Timothy not to be partaker in other men's sins. To follow that which is good, not evil. The Christian's mission is to purify, refine, elevate, make the world better for living in it. If he makes it worse, he is no Christian. No Christian can follow a calling that makes men worse. Christ came to make them better. The Christian must be a co-worker with him for good to man. It is a most ridiculous and almost blasphemous pretense to talk of a man being a Christian and at the same time engaging in callings that injure his fellowman. God works for their good, but God's servant works injury to them: Christ died to save them from evil and sin, Christ's servants work to injure them! Shame on the thought. It is an absurd contradiction in terms.

We must be co-workers with God, not with those who work evil. Christians ought not to let their good be evil spoken of. There is not a thought or idea in the Bible that justifies the course of evil doing.

Not only is it true that it is offensive to God and opposed to all spiritual good, but it is true that money brought by these evil courses into the family brings no true temporal good. We always expect the children of men made rich by means that bring evil to others to die poor, and neglected. The curse of God attends those who work evil to their fellowmen. It is safe to keep one's skirts

clear and hands clean from all connection with that which works evil. All can find enough that works good to man, to employ their services if they desire it.

D. L.

A Request.

"It was conceded that we have never had a series of better discourses, but Bro. Fall's discourse was especially admired. It was an expository discourse on the eighth Psalm, and was a model of its kind. In unity of purpose; clearness combined with profundity of thought; propriety, precision and conciseness in expression; good taste, fervor and dignity in delivery, we have seldom heard its equal. It was, in all these respects, a study for all of the younger preachers who heard it, and we regret that the number of them was not tenfold what it was. Quite a number of brethren united in a private request to Bro. Fall to furnish the discourse for publication, and we hope that he will do so. We would be glad to spread it on the pages of the Apostolic Times."

The above we clip from the account given of the preaching at the Kentucky Missionary meeting. We copy it as a well merited compliment to our revered Bro. Fall, and to join with the *Times* in a request not only for the publication of the discourse there delivered, but of others also. We have been able to hear Bro. F. but little of late years. But we have often heard gems of thought from him that we think ought to be given to the world in permanent form. We

have heard from him expositions of Scripture considered obscure and doubtful, made so clear and lucid, so connected and complete, that they gave a new beauty and harmony to the revelation of God to man.

Indeed Bro. Fall is the only man among us known to me who has devoted the time and who has brought to the study of the Scriptures the close, critical investigation of the thorough student and ripe scholar in manner and habits. Retiring and shrinking from a rough and aggressive conflict with the world, and he has devoted a well-trained mind to the investigation and exposition of the Scriptures, he has treasured up rich mines of thought that would enrich the religious thoughts of the age were it opened to them. We remember a discourse at Clarksville, that we would like much to see stereotyped for the use of the world.

Bro. Fall is now enjoying unusual vigor of both mind and body for one of his age. We would be glad to know that he was placing his ripened thoughts and matured knowledge of Scripture in form that will live to instruct the world after he has gone.

D. L.

Answer of J. Oresth to F. J. Tyler.

No. 1.

Editors Gospel Advocate: In his answer to query second he says, neither are they (faith, repentance, confession of sins, fruits and immersion) all embraced in the condition of salvation." There is but one condition (and only one) of salvation, viz: *faith in Jesus,*" by which it is clear he

means faith alone. Repentance is not the condition, nor a part of it. It places man in the position to comply with the condition, and is essential to salvation. Luke xiii: 3. I noticed that Mr. Tyler did not name the word *Do*, which John the Immerser used four times in his particular instructions which he gave to the believers made four thousand years before he was born. "*Do*" and "*faith alone*" do not work in the same yoke. He uses the word salvation, I used the word pardon;—who informed him, that repentance is no part of the condition of pardon in the preaching of John the Immerser and of the apostles, but is a condition of salvation? Did not John the Immerser and Christ and the Apostles make baptism or immersion as essential to the pardon of sins, as either faith or repentance? How did sectarians discover that faith and repentance are "essential to salvation" but non-essential to pardon of sins? Did not the same authority that ordained that faith and repentance should be preached "among all nations" for pardon of sins—ordain that baptism or immersion should be preached too as equally necessary to pardon of sins as either faith or repentance? How dare they separate what God has joined together? See John's preaching in Matt. 3, Mark 1, Luke 3, John 1. The apostolic commission in Matt. 28: 19-20, Mark 16: 16. Luke 24: 47, John 20: 23, Acts of Apostles for the execution of that commission. Who did they tell that their sins were pardoned by faith alone without baptism or immersion? What virtue is there in either faith or repentance to obtain pardon of

sins, more than in immersion, besides the appointment of God or his will which gives them all their power, or the will of the sects which say men can be pardoned by faith alone without baptism. Were the epistles of the New Testament written to "Christ's mystical body six thousand years ago?" What was the name of "Christ's mystical body" nearly six thousand years ago? Were they called Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, Samaritans, Catholics or some one of the six hundred and forty branches of the church? Malachi, 4: 6, prophesied that John the Immerser should turn many of the Jews to the Lord their God, and Luke says he shall do it. Luke 1: 16. Paul opened the eyes of the nations and turned or converted them to God. Acts 26: 18. These inspired men are said to turn sinners to God, and nothing is said about their being instruments to turn sinners to God. Balaam's beast was an instrument of speech in God's hand, as you say you were to turn sinners. Turning is active, being turned as an instrument is turned passive, this is the difference between Scriptural conversion, and sectarian conversion. In the Scriptures both preachers and sinners are *active* in their conversion, all sectarians, both preachers and sinners are *passive* instruments—so is the word of God in their hands—and has no more power to save sinners, than gravel stones. They one and all throw the blame of the sinner's damnation upon God, because he did not do it for them, the Scriptures charge the damnation of sinners upon themselves. They have Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles,

let them obey them. Luke 16: 19 to 31. No, father Abraham, all these will do no good unless used as instruments in thy hands or God's hand. The apostle James also speaks of brethren converting sinners from the error of their ways, chap. 4: 19–20. Sects pray for the Holy Ghost to do it all, and hence if he does not baptize the sinners it is his fault if they are damned, they have nothing to do in the matter of their pardon, except to wait and hope the Lord's time and pleasure, just as though he had never said one word to them in the Bible and though they were as passive as stones or beasts. The following passages show that I was right in what I said respecting John the Immersers turning the majority of the Jews to God. And all the people that heard him (John) and the publicans, justified God, being immersed (baptized) with the immersion (baptism) of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves not being immersed (baptized) of him. Luke 29: 30. Matt. 3. Jerusalem, Judea and all the region round about the Jordan were immersed by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins." But both ancient and modern Pharisees build on the Abrahamic church or covenant. In Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, under the word church, about eighty learned witnesses, both Baptists and Pedobaptists concur in saying the day of Pentecost, Acts 2, was the birthday of the Christian Church." Page 110. We have the same number of witnesses testifying that immersion is baptism, and these are a greater number of witnesses than the Bible requires. The reason

why we have the word baptize in the common version is, King James required of his packed jury to transfer the Greek word baptizo, instead of translating it. The words church, baptize and the other words which he required his packed jury to transfer are the juggling words of the modern clergy by which they juggle the common people; they are the nets and traps in which they catch the people as spiders do flies.

Yours truly,
JACOB CREATH.

Is the Devil Safe?

I propose to answer the above question by the teachings of the Methodist fraternity. If the doctrine taught by our Methodist friends be true, I cannot see why the devil is not just as safe as man; for they teach that man is saved by faith alone. And I have heard their preachers, and one in particular, Rev. Robert Brooks of Walker Co., Texas, say, "He that believes, shall be saved; but he that believes not shall be damned." "The Devils also believe," James xi: 19. Here is faith alone, and possessed by devils at that. Can any one, in keeping with the faith alone system, doubt that the devil is just as safe as man?

They also teach that man is "totally depraved," that is, "wholly defiled." Now it seems to me that if this be true, the devil can be no worse. His Satanic majesty can not be more than totally depraved, wholly defiled. Nor can I see, in keeping with this theory, how man can be anything more than a devil. And if man be totally depraved, wholly defil-

ed, the devil can be no worse; and it necessarily follows that every man is a devil. And if one devil can be saved by faith alone, it follows that all devils can be saved by faith alone. And his Satanic majesty is in possession of this faith alone. James ii: 19. Hence, in keeping with the faith alone system, we are irresistibly forced to the conclusion that the devil is safe beyond a doubt. Away with such a theory from the face of the earth, and give me one that teaches faith, repentance, confession and baptism in order to remission of sins, and a hearty obedience to all the requirements of the New Testament, after which, finally triumph over the grave, and enter the world of spirits of just men made perfect, and there strike hands with all the redeemed and glorified millions to sing the praises of him who has bought us with his precious blood.

ELIAS LAND.
Groesbeck, Texas, Sept. 10 1874.

QUERIES.

Bro. Sewell: In our Bible lesson at Rock Spring Church last Sunday there was one item that we could not settle satisfactorily to my mind; it is this: The 7th verse, 20th chapter of Acts says "on the first day of the week the disciples met to break bread, while the 11th verse seems to teach that it was after midnight.

M. V. CUCHIN.
Lavergne, Tenn., Sept. 14, 1874.

We do not think the verse refers to the Lord's Supper but to taking food for refreshment after the labors of the night, before beginning the

next day's journey. The expression, had broken bread *and eaten*, indicates that it was more than merely the Lord's Supper. One would hardly emphasize the fact that an individual had eaten when he had merely taken the Lord's Supper. If they met to break bread on the first day of the week, we presume they did it.

D. L.

Brethren L. & S.: By order of the Disciples worshipping at Millersburg, I write you a few lines requesting you to answer through the Advocate the important question whether the members have the right to absent themselves from the regular Lord's day meetings by going and worshipping with other congregations without permission from the church. You will please answer the above question and oblige many friends.

Yours truly,

W. K. ELDER.

Jordan's Valley, Tenn., August 3, 1874.

Paul says that those who have the rule of the church should not be lords over God's heritage. We believe it not good to neglect the regular worship of a congregation for any cause. Especially is this true in reference to a small congregation where all are needed to create an interest, where one is missed so as to discourage the others. If a person regularly worships at another place, he ought to hold his membership there. Where he worships, he ought to feel his home, and his responsibility to rest. But occasionally, if a man wishes to visit other congrega-

tions, or if other interests call him into the vicinity of other congregations that makes it convenient to him to worship with them, this kind and considerate in him, for him to let his brethren or some of them know that he will be absent and the reason why. It is due the congregation, that they may be fully satisfied nothing is wrong and that his interest in the Christian religion is not growing cold, that he is not wantonly neglecting the assembly of his brethren. But for a Christian to be required to ask permission before he is permitted to go, is rather a greater surrender of personal liberty on the one hand and an assumption of authority on the other than the Scriptures contemplate.

D. L.

Bro. Lipscomb: Please explain, through the columns of your valuable paper, the language of our Savior to his Disciples in 9th and 10th verses of the eleventh chapter of John.

Your brother,

N. G. MURPHY.

Paris, Lamar Co. Texas.

The only meaning we can attach to the verses is, it was not yet time for the betrayal and crucifixion of the Savior, so there is no danger in going into Judea. The time of his betrayal and trial is likened to night, in which a man will stumble and fall. Until the time came for his trial he could walk in Judea without danger as one walks in the day without danger of stumbling.

D. L.

IS IT TRUE?

The Missionary Board of Kentucky makes the following statement:

"We have at least two hundred churches needing aid, most of these in time can be made self-supporting, while others of them, consisting of brethren in very humble circumstances, will always need assistance."

We say nothing of the two hundred churches needing aid, but is it true that brethren in humble circumstances, that is poor in the goods of this world cannot constitute and maintain a church without aid from the rich? Can they do nothing for the good of the world, but only tax and burden others able to aid the world? Is not something radically wrong in the conception and practice of the church when it can never be maintained in poor communities without being a perpetual pensioner upon the bounties of the rich? Were not the early churches almost wholly composed of the poor? Were they dependent for their existence on the bounties of the wealthy? Did not the poor churches not only sustain themselves but extend the knowledge of the Lord throughout the world?

We ask again are not our conceptions of the church and its work, the necessities of great wealth and money as means of maintaining that church and spreading the Gospel, at variance with and antagonistic to the facts as presented in the history of the early church?

Does not the idea necessarily involve the subversion and destruction of the early order and work of the church?

Would it not be well for us to stop

and revise our ideas concerning the church and what is needed to perpetuate and extend that church and make them harmonize with the true condition and order of the primitive church?

D. L.

Gospel success.

Dear Brethren L. & S: I never see any report of the Lord's cause from this section in your excellent paper. I therefore thought a word from us would be read with interest by your numerous readers, so I send this communication.

The cause of truth is gaining a sure footing in this section of country. There has been and is yet the most malignant opposition to the truth in this vicinity, that I ever knew any where. Still we are steadily gaining ground. Misrepresentation, abuse and calumny are the weapons of our enemies, but their days are about numbered. The people are moving in the matter, and demanding argument instead of abuse. Thus we are commanding respect from Sectarians. The pure and unadulterated word of God is gladly received by the people, and this is death to Sectarianism. They cannot stand against the word of God. They say the word of God is not sufficient to convert men, and turn them to God. They say we must have something else. The people want to know what that something else is; but the preachers cannot tell them what it is; so the people are disposed to believe that the Bible contains all that is necessary to convert men and women; that the Spirit puts forth

his power to convert the people through the gospel.

We have been having some good and successful meetings here recently. I am preaching once a month for three congregations: Enon, Knob Creek, and Dukedom.

I held a meeting of five days at Enon, embracing the last Lord's day in July, resulting in twelve additions to the congregation. I had no help from any preaching brethren. I held a meeting of nine days at this place, assisted by Bro. R. A. Cooke, who did most of the preaching. Such a powerful and lucid presentation of the truth as he gave us, I never before heard. Much prejudice was removed, and great and lasting good accomplished.

We held a meeting at Knob Creek of seven days, embracing the second Lord's day in this month, with nineteen additions to the cause of truth. Bro. E. F. Senter, a good and faithful preacher of the word, divided the labor with me for five days of the meeting. He did his work well. This was the most joyous meeting I was ever in. I had the delightful pleasure of baptizing into Christ the last of two families.

From Knob Creek, I went across the State line into Tennessee, to a school house, and where but little Christian preaching had been done before. Here I preached two nights and days. I also met a Methodist preacher here. He had an appointment for the same hour and place with mine. His appointment being the oldest I left it at his disposal. He is of rather small caliber. He preached on Saturday night and set Methodist teaching as opposed to our

plea. I followed and showed the Bible teaching on the points discussed. It was not, in the spirit of debate, but of friendly investigation. He closed the meeting without alluding to my remarks in any way. But on Lord's day morning he came full of fight. He ignored me entirely, treating me with supreme contempt. He spoke about an hour and a half. He raved and charged wonderfully; asked me a number of questions, which he thought I could not answer, and tried to close the meeting without giving me an opportunity to say anything. But I asked the liberty to speak, and the congregation granted it. I answered all his questions, and to his utter confusion too. I propounded some questions to him which he could not answer; and also some he would not answer. At the close of my remarks I gave an opportunity for those who desired to obey the gospel. Two ladies came forward. I proposed to take their confession. But to my astonishment one of them refused to confess Christ as the son of God. I asked her the question: "Do you believe with all your heart that Jesus Christ is the son of God. She hesitated. I then instructed her in the importance of making that confession and its purport. That in making that confession she confessed the whole Bible to be true, pledged herself to obey the Lord in all his commands, to live a Godly life, and be a faithful follower of Jesus till death. I then asked the question again. She answered she did not thus believe it. She had come up to be prayed for according to the Methodist custom. I took the confession of the other lady.

I then turned to the Methodist preacher and told him here is a mourner who desires to be prayed for after your custom. Give me the Scripture to pray for her or any other person, to be converted independent of the Gospel. He was silent. I asked again for Bible authority to pray for an alien sinner, or for the sinner to pray for himself, to be converted or pardoned independent of obedience, like Methodists practice at the mourners bench, pledging myself to get down there and pray for that lady till the next morning if she did not "get through" sooner. He was still silent. I pressed the matter. He finally answered that he could not give the Scripture for it. Such silence, such suspense as was in that vast concourse of people during this episode, I never before saw. He was a minister who had for thirteen years, been engaging in a religious practice for which he had never found any Bible authority. And not only so, but he now confesses he can't give any Scripture for it, and that right in the presence of those who had seen him engaging in the practice in question. Is it not humiliating? How long will men not cease perverting the right way of the Lord? The triumph in favor of truth was overwhelming. Many went away fully satisfied that we have the truth. We repaired to the water, where I had the delightful pleasure of burying two ladies with the Lord in baptism, the first thing of the kind ever done by a Christian preacher in that community. A good impression was made and a vast amount of prejudice removed.

Thus you see we have had in all

these meetings forty three additions ; six from the Methodists, two Missonary Baptists, and the remainder mostly from the world. The hearts of the disciples are greatly rejoiced. The truth is mighty and will prevail when understood. We need more preachers. We want earnest gospel preachers. Men who know the truth and are not afraid nor ashamed to tell it.

Go on brethren in your noble effort through the *ADVOCATE*. The Lord will bless you.

E. C. L. DENTON.

Dukedom, Tenn., Sept. 23rd 1874.

Bro. Sewell: During a meeting at Kelly's Chapel, Giles Co., Tenn., which continued five days, there were seven additions all by confession and baptism. Bro. H. J. Spivy did the preaching.

Your brother,
W. R. SPIVY.

Embracing the second Lord's day in September, I held a meeting at Philadelphia in Wilson County; eleven were added to the congregation at that place. Went to Gainsboro the next week and found Bro. Hoover, preaching to attentive hearers. Continued through the week with thirteen as the result of our meeting: six of these were scattered sheep of the one flock. From Gainsboro I came to Sparta, where we have had seven baptisms up to this time.

Yours in the one hope,

J. M. KIDWELL.

Sparta, Tenn., Oct. 5, 1874.

Bro. Lipscomb: Since my last report—the 10th ult. in compliance with a request of our good Bro. B. F. Bond and others, I visited Jack son in Madison County on the 12th for the purpose of holding a protracted meeting. When I reached the place, I learned the arrangements were, that I should preach at 3 o'clock P. M. in the Christian church on Lord's day to the white people in a hall engaged for the purpose. I spoke an hour on the importance of Christians being at all times led by the Spirit of God. Rom. 8-14. The audience was good and attentive. I only regret not being able to do the subject justice. I found the colored people carrying on two protracted meetings, one in the Methodist church and one in a Baptist Church, so I could get no hearing, but thought I would try and hear and see what was said and done at them. After attending both places and witnessing the proceedings, I reached the conclusion that the apostles doctrine was neither taught nor desired. If there is any improvement in teaching or practice among them I certainly failed to observe it.

Twelve miles West of Jackson on the Brownsville road is a large farm called the Henning place. The superintendent is a zealous Christian brother—Robert Bond. He has built a meeting house on it, which will seat, I judge, about 300 persons. He invited me out to preach to the laborers,—of which there are about forty—and others who might attend. I preached 3 sermons there to white and colored. Some of the colored expressed astonishment at hearing the plain teaching of the

apostles. They desired me to visit them again as soon as I could. Bro. Bond is so very anxious that they should hear the true teaching and be benefitted by it I am sure he will do what he can. He contributed \$7.00 the church in Jackson \$12. 00.

On the 19th I returned to Burnett's chapel near Trenton. Lord's day preached and baptized four, continued the meeting until Friday night, had 10 accessions, 9 by baptism, one from the Baptists. Preached by request of the white brethren in their house of worship in Trenton on Wednesday night to a large audience of both white and colored, called attention to the difference between building our hopes of heaven on the testimony of God and on the testimony of men, 1 John 5-9-10. I think the impression made was good. Saturday I left for Brummer's Grove. Reached Henderson Station, and having no house to preach in and it being too wet for services under Arbor, we had no meeting—notwithstanding a number of persons assembled where we stopped, and we imparted such instruction to them as we were able to do in that way, and were sorry to find our friends so backward in asking questions and seeking correct information relative to the apostles' teaching. We preached 4 sermons under the arbor, had three accessions, two by baptism and one from the Methodists.

A bro. Taylor (his initials I have forgotten) was preaching near our place of meeting in the forenoon Lord's day and had as the immediate result, one to baptize at half past 9 o'clock. We had two to be baptized at the same place and time. He

being a Christian brother in deed as well as name, baptized them both. We by his request gave a talk at the water and offered prayer. He has settled among the brethren at the Station. The brethren there are erecting a house of worship 60 X 30 at a cost of about \$2,000.

On taking leave of sister E. Brummer she handed me an envelope which we found to contain a two dollar bill. The colored brethren and sisters in their deep poverty contributed 95 cts., all the money we received there on our visit. The colored church now numbers 14, and needs the Christian sympathy, prayers and some money of the brotherhood. We were invited to make our first visit there by our good Bro. John A. McCally. The church there contributed \$12. 00. We had not a single colored member in that section. The next visit the church contributed \$10. 00 including the amount contributed by the colored brethren, but now they have more than they can do unaided. We left there on the 30th and reached Burnett's chapel Oct. the 1st, stopped with the brethren three days, preached five sermons and had five accessions, three by baptism and two from the Baptists.

Were absent three weeks and three days. Preached 20 sermons and delivered six addresses at the water, had 18 accessions, 15 by baptism and two from the Baptists—one had been a Baptist thirty years, one from the Methodists—received from Burgetts chapel \$20. 60, brethren in Jackson \$19. 00 brethren at Brummers Grove \$2. 95 \$42. 35. Paid out 16. 75.

Now Bro. Lipscomb will you ask

brethren to send to you for the prosecution of this work, two hundred dollars by the 15th of Nov. Those young churches need and deserve to be helped, one a membership of 32, the other 14. To the Lord be all the praise.

DANIEL WADKINS.

Nashville, Tenn. Oct. 7th 1874.

We gladly publish the reports of Bro. Wadkins' labors. Here are certainly indications of his doing good. The white brethren where he labors take an interest in his labor, approve his work and course and assist him somewhat. The colored people with their lack of property and improvident habits cannot be expected to do much. Are there not white brethren throughout the country who will aid him in this work. Times are hard we know. The discussion of the Civil Rights Bill cools the ardor of some, but we ought to help in instructing the colored people. Any amounts sent us we will see shall be carefully spent in having them taught the religion of Christ. Bro. Wadkins himself eschews all political parties and hobbies and encourages those whom he instructs to follow the same paths.

D. L.

From the Religious Herald.

Swear Not at All."

[We publish, by request, the following selection, from an old magazine.]

"Good heavens!" exclaimed Mrs. Perrin, "the man is here."

Mrs. Perrin was a little, round, dumpling of a woman, with a mild,

benevolent face, and a smile almost always on her lips. On the occasion of this exclamation, she was at work in her kitchen porch, shelling peas, and her neighbor, Mrs. Jerkin, sat beside her, knitting.

The minister was seen at some little distance, facing toward the house.

Perrin had her cap ribbons tied up to the crown, her sleeves rolled up to the elbows, her old blue checks apron on, and her household implements around her; and it was this dress of dress as she thought that brought out the irreverent speech.

"Who, the minister?" asked Mrs. Jerkin, an expression of a peculiar character passing over her face.

"Yes; why in the name of mercy didn't he come yesterday, when I was all cleaned up? In the morning, too, when I'm in such a stew!" said Mrs. Perrin, untying her cap-strings as fast as she could, and pulling down her sleeves, while the perspiration rolled down her face. "Land of promise? I haven't a minute's time!" Sure enough, before the words were out of her mouth, the minister stood on the steps of the kitchen.

"La! Elder, how are you? I'm mighty glad to see you. Won't you just go round to the front door, and I'll let you into the parlor? I ain't fit to be looked at here."

"Do let me sit here, good Mrs. Perrin; don't drive me into your parlor, just because I happen to be a minister. There, now, I am comfortable, if you will allow me," and seating himself on a huge log that was used for some domestic purpose, he tanned himself with a great burdock

leaf that he plucked from the side of the door.

"Now, Mrs. Perrin, I insist that you go right on with your work; or shall I shell the peas for you?" he asked, observing the basket full of that vegetable by her side.

"La! Elder, how comical! No, I guess I'll just go through with the job, seeing you say so. We must all mind the minister," and she took up her work again.

After a few moments of pleasant discourse, the minister, quite rested and refreshed with a draught of new milk, arose to go on his way. As soon as he was out of sight, Mrs. Jerkin commenced praising him.

"He's a good man, and preaches such beautiful, plain sermons!" she said. "Even the little children can understand them. Do you remember his last Sabbath's discourse?"

Oh, yes! Didn't he give it to some of our folks? I wouldn't have been in Jerry Cook's shoes for something, I can tell you. Did you see Jerry Cook's face? just as red as a beet. Let me see—his text was, 'Swear not at all.' Didn't he handle it beautifully?"

"Yes; I took considerable of it to myself," said Mrs. Jerkin; "and I don't know but I felt almost as bad as Jerry Cook."

"You!" exclaimed Mrs. Perrin; "I took considerable of it to yourself? Why, you don't swear do you?"

The neighbor could not help laughing at the comical expression of the little fat, rosy face before her.

"Yes," replied Mrs. Jerkin, "I found that I had been swearing the greater portion of my life—though

I hope, ignorantly—and I resolved to give it up immediately; since then I've been careful of my speech."

Mrs. Perrin looked first amused, then thoughtful—but the shells fell on the floor, and the knitting-needles clicked, the cat purred, the sunshine lay across the fields—everything told of quiet and contentment, and the two women only spoke occasionally, as they worked.

"Good heavens!" exclaimed Mrs. Perrin, looking up, "there's the door of my bird-cage open—suppose the bird had gone?" She shut the door and was about to resume her occupation, when she observed a singular smile on the face of her companion, that arrested her attention.

"Of what are you thinking?" queried.

"Of that expression you used just now, and I dare say you would think quite innocently."

"O! I said 'good heavens,' member," said the little woman, more soberly; "why that is nothing."

"But Christ said it was," returned the other. "Don't you remember the words: 'For I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne?'"

"O, dear! I never thought of it, I'm sure," said the little woman, shuddering; why, it's real swearing, isn't it?"

"I consider it so," replied Mrs. Jerkin.

"Dear me? And I've got such a habit of it," said Mrs. Perrin. "Do you think it is wrong to say, 'In the name of patience,' 'in the name of mercy?'" queried Mrs. Perrin.

"Most decidedly," "Christ says

"Let your communication be yea, yea, and nay, nay; and he adds, 'For whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.'"

"Dear me! But people don't know they are doing wrong," said Mrs. Perrin.

"They have the Bible," replied her neighbor.

"To be sure," said Mrs. Perrin, hastily "I didn't think of that—but you don't find a woman but uses some such words."

"More's the pity," said Mrs. Jerkin. "I have heard really lady-like women exclaim. 'My gracious!' and 'creation!' That was swearing by the earth and all created things; expressly forbidden, you know. Ah! intemperance of speech prevails to an alarming extent"

"Dear me!" said little Mrs. Perrin. "There, was that wrong?" she asked, looking up. "Well from this time henceforth, I'm determined to have no slang words or pet phrases," said the little woman, resolutely. "The thought that I was swearing—it seems dreadful."

"I, too, am determined to have my communication as near the gospel standard as I can," replied Mrs. Jerkin, gathering up her knitting and taking her departure.

Mr. Perrin came home from the farm very tired. He was a good Christian brother, but his communication was not yea and nay. He sat down to the supper-table. Some of his favorite cakes were set smoking before him. "Jerusalem!" he exclaimed, with a pleasant air, as he surveyed the smoking pile.

"O Amos!" said his wife, "don't, swear please."

The farmer dropped his knife, and stared with a ludicrous countenance.

"Don't swear?" he repeated.

"You said Jerusalem, husband."

"Well, and you call that swearing do you?"

"Christ says so."

"I'd like to have you tell me where! Pretty conscientious you are getting, to reprove a man like me, who never swore an oath in his life."

"Why, husband, dear, said Mrs. Perrin, repeating from memory what she had refreshed since Mrs. Jerkin's visit. "Christ says, "Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; neither by the earth for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great king."

"Well, really, I never thought of that before; and the habit has grown upon me, I believe."

"You see, Mrs. Jerkin was in here and took me to task for swearing."

"Took you to task for swearing; well, that's a pretty piece of intelligence."

"But I did, Amos. I said 'good heaven,' and 'good gracious,' and ever so many other things, when I felt excited; and she proved from the Bible that I was wrong; and so I was, you see."

"Well, well; that is new light to me. Live and learn, my old grandmother used to say; but I never thought I should learn that I'd been swearing all my days. Why, I've often said I never used an oath in my life. Je—there! you see, I just saved myself. A habit is so hard to break; but I will try it. Just reprove me when you hear it, will you wife?"

"Yes, if you will reprove me!"

"I certainly will," returned the good farmer. "When I hear the wrong word coming, I will quote the Bible, "Swear not at all."

ALMA MATER.

From the New York Observer.

MOTHER.

"As one that mourneth for his mother."

David.

"The only love which on this teeming earth, asks no return."

Mrs. Norton.

It was never given to mortals to be free from imperfection. It is a kind and beautiful withholding of the eyes, by which each of us is able to behold one faultless model.

That model is a MOTHER.

No one wishes to say that his mother is better than another one's mother, but only that his mother is the best of mothers, and there never was such another mother. This was his faith when he was too young to put it in words. It grew up with him, was stronger when he was a strong man.

When she was old and decrepid, and dying and dead and gone, she was more loved and lovely. Not one fault, failing or infirmity marred the symmetry of the perfect model. He never wished her other than she seemed; and the memory of her person, her virtues and her works, remains a sacred presence, a light in his heart and a joy in his house, a comfort, a shield and a guide.

The tenderness of her love and care of her children in their early years is the first impression, and therefore the strongest and longest that remains. The memory of no loud word, no harsh, severe, fretful, im-

patient word, is left upon the mind.

Firmness and decision were as marked and pronounced, as her affection, and commanded the respect and obedience that tenderness only does not insure. No weak indulgence of childhood's waywardness that required correction, made her the evil genius that in thousands of cases has stood between an erring child and the punishment he deserved; and which was essential to his preservation from future vice. Mistaken kindness! Fondness! It has been the ruin of millions of men, who would with the aid of judicious mothers, have been governed as well as coddled, and taught to obey as well as to love, and would have learned that filial obedience fosters and begets love.

She mingled the virtues of firmness and gentleness with such good sense, that her wish was at once the reason and the rule. A living child obeys a parent as the good man fears God: not because of punishment in case of sin, but the will of one who loves and has a right to be loved is law, and obedience is both duty and joy.

Her watchfulness in health and sickness; the visits in the dark to the bedside of a child; the listening ear to to catch the breathing; the soft hand to feel the skin; the low voice of inquiry, lest touch or sound should disturb the little one; these are among the memories of early days, the earliest and so the last.

What patience, self-denial and frugal carefulness when many mouths were to be fed, and many backs to be clothed, and many minds to be taught,

and the means were very, very small: so scarce that only the closest and most judicious economy could make them reach the end. But there was no fretfulness or complaint; no repining for the old mansion of ease and plenty that had been left for the lot of a poor man's wife and the mother of a flock. Household help was scarce and often not to be had at all, and the work must be done, all the work of a large household—and what that *all* includes many mothers never know even by sight much less by touch—must be done by delicate hands unused to toil. It was hard, but not worth calling a hardship, no pieces were written about it in the newspapers; no appeals for a poor suffering minister's wife with six small children and one at the breast, doing all her own work—but a willing martyr at the steak, when any steak was to be had—steadily, cheerily, joyously, always, making the house glad and bright with story, song and love.

Her conversation was always with grace seasoned with wisdom and wit, a quiet humor welling up in the midst of social hours, amusing the happy circle, winning admiring smiles and provoking fresh supplies from the inexhaustible fountain of a well-furnished mind and a cheerful heart. For her knowledge of books and men was varied, her memory remarkable, and from the storehouse of her receptive and retentive mind she had the happy power of recalling the right thing at the right time. Huge volumes were filled by her industry, and taste with pictures of notable men and scenes, with full length descriptions, so that her col-

lections form a cotemporaneous history of the times.

And over all these charms of person and mind the graces of religion were shed, crowning the character and life with the radiance of a partaker of the divine nature. She lived in Christ. His work was her ground of confidence in God. To be like Him was her daily prayer. The greatest of all Christian graces was pre-eminently hers. The censure of others she left for others. Her charity was so large that she had no wish to speak severely of those whose ways were not as her ways. And so the law of kindness governed her lips.

With long life she was satisfied. Three score years and ten flowed on, and by reason of strength, even four score and five; but "labor and sorrow" did not come with them. Peace, that had no disturbing forces, dwelt in her soul. Memory held pleasant images of the past, and these were a perpetual feast. Loving children and friends without number, gathered around her. She held the pen of a ready writer, and her correspondence was the bond of a great circle that through her was kept in constant communion.

And so she lived doing and loving and so she died. Many had gone before her, and death was reunion with the greater number on the other side.

IRENÆUS.

More of my Experience.

Brethren L. & S: I have concluded, with your permission however to give to the public, a little more of my experience while in the Cumber-

land Presbyterian Church. (*Not in Christ.*)

I hope no one will charge me with belief of what is called "experimental religion." However, those wishing to render such a verdict against me, will please wait until they have the testimony upon which to predicate such a decision.

In the Summer of 1870, at Prairie Plains church house in Grimes Co. Texas. "Rev." J. Phillips was the conductor of a protracted meeting, of which I was a constant attendant; and was as conspicuous among the mourners at the bench as any Presbyterian or Methodist present.

The meeting continued several nights without any one "getting religion." Notwithstanding the many mourners at the "anxious seat," with their hearts purified by faith; yet unpardoned, and making the inquiry: "Men and brethren, what shall we do? But there was no Christians or disciples participating in the meeting, to tell them like Peter of old, "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."

The Conductor came to the conclusion at last that something was wrong, and requested the membership to go into the secret grove and pray God to help them to get right, and come back next night in the Spirit. It may not be necessary to say, that next day, according to the conductor's request, the woods, and secret groves were filled with the members knowing full well, that if they returned that night without being in the Spirit, that they would meet with the re-

proof of the conductor. Many, like myself, returned to the house that night after a days supplication in the groves somewhat jaded from their days work, which had the appearance of sanctification. (According to some people's notions about sanctification.) The conductor ("Rev." J. Phillips), appreciating the jaded condition of of this people, as sanctification, remarked, that he knew God was there ready to bless their labor. And after about an hour's toil, he presented a most horrible photograph of hell and its torments. At the close of which he appealed to the sinner to "flee from the wrath to come." "Come into the altar of prayer" "flee to Christ," etc. In a few minutes the "altar" was filled with anxious inquirers. In the mean time, the members who, in view of the horrible picture presented, had entirely recovered from their jaded condition, now, at the request of the conductor, rushed into the "altar" full of zeal and anxiety for the sinners to escape from the wrath to come. The conductor called upon several (myself among them) to pray, after several prayers, he called upon Bro. Wm. Zuber a good old Methodist, who, with a little additional point, if possible, made the picture still more appalling. Several times I started to my feet with alarm; but using all my muscular power, I succeeded in retaining my position. However, in the mean time my eyes came open enough to get a glimpse of the light in the house. Upon the first glimpse I was willing to take it as a direct evidence that some one had "got religion." But upon the second evidence I was convinced. that it was

a reflection of the lights in the house and was beginning to doubt whether God gave a direct evidence to any one when another "got religion." But about this time the conductor rose to his feet and exclaimed, slapping his hands together. "Thank God. Some one has got religion, I have an evidence that some one has got through, Who is it? Who is it. I know some of you got it, Cry out and let us know who you are." By this time all were on their feet except a few mourners who were not so easily excited, still remained in their position, and some sitting on their seats, slapping their hands through the excitement, thinking they had religion."

Now, can any one doubt "Rev." Mr. Phillips' evidence that some one had "got religion?" If so, you doubt the evidence I had, and you have a reason to doubt mine; and I can vouch that his evidence was no better than mine. And I will venture to say that Mr. Phillips nor any other man ever had such an evidence in the broad open day time.

ELIAS LAND.

Groesbeck, Tex. Sept. 6th 1874.

UNION.

Where is the body of professing Christians, that dare to put forth the the plea for union of ALL Christians upon the platform they themselves occupy? That claim divine authority for such union? I know of but one body of Christians that can, consistently plead for such union. That body ask the union of all Christians upon the Bible. This is the only plea for union, and the only basis of

union that can ever be offered consistently. Let a Baptist plead for union on his platform, and at once objections are raised to his "articles of faith" thousands begin to cry out and say "we cannot subscribe to your 'articles.'" Let a Methodist plead, and the cry is against his discipline. And so with every body of professing Christians, who hold any other rule of faith or practice, than the Bible. These all differ about opinions—about creeds, but agree in the meantime that the Bible is right, and that to follow its teaching is sufficient to save. Upon that they agree. So that men are divided, not about the Bible or its teaching, but about human opinions.

JNO. T. POE.

The Cost of Coffins.

Was the name of an undertaker ever seen in the list of bankrupts? We have never found patent caskets in any schedule of assets exhibited by an assignee. Farmers are sold out. Brokers break. Companies collapse. Governments insolvent. But the fashionable undertaker flourishes and is never brought to grief except in a professional way. The dealers in metallic cases are unaffected by financial panics.

Is it because burying is a steady, unfluctuating trade, or is it that there is a wider margin of profits in coffins than in other merchandise? They ought, as necessities of life, or rather, of death, to be, like other necessities, cheap. But does not the cost of a modern sarcophagus, walnut or metallic, rank among the luxuries? There is a growing inquiry whether

this peculiar kind of joiners' work is not rated much above the usual cabinet prices.

People pay funeral bills without a word. To hesitate at a single item is counted a sign of an ignoble spirit, and to squabble over the price of a coffin would entail a disgrace upon children's children. In other purchases men examine the goods and hear the prices. They pass from shop to shop, and buy only at the best bargains. But who has the heart to inquire the cost of the coffin that must receive the first-born of your boyhood friend, far less to haggle over the price put on it by the maker. The day of mourning is not a time to pass from street to street comparing these sad forms of polished wood, and setting the price of one against the other.

There are many households in fair condition that can ill afford to lose the head of the family, and find that the burial expenses cut deeply into a year's income. Not to have a fitting funeral equipment, such as the fashion of the day requires, argues in the public mind ignorant or unworthy views, and to yield to the full tax of modern mortuary upholstery is a severe pressure upon persons even of not very limited means.

We shall hail the day with pleasure when the mode of sepulchre shall be simple, and the laying of the dead in the earth will not heavily burden the living. When "dust to dust" is so expensive, is it any wonder that the cremationists have received countenance, when they offer at a trifling outlay and in the old classic fashion, to turn "ashes to ashes."

Whoever will inaugurate a "move-

ment against expensive funerals will be a benefactor. It will be a Christian charity for the churches to begin a crusade against the cost of coffins.—*Richmond Advocate.*

Correspondence.

Bro. Lipscomb: Dear Sir.—Do not think me an intruder. I am not personally known to you, but I hope you will bear with me whilst I commend you for your independent course in reference to the departures of our brethren in holding State Meetings, District and County meetings, for the purpose of organizing to carry on Missionary purposes, etc., thereby leaving the Bible and introducing human institutions for that sacred Book. The brethren a great majority of them are with you and Bro. Franklin. We want to encourage you to contend for the Bible and the Bible alone as being sufficient for our faith and practice,

I have been a Disciple for forty years, and I deeply mourn over the innovations that are constantly pressed on us. Cry aloud and spare not.

Your brother in the Lord,

J. R. WARREN.

Stanford, Ky., Sept. 28, 1874.

Union of Baptists and Disciples.

The subject of Christian union is one of vital importance, and deserves the prayerful consideration of all Christians—one for which the Redeemer prayed, “that all which believe in me may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the

world may believe that thou hast sent me.” And for this object the Christian is taught to pray every day, “thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven;” and Paul beseeches the Corinthians, who were becoming divided, “that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” Do the Disciples advocate the union of all Christians? So have the Baptists ever done; and deeply deplored the schism resulting from the labors of Mr. Campbell and his coadjutors. Do they contend for the supremacy of the Bible in matters of faith and practice? So have the Baptists ever done; and from age to age have declared to the world what the Bible taught in contrast with the creeds of councils and human traditions. In theory all Christendom unite upon the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures—their inspiration—their authority in the settlement of all points of controversy, but differ widely in their interpretations of their doctrine. And right here division begins. All bow to the supremacy of the Bible; take it as the only inspired rule of faith and duty; are united upon it as such; but place upon its teachings constructions in irreconcilable conflict. Now these conflicting constructions form the ground-work of the divisions among the various denominations; and, for this thing there must be a remedy, or there can be no intelligent union among Christians. “How can two walk together except they be agreed?” and how can they agree without a mutual expression of their sentiments?

The Romanist claims Bible authority for priestly absolution, and for the supremacy of the See of Rome. Episcopacy claims Bible authority for its existence and rule: and so of the various Pedobaptist fraternities. Upon the inspiration of the Bible, they all stand as a unit; but are the poles asunder in their constructions upon its teachings. In these there must be union. - The Baptists have been arraigned before kings, popes, and inquisitorial courts for heresy, and in self-defence have, from time to time, made a declaration of their faith upon the great issues of the age, in contradistinction to the false doctrines held by their adversaries, and no one need be at a loss as to their views of Bible doctrine; but this is not the case with the Disciples; as an organized body, they have never made any declaration of what they conceive the Scriptures teach on the fundamental issues of the age, and hence their views are undefined and uncertain. Every reviewer of their tenets encounters this danger, and seldom escapes the charge of misrepresentation. While they concede, with others, the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures, they repudiate all creeds and confessions of faith, and, as a body, leave the world ignorant of the doctrine they hold, conceding to each individual the right to interpret them for himself. According to this principle, any one is entitled to membership with them who claims for his sentiments Scriptural support: and this claim is asserted by all, no matter how antagonistic their views! With such a body the Baptists cannot, dare not unite. Union is real and Scriptural *only* when it

exists in the construction put upon the inspired volume; otherwise, error of every hue and grade would find in the church a genial home; and she would no longer be the "pillar and ground of the truth." Universalism, Pedobaptism, and every other claiming Bible support, comes legitimately into such union! And however desirable the union of Baptists and Disciples may be, the tenets of the Disciples must be better defined than they have been, or it is vain to attempt it.

Soon after the close of the war, the Baptists and Disciples held a union conference in the city of Richmond, to see how near they could approximate each other in their sentiments, without any sacrifice of conscience. The Baptists submitted a union platform, embracing the main points of difference, which underwent a pretty full discussion; and the parties were astonished to find that they differed on so few, and agreed on so many points. But there remained on the mind of many a grave doubt as to whether the Disciples in other sections would come so near a full indorsement of Baptist views. This effort for union was a most laudable one, and I trust will be repeated. The only hope is a union upon the Baptist platform; i. e., a union in what the Bible teaches,—in the construction put upon its teachings. There is a church responsibility in the question of union which must not be ignored. That false systems of religion, of great plausibility, would be advanced, we are fully informed; and also as to the duty of the churches concerning them. To the churches of Galatia, Paul writes: "But there be some

which trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ, *Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.*" This admonition is solemnly repeated; and is proof that the churches are to discriminate between the false and the true in theology, and that a man is not entitled to membership in the church, regardless of the sentiments which he hold. Each person is left by the gospel in the exercise of a personal direction on various subjects; but there are facts to be believed, and duties to be performed, divinely submitted, where human discretion comes to an end, and duty becomes imperative. Where the gospel gives personal discretion, the churches ought not to interfere; but where it does not, the duty of churches is to enforce obedience to the divine will in all things. Church union is prerequisite to communion at the Lord's table. A valid reason against uniting with a church is a valid reason against communing with it. Without such union, the church communing is liable to violate the laws of the Lord Jesus every time she communes. Of the offending member, who will not hear the church, the Redeemer says: "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." Of whom Paul says: "With such an one, lo, not to eat." Within my acquaintance, members have been excluded from the Baptist churches, and since united with the Disciples; and should the Baptists commune with them, the law in question would be violated. This the Baptists dare not do, and it must not be expected.

Let the effort for a union be renewed and it may succeed. Do the Disciples exalt the Bible above all human creeds? so do the Baptists. Do they plead for the union of all Christians upon it? so do the Baptists. Do they demand repentance, faith and baptism, in order to church membership? so do the Baptists. Do they hold to the purity of the ministry and the independence of the churches? so do the Baptists. Are they disciples of Christ? so are the Baptists. The Baptists claim for themselves and their churches every Bible name and every Bible prerogative, known in the Scriptures, applicable to the followers of Christ in primitive times. They inherit the name "Baptist," not wholly by their own volition, but partly from their persecutor, who reproached them with being "Anabaptists," because they rejected infant baptism, and baptised such in after life, upon a credible profession of faith; for which they were charged with repeating the ordinance. This they denied, but owned that they were Baptists. They were also called the "*baptized churches*," as distinct from churches whose members were sprinkled for the gospel rite. Sentiments for which the Baptists have suffered immensely—such as the severance of church and State, liberty of conscience, opposition to clerical usurpation, infant baptism, pouring and sprinkling for the ordinance, &c.,—are now becoming exceedingly popular, and must ere long triumph.

M. ELLISON.

—*Religious Herald*.—

We give the above from the *Religious Herald*, a Baptist paper pub-

lished at Richmond, Va., for two reasons: first, because it contains some good thoughts on the subject of Union, and secondly, because there are some very objectionable features in it, about which we wish to make a few remarks. While the above writer seems to be strongly in favor of the union of Christians upon the word of God, he certainly has very vague ideas as to how it is to be brought about. He speaks as if it is to be brought about by, and based upon some universally acknowledged system of interpreting the Scriptures. We are quite sure that if Christians ever unite, it will not be upon man's interpretation of what the Scriptures mean, but it will be upon what the Scriptures actually say. Man never can make the word of God plainer than God himself has made it. Instead of trying to interpret the Scriptures into systems of doctrine, it ought to be the effort of every Bible student, to try to understand just what God has said, by applying the most literal definitions to the words of Scripture. But just so long as men attempt to give their views of the Bible in creeds, confessions of faith, articles of faith, or formulas of religion, there never can be unity among them. This writer says of the different denominations, that they are agreed as to the inspiration of the Bible, but that they "are the poles apart in their constructions of its teachings." This is very true, and always will be true, while they attempt to put constructions upon the word of God. But he says of the disciples: "While they concede, with others, the supremacy of the Scriptures, they repudiate all creeds and confessions of faith, and, as a body, leave the world ignorant of the doctrine they hold, conceding to each individual the right to interpret them for himself. According to this principle, any one is entitled to membership with them who claims for his sentiments scriptural support; and this claim is asserted by all, no matter how antagonistic their views. With such a body the Baptists cannot, dare not unite. Union is real and scriptural *only* when it exists in the construction put upon the inspired volume; otherwise, error of every hue and grade would find in the church, a genial home; and she would no longer be the 'pillar and ground of the truth.' Universalism, Pedobaptism, and every other ism claiming Bible support, comes legitimately into such union! And however desirable the union of Baptists and Disciples may be, the tenets of the Disciples must be better defined than they have been, or it is vain to attempt it." With such interpretations of our teaching as this, no one ever will understand it. This writer is either very ignorant of our teaching or else he willingly misrepresents it. We would never ourselves be willing to unite with such a people as he represents our people to be. No wonder that there are divisions, and that these divisions are perpetuated, with such men as this writer as leaders. He seems to think that because we have no creeds, no religious formulas drawn up by men, apart from the bible, that therefore our teaching cannot be understood. He never seems to think that these creeds and formulas are much harder to be understood than the bible itself, and that

these creeds are the most prominent things in all the world in making and perpetuating divisions. We cannot see how the New Testament, which reveals to us the religion of Jesus, can be made any plainer than the Lord has made it. If all who claim to be Christians will just be willing to go by what that says, then there will be union, and never till then. The word of God gives the history of Jesus as plainly as that history can give. It tells us where he was born, where he was baptized, where and how he raised Lazarus from the dead. It tells us with equal plainness where and how, and by whom he was put to death, by whom he was buried, and on what morning he rose from the dead, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. It also tells in language equally plain, that the sinner must believe the gospel, must repent of his sins, must confess the name of Jesus, and must be baptized. And to such the bible says, you are saved, are pardoned. No creed, no human formula is needed to express these things; the word of the Lord makes them as plain as man can make them. And just the same may be said of the duties of Christians, and the government and management of the church. All the wisdom of the world combined can never make these things any plainer than they now are, as recorded in the word of God. A fair translation of the original Scriptures into our language is all we need, to understand the will of God. If all Christians would go prayerfully into this sort of work, all might soon be one. But we may forever despair of union with our Baptist brethren,

while our teaching is so mis-stated and misrepresented as it is in the above article of the *Herald*. But time at present forbids that we should make a general criticism of this article, but we give it, that our brethren may see what they have to contend against, in getting the people to appreciate our efforts and aims, in trying to get the world to understand the plain word of the Lord-as it is, and to bring about a union upon that, of all Christians.

E. G. S.

ITEMS.

Eld. L. R. Sewell, son of our beloved bro. Jesse Sewell, is holding an interesting meeting at McWhitersville, a village near this city. At latest accounts there were 10 additions, with the interest still increasing. The brethren at that place have recently completed a neat and commodious house of worship.

Eld. John I. Rodgers of Kentucky will preach this week a series of discourses at the Church Street Christian church in this city. He has the reputation of being an able man, and will we hope, be greeted with large audiences.

The church at Mooresville, Ala., has engaged the services of Eld. J. M. Pickens, editor of the *Southern Christian Weekly*, for the ensuing year. We doubt not his labors with that congregation will result in much good.

The brethren at Lebanon, Tenn., are making arrangements to open their new house of worship on Lord's day the 18th inst. A cordial invitation is extended to all the brethren and friends to meet with them at that

time, and ample accommodations will be made for their reception.

A. Alsup, Jr., well-known to our readers as a frequent contributor to the Advocate was in our office on Friday last. He is attending the co-operation meeting at Murfreesboro, Tenn.

Says the "Christian:" "Sixty six persons were added to the church in the vicinity of Owingsville, Ky., during the last three weeks."

Dr. W. H. Hopson is preaching for the 17th and Olive St. Church in St. Louis.

L. B. Wilkes has retired from the editorial staff of the Apostolic Times.

Bro. Joel M. Jones writing from Cave Creek, Ark., says that the brethren are doing well in his part of the country. Many are converted and much good seed is being sown.

General News.

The Southern Republican Convention met in Chattanooga on the 18th inst. A large number of newspaper men and prominent Southern politicians are in attendance as spectators.

A destructive fire occurred in Murfreesboro on the 12th inst. The loss is estimated at \$20,000, and the insurance on the same at \$3,500.

The General Episcopal Convention has been in session during the past week in New York.

President Grant is making a tour through the South-Western States. The authorities at New Orleans have sent him a formal invitation to visit that City.

It is said that Gen. Bristow and

Mr. Jewell have determined to remove all the Officers from the Post Office and Treasury Departments in Texas.

The Republicans in La. are constantly sending reports of negro outrages to the North and say that the White Leaguers continue to hold armed meetings—all of which the whites flatly deny.

At an election held in Ga. last week 250 Democrats and 14 Republicans, were elected to the Legislature.

The Rev. G. W. Revere (col.) declines the call of the colored citizens to become a candidate for Congress, on account of his moral habits and worth unfitting him for the questionable career of a Congressman.

Ex-President A. J. addressed a large crowd in this city on Saturday evening.

DYING WELL.—A Scotch minister, when asked whether he was dying, answered, "Really, friend. I care not whether I am or not; for if I die, I shall be with God; and if I live, God will be with me."

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Is it right for Christians to aid in the Manufacture of Strong Drink.....	96e
A Request.....	96e
Answer of J. Creath to F. F. Tyler.....	96f
Is the Devil Pass?.....	96f
Queries.....	96f
Is it True?.....	96f
Gospel Success.....	96f
Swear not at All.....	96f
Mother.....	97a
More of my Experience.....	96a
Union.....	97f
The Cost of Coffins.....	67e
Correspondence.....	97f
Items.....	98f
General News.....	98a

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 42.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCT. 22, 1874.

Memoirs of Jesus.

THE SCENES AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF
THE CRUCIFIXION.

With feelings of awe and sadness we pass, in imagination, from the scene of the trial to the crucifixion of Jesus. It was but a short distance from the City, Jerusalem, to the devoted spot outside of her walls, which was to witness the expiring agonies of the Son of God.

A great crowd of people are ready to accompany the illustrious prisoner and his sinful companions to the little hill, or mountain, called Golgotha, Hebrew; *Kranion*, in Greek; *Calvaria*, in Latin; and in English, SKULL; where the great number of bones and skulls of persons executed on its summit procured for it the dolefully sounding appellation, "A Place of Skulls." To this gloomy place the soldiers are about to conduct the victim of priestly malice.

They do not appear to have taken the thorny crown from his head; but now they lay the beam of the cross upon him; and thus, wearing the crown of thorns, he goes forward car-

rying the very piece of wood on which he is to be crucified,—to which his hands are to be nailed! Cruel burden!

But it is too heavy for him. He who had been without rest or refreshment for fifteen or twenty long hours and was weakened by fasting, beating and much mental suffering, could not now, without supernatural aid, endure the weight of the cross; and he began to sink. At this moment the soldiers see a man coming in from the country,—a Cyrenian named Simon, (father of Alexander and Rufus,) and seizing him on his arrival, "they lay the cross on him, that he may carry it after Jesus."

Was it through *compassion*, that the soldiers thus relieved the meek sufferer of his cruel burden? or was it because they feared that Jesus might die on the way to Calvary, and they would not have the satisfaction of witnessing his dying agonies on the Cross? But if the hard-hearted soldiers and the heartless priests felt no sympathy for Jesus, there were many in that vast crowd of witnesses that did. For "there followed him a great number of people, and of women, who bewailed and la-

mented him." Mary, his widowed mother; John, the beloved disciple; and Peter, the Penitent man, were all there. How many incidents of the past three years and a half of the life of Jesus, were now recollected and recounted by those who had witnessed the wonderful acts of love, listened to the inimitable teaching, and enjoyed the holy companionship of the Blessed Jesus! What cries of grief and lamentation went up from that mingled, excited, surging crowd, during the solemn procession! Ever memorable occasion! Touching scene!

"But Jesus turned around, and said to them:

"Daughters of Jerusalem! do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and your children. For, look! the days are coming, in which they will say: "Blessed are the unfruitful—the wombs that never bore and the breasts that never suckled." Then they will begin to say to the mountains, "Fall on us;" and to the hills: "Cover us." For if they do these things in the green tree, what will they do in the dry?"

From this last sentence, some might conclude, that Jesus had reference to the persecutions of his followers;* meaning this: if these cruelties are practiced on me in the beginning of this revolution, what will be done to you by my enemies, at a more advanced stage of affairs?" But perhaps Clark was right in applying this prediction to that period of Jewish calamities, embraced in

the siege of Jerusalem, which took place forty years afterwards. For we can hardly think that the Christians who suffered cruel torments and martyrdom ever wished for the mountains to fall on them, or the hills to cover them! (Rev. vi. 16.)

The procession at length arrived at the appointed place of execution. The crosses had been prepared, and carried out to the hill; one for Jesus and one apiece for the two criminals. As comparatively few readers in the present age, are familiar with the manner of crucifying, as practiced in the Roman Age, it becomes necessary to give here a particular description of it.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ROMAN MANNER OF CRUCIFYING.

I would not wish, through sheer laziness, to copy what others have written and furnished to my hand. But, with reference to the manner in which the Savior was put to death by the Romans, I feel assured that I could not compose a better description of it than the following, quoted by Horne from some well written work,—perhaps Doctor Benson's "Life of Christ," to which he refers:

"After they had inflicted this customary flagellation, the Evangelist informs us that they obliged our Lord to carry to the place of execution the cross, or, at least, the transverse beam of it, on which he was to be suspended. Lacerated, therefore, with the stripes and bruises he had received, faint with the loss of blood, his spirits exhausted by the cruel insults and blows that were given him when they invested him with robes of mock royalty, and oppressed

*Jesus had said to the disciples: "if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you," But now he is addressing himself to the crowd of weeping women, some of whom with their children, would live to witness great calamities which would certainly befall his enemies and murderers.

with the incumbent weight of his cross; in these circumstances our Savior was urged along the road. * * * * * The circumstance here mentioned of our Lord bearing his cross, was agreeable to the Roman custom. Slaves and malefactors, who were condemned to this death, were compelled to carry the whole or part of the fatal gibbet on which they were destined to die. * * * * * When the malefactor had carried his cross to the place of execution, a hole was dug in the earth, in which it was to be fixed; the criminal was stripped, a stupefying potion was given him, the cross was laid on the ground, the wretch distended upon it, and four soldiers, two on each side, at the same time, were employed in driving four large nails through his hands and feet. After they had deeply fixed and riveted these nails in the wood, they elevated the cross, with the agonizing wretch upon it; and, in order to fix it more firmly and securely in the earth, they would let it violently fall into the cavity they had dug to receive it. This vehement precipitation of the cross must give the person that was nailed to it a most dreadful convulsive shock, and agitate his whole frame in a dire and most excruciating manner. These several particulars the Romans observed in the crucifixion of our Lord."†

Mark informs us that "along with him, they crucified two robbers; one on his right hand, and the other on his left;" and he reminds us, that this circumstance was a verification of the Scripture which reads: "And

he was numbered with the transgressors." (Isa. Liii. 28.)

As Jesus had been the reputed "friend of sinners,"—had sympathized and "eaten" with them,—his "religious" enemies appear to have thought it becoming, that he should die along with transgressors.

It ought to impress the sinner with a deep sense of the unbounded love of Christ for him to learn, that Jesus associated with sinners in life; was enumerated with them in death; and, in his last Will and Testament, provided for them an incorruptible inheritance in heaven, on the simple conditions of faith in him and obedience to the Gospel.

We must next pay attention to

THE TITLE ON THE CROSS.

Pilate had, in the meantime, prepared a writing, "in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, "which read as follows:

"JESUS THE NAZARENE,
KING OF THE JEWS."

Horne, on the authority of several ancient historiographers, to whose writings he refers informs us, that "it was customary for the Romans, on any extraordinary execution, to put over the head of the malefactor an inscription, denoting the crime for which he suffered. Several examples of this occur in the Roman history. * * * * * In conformity to this usage, an inscription, by Pilate's order was fixed above the head of Jesus, written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, specifying what it was that had brought him to this end. This writing was by the Romans called *titulus*, a *title*; and it is the very expression made use of by the evangelist John: 'Pilate wrote a *Title*, (*egrapse titlon*),

†See Horne's introduction to the Study of the Bible. Vol. ii. pp. 70, 71.

and put it on the cross.' (John xix, 19.)†

"Many of the Jews, therefore," says the Evangelist, "read this superscription." "Then the chief priests and the [other] Jews, [who had participated with them in the murder of Jesus,] said to Pilate:

'Do not write, "The King of the Jews." but that, "He said: 'I am the King of the Jews.''"

They were displeased with the title, which implied that the despised Nazarene, who was ignominiously dying on the cross, was actually the King of the Jews. They did not like to have the impression made on the spectators, that they had been guilty of crucifying their king. But Pilate, whom they had compelled, by their importunity, to order the execution of Jesus, contrary to his own will, and who was no doubt, influenced by a spirit of resentment, when he wrote the title, "KING OF THE JEWS," now coolly "replied:

'What I have written, I have written.'

He was not now going to change the title to please those chagrined and mortified priestly regicides. They must bear the opprobrium of murdering the Prince of Life.

JESUS PRAYS FOR HIS ENEMIES.

It was while they were crucifying him,—nailing his hands and feet to the Cross, that Jesus uttered that memorable prayer for his enemies: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they are doing."

What a prayer was this! How few words, and yet, how full of meaning! What a forgiving spirit he manifests toward his executioners! Truly, *they*

did not know they were crucifying "the Lord of life and glory." Jesus would have his Father forgive them for *this* sin. He would not have them punished on *his* account. If they perish it must be for *other* crimes—for the many sins they have committed against God.

But those touching words of prayer seem to have had little effect on either the hardened soldiers or the unfeeling populace, as we shall presently see, by observing the further proceedings of the hour.

"After the cross was erected," says Horne, "a party of soldiers was appointed to keep guard, and to attend at the place of execution, till the criminal breathed his last; thus, also we read, that a body of Roman soldiers, with a centurion, was deputed to guard our Lord and the two malefactors that were crucified with him. [Matth. xxvii. 54.]"

Mark mentions the fact, that, while crucifying Jesus, "they gave him some wine, mixed with myrrh, to drink." (xv. 23.) Matthew says: "They gave him *vinegar*, mingled with *gall*, to drink." (xx. vii. 34.) Here is a seeming contradiction. But if we consider that *vinegar* the word used for the Greek *Oxos*, simply means "sour wine," and that *myrrh* was something "bitter," we shall see the difficulty begin to vanish. And further, considering that, "gall" denotes *bitterness* and "vinegar," a particular state of wine, (the sour,) we are assured that Matthew and Mark are speaking of the same mixture.||

||This apparent contradiction has been well handled recently in the *ADVOCATE*, by Bro. Sewell. See, and read again, the article on pp. 863-4-5, current volume.

†Horne, Vol. ii. p. 70.

"The design of this potion was, by its inebriating and intoxicating quality, to blunt the edge of pain, and stun the quickness of sensibility." But Jesus, after tasting, refused to drink the mixture.

WHAT WAS DONE WITH JESUS' CLOTHING.

After the victims had all been crucified, the soldiers proceeded to divide Jesus' clothing among themselves. This was necessary to verify the following prediction of David :

"They divided my clothing among them, casting lots upon my vesture." (Ps. xxii. 18.)

This may not, by some, be regarded as a prediction ; but, if we read the whole Psalm, we shall see, that it is peculiarly applicable to the case of Jesus. Several sentences of this Psalm have been quoted by the New Covenant writers, and applied to the Savior. §

It is John that mentions this verification of Scripture. (xix. 24.) He says :

"Then the soldiers, having crucified Jesus, took his clothing, and made four pieces, to each soldier a piece. They took the coat also, but his coat was seamless, woven from the top throughout.

Then they said to one another :

"Let us not tear it, but throw lots for it, [to decide] whose it shall be."

[This was done,] that the Scripture might be fulfilled, which says : "They divided my clothing among them, and for my vesture did they throw lots." The soldiers, therefore, did these things."

§See Matth. xxvii. 46, when the 1st verse is quoted : the 48th in Luke xxiii. 34, the 23d, in Heb. ii. 12, and John xix. 37, seems to refer to the 16th. and 17th verses.

THE TIME OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

"It was the third hour (9 o'clock in the morning) when they crucified him." (Mark xv. 25.)

Clark, referring to John xix. 14-17, says that Christ was "nailed to the cross a little after *midday*." John does say, according to our version of his gospel, that it was "about the sixth hour," when the sentence was passed against Jesus. But as this contradicts Mark, the learned Wm. Smith conjectures, that John "probably reckoned from midnight," which would make it about six or seven in the morning, when Jesus was led out to be crucified. But I cannot see why John should reckon from *Midnight*, when, according the Jewish method of reckoning, the hours of the day were numbered *first, second, third*, etc., beginning at sunrise ! Besides, it would make it as much too early for the crucifixion to take place as the other supposition makes it too late. I appeal to the common sense of the reader, who contemplates all the circumstances of the crucifixion, to verify this assertion. Clark, notwithstanding the above mentioned assertion, furnishes us the data for a much more rational solution of the difficulty.

He supposes it possible, that some copyist made a mistake in transcribing John's Gospel, substituting the Greek letter *sigma*, which stood for sixth, for *gamma*, third. He even makes it appear probable that several valuable manuscripts of that Gospel have "third" instead of "sixth." This supposition appears the more natural, and therefore more reasonable, because it would be so easy for

transcribers to make such a mistake, where letters representing numbers, so much resemble each other as do those in question.

We may therefore safely accept Mark's statement as correct, and believe that John actually wrote as follows:

"It was the preparation for the Passover, and about the THIRD hour; * * * * and they took Jesus and led him away."¶

W. PINKERTON.

Tardy Justice.

Several of our papers profess to make a specialty of collecting religious news from all of the papers published. We have often wondered how they could ignore the work reported in the *Advocate* from our State and those further South. Not one tenth of it has been noticed by them. Frequently one out of a dozen reports in one number of the paper would be noticed, others ignored. Then directly some one would hold the brethren in Tennessee up as doing nothing. The *Christian*, the *Times*, the *Standard* have each of them frequently done this with the opportunities of knowing better in their reach. Recently however they seem to recognize the work. The following from the *Standard* and the *Re-*

¶ So Bro. H. T. Anderson has translated the passage,—On the subject of Various Readings of Manuscripts, an understanding of which will help one to appreciate the above solution of the difficulty in hand, I refer the reader to Gausson's work on the "Origin and inspiration of the Bible," pp. 178-197. Respecting the time of the crucifixion, I would only add in this note, that Isaac Ambrose, in his elaborate work, entitled, "Looking to Jesus," (an old book) makes the crucifixion take place between 11 and 12, A. M. (p. 391.)

view is a recognition of this. The *Christian* has also noticed the subject.

"We give our usual monthly summary of church and evangelistic reports, for September—the largest, or nearly the largest, of the year, so far. The largest number, by far, is reported from the South—principally Kentucky, Tennessee and Texas; while in all the Gulf States there is an unusual awakening."—*Standard*.

"The brethren in Tennessee have had no *outside* plans, schemes, or societies, and, we doubt not, they have, in proportion to their number, succeeded as well, in all that is Scriptural, as the same number of brethren have in any State. There has been, and is, no blowing on their part about the amount of money raised, the great conventions, missionary addresses, the numbers added, etc., etc. Still, the work moves steadily on. Bro. Lipscomb moves along unassumingly and unostentatiously, in the even tenor of his way; we hear no ado from him about any *financial crash, panic, or crisis*, in his office; yet no plan at his back, nor strong company to foot up the deficit in his publishing bills, and no sinking of money enough to start a bank! In the good providence of God the work moves on quietly and steadily, and the cause is being planted largely over the State."—*Review*.

Our brethren in Tennessee and the South do not report near all of their additions. Some have a distaste for it, thinking it savors of egotism. In this we think they are wrong. A report can be made in an egotistic, bombastic style, it can be made in a

modest, unassuming style. Let us have the reports in the Christian style. The success in Tennessee is not greater now than in former years. The success I have no doubt is greatly owing to our freedom from Plans as occasions of strife. In Kentucky the Plan is virtually dead. In many parts of the State it receives no more attention than it does in our State. In these sections the success is great also. Here we have no controversy over Plans, except as some one from a distant State comes in to agitate the subject or some man who lays the blame of his failure upon some fault of the church arrangements. The strife concerning the Plan is fiercer now than ever before in many of the States, and some of the papers. These strifes hinder the cause much more than any plan will ever aid it. The plans will always gender strife. The opposition to these plans is especially strong and bitter in the Review. Ten times as much bitterness against them there as ever was in the Advocate. Of course if our opposition through the Advocate drove Bro. Kendrick from it, the opposition of the Review, so much greater in amount and in bitterness, will drive him out of the Review. He cannot possibly remain there. These plans all gender bitterness, envy, jealousies and strifes. We congratulate our brethren that they have no occasions of strife, but may labor together unitedly and harmoniously for the truth of the gospel. They are now reaping the results of this harmonious labor. While, too, meetings of brethren are pleasant and discussion of truths are beneficial in many respects, the aggregate of time lost in attending conventions, mis-

sionary meetings and consultation meetings, especially in the best season of labor, can scarcely be compensated for by any amount of good that results from them.

Even in the consultation meetings in Tennessee this year, there has been at least the loss of a week of labor to fifty preachers, we judge, or the loss of the labor of one preacher all the time. The little Consultation Meeting at Murfreesboro spoiled a week's labor for at least ten preachers. Where is the corresponding good? The Conventions of the United States, spoil a week's labor for at least five hundred preachers. That equals the time of ten preachers all put in for the whole year. Does anybody believe these meetings ever caused half so much labor to be performed as they hinder? Think of these things.

We publish the foregoing articles for the benefit of a few croakers in our own State. They never think for themselves. They have no estimate of anything being done without swelling reports and pretentious organizations. They have no courage for quiet, unobtrusive labor themselves. They think no one else has. They habitually depreciate everything at home, magnify everything abroad, merely because they see only the glowing reports from abroad and do not see the drawbacks.

They are not of a sufficiently practical cast of mind to realize that drawbacks do exist everywhere—similar and often greater than those with which they meet at home. We wish to aid them by letting them see their brethren at home through the eyes of the *Review* and *Standard*. It will encourage them to work quietly

and faithfully. One reason why the reports show better for these States than others is, this is our season for protracted meetings. The Winter is the season further North.

D. L.

The Sin against the Holy Spirit.

As much has been said recently concerning the evil speaking against the good Spirit, it seems good to me also to say something; for the subject is by no means unimportant though, like the doctrine of depravity it does not make an individual the happier for being perfect in it.

The occasion that called forth the oracle of our Lord on the subject, was the allegation by the Pharisees, that he did not cast out demons but by Beelzebub. (Mat. 12. 22-37). Yet it was manifest to the rational mind that all his works did proceed from the good Spirit. For he argues: (ver. 33) The evil tree does not bring forth good fruit nor a good tree evil fruit. Their evil speaking was a demonstration of the doctrine. "O generation of vipers, how can ye being evil, speak good things, ver 34. Evil could not do good. Satan could not cast out Satan Thus the tenor of his parabolic teaching forces the conclusion that the allegation was false—a slander—a blasphemy against that Good Spirit, by which his works were done. Hence he says. "All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme, but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation, because they said, He hath an unclean spirit."

This seems to our mind to settle the question as to what the sin is and who, on that occasion, had committed it. That Jesus had done good they very well knew. The facts and their character they could not deny, without offering an insult to the common sense of the people. To offer such an insult would be to invoke popular indignation. Nor would it avail to say: "This man is a sinner." The people knew his life to be blameless. What shift can they make to turn the people from him? They fabricate a willful falsehood as to the source of his power. Rather than confess what they knew to be true, they ascribe to Satan the good works done by the Son of God.

When we reflect that blasphemy against the Son may be forgiven, but that against the Good Spirit never, are we to conclude that the Son is inferior to the spirit? Certainly not. The evidences of the Messiahship of Jesus may not be conclusive, as often imperfectly presented to the mind. Some may have Thomas' doubts without enjoying his opportunities. In such a case of unbelief one might sin against the Son and yet "not unto death." But whoever sees the good directed by the Holy Spirit, whether it be miracles of healing, teaching the truth, or feeding the hungry, cannot fail to discover the causes of the Good Spirit. To judge otherwise is to judge from a wicked heart; to speak otherwise is to speak contrary to common understanding. Such judging and such speaking is not only contrary to the word of God, but contrary to the light of reason, proceeds from evil motive, is willfully

wicked, and deserves eternal condemnation.

J. R. WILMETH.

How to keep our actions right.

As the actions of our lives proceed from the thoughts of our heart, in order that these actions be right, we must strive at all times to keep our thoughts right. We are responsible for our thoughts as well as our actions, Paul says, "Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought, to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10. 5. Our actions spring from the thoughts and desires of our hearts as certainly as do our words. Christ says, "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." And if our words and actions thus spring from the thoughts, how important these thoughts be properly governed and controlled. If our thoughts are constantly dwelling and running upon the pleasures of this world, we may be sure that our actions will go in that same direction. If the young Christian allows the desire of his heart to go out toward the dancing hall, his actions are very apt to be in that same direction, whenever opportunity affords. So also if we cultivate in our hearts a fondness for theatres, and such places, we are sure to go in that direction whenever we have a chance. Upon the same principle, if we set our hearts upon wealth, or worldly honors, we will surely be found working in that direction. Hence the word of the Lord requires that we shall "set our affections on things above, and not on things on

the earth." And there is certainly no one requirement in the word of God of more importance to Christians than this one. Christians should strive daily to set their hearts and affections upon such things as are agreeable to the word of the Lord. And there is no hope that we will ever be devoted Christians, unless we attend closely to the proper cultivation of our hearts. In order to do this, we must let the word of Christ dwell in us richly, in all wisdom. We must read, and meditate upon that course of life that the word of the Lord requires at our hands. The Son of God himself has given us an example of the sort of cultivation in his own life. He always had his thoughts engaged upon the great design of his mission into this world, and hence the actions of his life were ever in that direction. He went about doing good; healing the sick, casting out devils, and raising the dead. He never lost an opportunity to teach or do something good for humanity. And so if we will keep our hearts employed on something good, it will be easy to keep our actions there. Some Christians never seem to think of any thing save their own personal and selfish ends, while others are ever thoughtful and careful for the welfare of others, and for the prosperity of the Cause of the Redeemer. And if the love of God, and a desire to do good do not fill our hearts, worldly and fleshly desires will. We are not likely to be idle. We will be engaged in learning and doing the Lord's will, or in doing the will of the flesh. How important then, that we make it the daily effort of our lives, to bring our whole being

under the constant control of the word of God, so that we may not only do our duties to God, but to one another and thus do and obtain all the good that lies within our reach. All this may be easily done, if we will only attend to the proper control and cultivation of our hearts in those things that pertain to our present and everlasting happiness.

E. G. S.

Gospel Accessions.

Bro. Lipscomb: Thinking that the many readers of your excellent paper would be glad to hear of the success of the gospel, I have concluded to write a brief sketch of my labors for their information.

I left home in Robertson Co., Texas, Tuesday before the 1st Lord's day in Sept. to attend a meeting on Brewer Prairie in Freestone Co. Here I met with Bro. Blackwell, and together we preached ten days with 8 accessions, 6 by confession, and 2 from the Missionary Baptists. We began a meeting at Antioch Saturday night before the 2nd Lord's day. Preached fourteen discourses with 50 accessions—39 by confession, 3 reclaimed and 8 from the Baptists.

We then went to old Bro. Hawkins', where we preached four discourses resulting in 13 accessions, making in all 71 up to the present time. We commenced a meeting at this place on the 4th Sunday, but so far have had no additions. I will write again after I return home. Your paper is doing a great work in this State. A few with whom I meet think that you are not explicit enough on the "plan" question, but

the majority say that they are with you. You are certainly right in opposing everything human and in contending for that alone which is divine. I hope you may live long to defend the plan of which Christ is the author and in which we read that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for teaching, reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto every good work." These two words "thoroughly" and "every" cover all the ground.

B. P. S.

Mexia, Limestone Co., Tex.

Brethren L. & S.: Allow me through the columns of the Advocate to report concerning the cause of Christ in this community. We have reason to rejoice when we see the success the cause has had within the last year. One year ago last September Bro. T. Fanning set in working order a congregation of Disciples of Christ at this place, consisting of thirty-two members. We were then meeting in an old tavern in our little village. Soon after our organization we were driven out by one who claimed to have bought the place of those who had been kind enough to give us the privilege of using it, and when the tax assessor came round this same individual disowned his claim to the place. We speak of this as an illustration of the kind of opposition against which we have had to contend, yet notwithstanding all such, the brethren by a strong and earnest effort have now a neat and comfortable meeting house. It cost about eight hundred and fifty

dollars. Over seven hundred has been paid, and we think by Christmas we will be able to pay the balance.

Since our organization here we have not been able to meet regularly until recently, being without a house. We now feel much encouraged, having a house of our own where we can meet and worship unmolested. Bro. Rice Sewell has just closed a pleasant and profitable meeting at this place. He commenced on Saturday night before the 1st Lord's day in this month and delivered thirteen discourses resulting in thirteen additions to the Church; two from the Baptists, two from the Methodists, two from the Presbyterians and seven from the world. The meeting was well attended. We had good order, good attention, and good preaching. Brother Sewell is well liked here. He has made a good impression for himself and our Master's cause at this place. The brethren are anxious for him to visit them again.

Your Brother in Christ,

W. BOYD,

McWhirtersville, Davidson Co.,
Tenn. Oct. 14. 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: I commenced my protracted meetings the third Lord's day in July. At Cleburn there were 15 additions, 7 by baptism; at Caddo Grove 12 additions, 8 by baptism; at Alvarado 28, 23 by baptism; Mustang 27, 23 by baptism.

I was assisted at these meetings by brethren A. Clark and W. P. Richardson, both worthy and able men as you are well aware. I have just closed a meeting in Wise County

where I met Bro. H. L. Wilson of Maury Co., Tenn. He is a faithful and earnest Christian. The result of my meeting at this place was 10 additions, 6 by baptism. I formed the acquaintance of many good brethren and sisters, faithful in the Lord.

Some at all the above meetings were from the Baptists. Bro. Barnes of Alabama assisted me at Cleburn, preaching three discourses, but was called away by sickness.

The cause here is in good condition.

Your Bro. in the Lord,

H. D. BANTAU.

Ft. Worth, Tex., Oct. 1st, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: At a meeting held near this place, on last Lord's day, three immersed believers took membership with us on the Bible, as the only rule of faith and practice.

I rejoice in the success of the Gospel in Texas this year.

And what is remarkable, we have no "plan," save the plan set forth in the Gospel. To wit: "Let him that heareth say come," "Go preach the Gospel to every creature." And, they that are scattered abroad, go "everywhere preaching the word."

I have never seen the cause so hopeful as now, and trust that thousands may be yet added to the grand army, ere the close of 1874.

Fraternally,

JNO. T. POW.

Brethren L. & S.: The good work is still going on in Texas. In August I held three meetings with the following results. At Mantua, Collin Co., aided by Bros. McKinney and J. R. Darnall, we had forty-three

added—31 immersed and the others from the sects and by relation. At Farmington, Grayson Co., aided in the beginning by Bro. Darnall, we had a ten days' meeting resulting in thirty-one confessions—two from the Baptists and several by relation—forty-three in all. At Union, in Collin Co., I aided Bro. C. M. Wilmeth in a few days' meeting which resulted in four baptisms and one reclaimed and we hope much good otherwise. Bro. Wilmeth and I also assisted Bro. Darnall at Hackberry Grove in Collin Co., during one week's meeting which resulted in sixteen additions to the congregation—ten were immersed. In September I held a meeting at Pilot Grove, Grayson Co., which resulted in eight immersions—four united from the Baptists, one from the Presbyterians and two by commendation. Bro. H. P. Dyer was with me and aided by his able presentation of the gospel. I will be engaged in protracted efforts until December, when winter will put an end to such meetings for a few weeks.

Yours fraternally,

R. C. HORN.

McKinney, Texas, Oct. 7, 1874.

Brethren L. & S: The Success of the Gospel has been pretty good in this section for the last two months.

Since I wrote you last we had a meeting at Christian Chapel in Jackson Co. (one of the churches at which I preach) continuing five days resulting in six immersions. The principal preaching was done by Bro's. T. F. Lamar, Doster and Foster. We had one discourse from our venerable brother, Robert Mayfield. Let me recapitulate:

At Corinth, Walton County, 4
Mt. Vernon 20, Antioch, Clark 24,
Union, 5. The above are the
churches preached to by Bro. T. M.]
Foster.

Bethany, Jackson County 22
Christian Chapel 6, total 81.

I preached at the two last mentioned churches.

The brethren seem to be more alive and more determined to extend the borders of the kingdom, than they have been for years.

Yours in the one hope,

W. T. LOWE.

High Shoals, Ga. Sept. 25th 1874.

Brethren L. & S: I wrote you last from Lemalsamac, Dyer Co. Tenn. Bro. Roulhac and I continued to preach at this place without tacking anything to the Lord's plan, until fourteen were added to the Lord's army. We gave one brother a call to the ministry: Bro. W. L. A. McCorkle, and hope he will respond to the call by going to work immediately. The brethren need his work. Bro. R. and I moved from this place to Palestine, Obion Co. where we commenced a meeting embracing the fifth Lord's day in August. The brethren never asked us what district or co-operation had sent us out; neither did they want Bro. R. to do all the preaching because he was educated and I was not, for the people obeyed by my preaching as well as by his. But we worked on together until eighteen were added to the congregation at that place, and some serious difficulties between brethren, of long standing were broken down. So we think that if the brethren will go to work in earnest we left them in

better order than we found them. They have the facilities for being the best congregation in the West.

Embracing the first Sunday in September Bro. R. and I commenced a meeting at Wilsonville, six miles from Palestine. The congregation at this place numbers but few; but they are true and faithful in the master's cause meeting every Lord's day with Bro. Isaac Sewell to preside over their meeting, who has been a soldier for a good while, but is now a little the worse for wear. Our meeting closed with twelve accessions.

Bro. R. and I then took the train at Obion Station for Union City, where we separated, perhaps never to meet again. I know we had an agreeable tour together, and pray that we may have a happy meeting beyond the Jordan of death.

Hoping that my communication will not be irksome,—with the promise to write again I am your brother in the one faith, hope and love,

J. M. F. SMITHSON.

Brethren L. & S: Allow me to report through the ADVOCATE a meeting that was conducted by Bro. John Farrow and M. S. Moser commencing on Saturday before the 2nd Lord's day in Sept. The meeting continued over till Thursday night when we had to close on account of a protracted meeting that was to be held by our Methodist friends in the neighborhood. We had to hold our meeting in the woods under a shelter. The immediate result was 2 additions.

We trust there was good seed sown and that the fruits thereof may yet be gathered up. The meeting closed with interest increasing. Bro.

B. Morton has been preaching for us at this place for 2 years, monthly, but we have not as yet organized a church here, but hope it will not be long before we can build a house in which to worship. I think we can then effect an organization at this place. We have been using a school house this year, except for our protracted meeting, then we had to build a shelter in the woods. But remembering that the Groves were God's first temples we were encouraged to sing his praises and hear his word preached beneath a shelter in the grove, and for the good that was done let us give God the praise.

Yours in the one hope,

J. R. SIMS.

Cairo Crocket Co., Tenn. Sept. 28,
1864.

Golden Wedding.

On the 7th inst., we had the pleasure of attending the celebration of the golden wedding of our venerable friend, Bro. Jno. N. Mulkey who resides some four miles east of Tamaroa, Ill.; and by the request of our aged friend, we attempt the following description of the proceedings on that day.

Bro. Mulkey is 69 years of age and has been for about forty years, an earnest and faithful preacher of the Gospel. He is well-beloved by all, and many of his friends came from far and near to help celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of his marriage. He has nineteen children, forty-two grand-children, and three great grand children; making a family of sixty-four in number, only forty-eight of whom were present, some of them

being so far removed as to find it impossible to be here.

The dinner table was spread with a bounteous supply of the good things of this life, reminding us of the promise that God will not forsake those who serve him in truth. At the head of the table sat the bride and groom; at the foot, Dr. Isaac Mulkey, (brother to the bridegroom) and his wife, and on either side sat the children. Thus was the first table graced, after which we did all eat and were filled. After dinner was over, the most impressive scene of all transpired. A room was prepared, with a table in the center, on which were placed the presents intended for the bride and groom. In front of this table were seated the aged couple; and the whole assembly was invited into the room.

Dr. Mulkey, after making a few remarks appropriate to the occasion, read the names of the donors and presented the gifts. The oldest daughter, sister Jane Welch, then presented her parents with an album containing the pictures of all the family, addressing them in such an affecting manner, as to draw tears from the eyes of many assembled in the room. Then after a short prayer by Dr. Mulkey, and a benediction by the writer, the guests separated with many kind wishes for the future.

The scene just described is one of very rare occurrence in the course of human events. Bro. Mulkey seems to be enjoying very good health for a man of his age. His life has been devoted to the cause of the Master, and he is still able to do good service. May the Lord bless him in his declining years and bring him

down to his grave in peace. May he be raised up in the last day to join his large and intelligent family, and the many brethren who love him, in the sunny climes of everlasting day, where we shall meet to part no more.

Very truly yours,
G. W. PUCKETT.

A. C. Review please copy.

Courage and Cowardice.

BY REV. ASA BULLARD.

I was much interested in the story recently published in the *Congregationalist*, about a "Cowardly Boy." Such incidents are greatly needed for the instruction of that class of readers for whom it was especially intended.

Boys are very apt to get wrong ideas about courage and cowardice; they often confound the two, calling that courage which is cowardice, and that cowardice which is courage. Two or three illustrations will make this plain to all your boy readers.

George came into the house one day, all dripping wet. His mother, as she saw him, exclaimed:

"Why, George, my son, how came you so wet?"

"Why, mother, one of the boys said I 'daren't jump into the creek,' and I tell you, I am not to be dared."

Now, was it courage that led George to do that? Some boys would say it was; and that he was a brave and courageous boy. But no, George was a coward; and that was a very cowardly act. He well knew that it was wrong for him to jump into the creek with his clothes on, but he was

afraid the other boys would laugh at him, if he should stand and be dared.

Edward came strutting along up to James, and putting his fist in his face said: "Strike that if you dare!" just to see if he couldn't get him into a quarrel. Now, which would show the most real courage, for James to give him a hit and have a brutal fight, and both get wounded, or to say as he did: "Edward, if you want a quarrel, you have come to the wrong boy. I never fight, because it is wrong. You may call me a coward if you will, but I will have courage enough not to be tempted, by your ridicule, to do what I know is wrong. That was brave and courageous.

Well, a great man, Mr. A, a member of Congress, said something that offended, Mr. B. another great man. Mr. B, sent him a note and dared him to fight that is, he challenged him to fight a duel. Mr. A accepted the challenge, and they met with deadly weapons and sought to take each other's life. Now, some said Mr. A. was a man of courage, because, like the foolish boy who jumped into the creek, he wouldn't be dared. But Mr. A accepted that challenge, probably, through cowardice. He knew it was breaking a positive command of God to attempt to kill the man who dared him, but he had not courage enough to bear the tauntings of those who would say he was afraid to fight. He was a coward!

A good definition of courage is "not to be afraid to do what is right, and to be afraid to do what is wrong." The stories of Daniel and his three friends and of Joseph, give us fine examples of those who possessed true

courage, who were not afraid to do what was right and who were afraid to do what was wrong.—*Congregationalist.*

Whose are the Kingdoms of the world?

Bro. Lipscomb: In your closing remarks in reply to Bro. Jones, you say that "the Bible abundantly testifies that the kingdoms of this world are the kingdoms of Satan." I quote from memory, the number of the Advocate being misplaced or taken away; but I think I quote the idea. Will you please publish one, two, three or four of the testimonies upon which you rely for proof, for my edification and that of others? You need not present the arguments, unless you choose to do so: let us see the *testimonies*, which will be enough.

Yours in the good hope,

WARNER LAMBETH.

McKinney, Tenn Oct. 1, 1874.

Man was made ruler of this world, and as such obeyed the devil and transferred the government of the world from God to the evil one. The evil one thus became the ruler of this world, the prince of this world. Jno. 21: 33. 12: 31. 16: 11. He is called the God of this world. 2nd Cor. 4: 4. The devil in the temptation claimed the kingdoms of the world with all the glory of them as his. Said they were delivered into his hands, and offered them to Christ if he would fall down and worship him. Mat. 4, Luke 4: 5. Christ recognized the offer as a strong temptation, that caused him to suffer in resisting. Hebrews 2: 18. He could not have been tempted by the offer unless the devil had been

the real owner. He came to redeem the world: Redeem it from whom? but the prince of this world, the devil? John saw that the kingdoms of this world would become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ. They could not become such unless they were in the possession of some other being,—who but the devil is the ruler and prince of this world? The kingdoms of the earth started among a people in rebellion against God. The introduction of the human governments among God's people was rebellion against God. 1st Sam'l. 8. Christ said, My kingdom is not of this world. The world kingdoms belong to another. We might almost indefinitely multiply them. The whole mission of Christ is on the assumption that the kingdoms of the world are the kingdoms of the evil one, to be rescued from his dominion.

D. L.

Spiritual Gifts.

Editors Advocate: Please give through the Advocate the difference between that which was received from heaven by the disciples at Pentecost, Acts 2: 2, and that which was promised by Peter to those inquiring Jews upon conditions of repentance and baptism. Acts 2: 38.

Your brother,
J. R. TROUTT.

Benton, Ky.

We do not think there was any difference in the thing received. It was the same in each instance. The manner of reception was different,

The manifestation and gifts of the Spirit differed.

There was the same difference in these that there was in the bestowal of life upon Adam and Abel. Both received life, the same life from God. The manner of reception was different. One received his life direct from God, without the medium of laws or fixed conditions. The other received it through law and fixed conditions. The manifestations were different. One manifested the life and vigor of a full-grown man at once; the other, the feeble, flickering flame of infantile existence. One was the act creating full-grown men and women in the kingdom of God, before law was given to guide them. The other was the birth of babes in Christ, in accordance with the law of Christ given by the Spirit.

D. L.

Queries on Holy Spirit and Paradise.

Eds. Advocate: Did any one ever receive the gift of the Holy Ghost before his sins were remitted?

Was the thief, who hung upon the cross when our Savior did, saved? I some time since heard a Christian minister say he did believe the thief was saved, because after the Savior's resurrection, he told Mary, "touch me not, for I have not yet ascended to my Father." He had not, up to that time, gone to heaven notwithstanding, he told the thief *'this day thou shalt be with me in paradise.'*

The same minister denounced all works ever written upon Christianity. Why not *read* some man's expla-

nation of a passage of Scripture, as well as to have it given *orally*?

Yours truly,
L. D. GEIGER.

Ocala, Fla., Oct. 3, 1874.

We have instances in the Old Testament of a number of individuals being endowed with spiritual powers who were sinners and always remained so. Balaam and Balak are instances of this. Balaam's ass was also endowed by the Spirit with the power of speech. Spiritual gifts were not dependent upon the man being a servant of God. Though as a rule they were given only to those who were willing to use them to God's honor. The household of Cornelius received the gifts before they had complied with the words whereby he and his house should be saved, but not before they had exhibited a willingness to serve God. We think paradise referred to the grave. Bro. Sewell gave an article on this subject a few months ago; we, a year or two since. We cannot now discuss it.

D. L.

QUERY.

Brethren L. & S: Please give me your views through the *ADVOCATE*, of Genesis, 1: 26. "And God said, let us make man in our own image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls" &c. And in 27th verse we have "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." And 2: 5-7. We want to know whether there was a man made before God made Adam of the dust, and if we are in the image

of God, I write this for the benefit of myself and others.

M. H. HEARN.

Lewisburg, Ark. Sept. 25, 1874.

There certainly was but one man created, and that was Adam. His creation is mentioned two or three times over, but no intimation that any human beings were created but Adam and Eve. 2. Yes, man is still in the image of God. "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man." 1 Cor. 11, 7. We know it is commonly claimed among the denominations, that in the fall, Adam lost the image of God, and that none have possessed that image since that time. But Paul contradicts the whole theory by declaring that man is *in the image of God*. So long as man attempts to build theories upon inferences, instead of what the word of God says, they will lead the people into mystery and confusion. If all would let this question rest where God has left it, there would be no difficulty on the subject.

E. G. S.

Obituary.

Bros. L. & S: It is our painful duty to announce to you the death of our friend and relation Mrs. Lucinda M. Parks, formerly the consort of James H. Wilkins. She leaves a very worthy and good companion and three children and a large family connection to mourn her loss.

She was the daughter of Benjamin and Katie Pritchard, and born in Davidson County Tenn. Up to the time of the late war she was a consistent member of the Christian Church but since that time she has not been connected with any church, I suppose she would have joined the Baptist church, but for their rebaptism, in order that she might be in the church with her husband. I learn that he ad-

vised her to unite with her own church. She was born June 4th 1830, and departed this life. Sept. 20th 1874.

W. N. MCCAIN,

COLD WATER DEPOT, MISS. OCT. 1st. 1874.

Walter Carruth was born in March 1812 and died Sept. 12th 1874. He was the last of four brothers to leave this earth. He was identified with the reformation at an early day, and lived a faithful Christian until the Heavenly Father called him home,

He was a quiet and unassuming man with kindness of heart unequalled. I doubt whether a more patient man has lived since Job. I have known him ever since I can remember and never saw him out of humor with any one. He has lived with his wife for near fifty years and never gave her a cross word. He ruled his house by love, and his children loved him. He had truly learned in whatever state he was to be content. He never murmured at any thing. He was an active man—working hard to support his family. He could always find work to do. In his final sickness, which lasted nearly two weeks, he was quiet, never complaining of pain or fear. He loved the assembly of the saints and often rode several miles in the heat of Summer to be with them. He leaves his aged companion and a family of Children behind who will feel his loss. Let them imitate his example and meet him in the land beyond the river of death.

R. C. HORN.

McKINNEY TEXAS OCT. 1875,

Died at our father's residence in Bedford Co. Tenn., on the 15th of August 1874, brother John Coop who obeyed the Gospel under the teaching of brother Smith Bowlin in 1873. since he has lived an exemplary life. Though his sufferings were great, he bore them with all fortitude and patience and said he was prepared to die." He was still young, in his 28th year, and has left a kind father, mother, brothers and sisters, who loved him dearly. Dark indeed would this world be if it was not for the resurrection from the grave and hope of a life where death never goes. He is gone from us.

Peaceful be thy rest dear brother, till the last trump shall call us all to the Judgment seat of Christ.

Farewell dear brother we will soon meet again,

Where trials and sorrows, afflictions and pain

Will no longer annoy the saints of the Lord.

But glory and honor will be their reward.

JANE COOP.

OCTOBER 10th 1874.

Wayside Words.

Good, kind, true, holy words dropped in conversation may be little thought of, but they are like seeds of flower or fruitful tree falling by the wayside, borne by some bird afar, haply thereafter to fringe with beauty some barren mountain-side, or to make glad some lonely wilderness.

Our imagination so magnifies this present existence by the power of continual reflection on it, and so attenuates eternity by not thinking of it at all, that we reduce an eternity to nothingness, and expand a mere nothing to eternity; and this habit is so inveterately rooted in us that all the force of reason can not induce us to lay it aside.

Let amusements fill up the chinks of your existence, not the great spaces thereof. Let your pleasures be taken as Daniel took his prayers—with his windows open; pleasures which need not cause a single blush on an ingenuous cheek.

God uses consecrated lips. Consecration is the secret of power with God. This is not for the few. All the Lord's people may be prophets. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. God sets high estimate on the speaking of his truth. It has pleased him that men shall be saved by the foolishness of preaching. Power waits to be claimed.

As the waters of the river continually descend until they are swallowed up in the ocean, so the Christian life, leaving worldly pomp, and pride, and self-esteem, sweetly flows through the vale of humility, until mingled with the innumerable host which stands before the throne.

One good action, one temptation resisted and overcome, one sacrifice of desire, of interest, purely for conscience' sake, will prove a cordial for low spirits beyond what either indulgence, or diversion, or company can do for them.

You can never catch the word that has once gone out of your lips. Once spoken, it is out of your reach; try your best, you can never recall it. Therefore, take care what you say. Never speak an unkind word, an impure word, a profane word.—*Selected.*

I have often thought how the good people who preach about the Apostle Paul, and regard him as the greatest luminary of the Church, would feel if he should come into their town just as he used to go to Corinth and Philippi eighteen centuries ago—on foot and inquiring for a tent-maker's shop that he might work at his trade. Would the ministers and elders call on the journeyman tent-maker? Would he be invited to speak in the fashionable churches? The whole spirit of the Bible is opposed to this growing feeling of our age in regard to manual labor, and political economy teaches that productive industry, which adds to the real wealth of the nation, ought to be honored. Without it we would soon become a nation of spendthrifts and then of paupers. God is a great worker. He is making something—nay, ten thousand things—all the time. The man who toils to develop the resources of the earth, to beautify it, to make it a pleasanter home for any portion of the race, is a co-worker with God, and whoever despises him because he works would despise for the same reason the

Creator. Away, then, with this silly idea that idleness is more genteel than toil—that the soft hand which indicates uselessness is more honorable than the hard hand of industry.

—*Selected.*

No More Room.

A dear brother recently converted, who, we trust, has truly given his whole life to the Lord, said, while speaking of the dealings of the Lord with him, as an illustration of the great change that had come over his life: "I was going out of the city the other week, for a few days of recreation, and when I went to pack my valise I was struck with this fact: heretofore I was always in the habit of putting in a small flask of brandy, and some cigars, pipe and tobacco, but somehow I seemed to forget all about the brandy, and, indeed, I had no room in my bag for it, and as for the tobacco, instead I put in my little pocket Bible, and so, during my absence, instead of spending an hour after breakfast in smoking, I spent it in reading that precious book." What a change was this! Room for the Lord, but no more room for brandy and tobacco. And so, dear friends, if we let the Lord tully into our lives, we will find that there is no more room for many things that heretofore "we always took with us."—*The Christian.*

THE VALUE OF MEN.

Not the money value, though that has its uses. We speak rather of worth to the world. A good, capable man, working with a sincere purpose

to make his fellows better, is one of our most precious possessions. Nor is he the product of a single day. Laborious years of self-culture, moral discipline, resistance to temptation, enter into his preparation for the service of mankind. He cannot be had to order, but is a growth, and only as a growth before our eyes commands the confidence which is one of the sources of power.

It is to the advantage of the world if such men are properly placed where they can do their very best; it is a still greater advantage if their lives are prolonged till the full maturity of their power is reached. It has been said of John Quincy Adams that, but for the last years of life which he spent in the House of Representatives, he would have been known in history only as a respectable placeman. In those years he taught the country a lesson in justice by fighting the battle of justice as the advocate of the oppressed. Fighting, too, almost alone, and with a courage which no majorities could intimidate, his position became one of rare sublimity. England is now governed by a premier of seventy years, who has all his life been sneered at as an adventurer, but who has all these years kept on growing; his antagonist is nearly a septuagenarian, yet turns from public duty to his books with the zest of a young student. Had John Wesley died at fifty the fruit of his life and labors would have perished. He was near forty when he preached his first sermon in the open air, sixty six when he sent the first preachers to America, and eighty one when he signed the "Deed of Declaration" and organized the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The fact most visible in the history of American Methodism at its present period is the shortness of the lives of its most capable men. As a rule, they quit us early. Robert Emory, one of the most finely endowed preachers the church has ever known, died in his thirty-fourth year; died, too, of consumption brought on by excessive labor. Olin, Floy, McClintock, Kingsley, Thomson, Clark, Hagany, Nadal, Eddy and Cookman were all under sixty years when they ceased at once to work and live.

In the determination of the length of the life of every human being, there is a supernatural agency, which we usually speak of as providence. We cannot always trace the extent to which each of these is operative in any given case. When, however, so many of the strongest fail in "heart and strength" before they have filled the measure of life, there must be some cause for such a fact in the character of the times. One presumable cause is this: the possibilities of human achievement have been, in a century, multiplied infinitely, but the human frame is capable of no more strain now than in other ages of the world. When John Wesley started out in midwinter on his e-back towards Newcastle, facing the cold wind and sleet, he was working under the very conditions most conservative of health. As his progress was of necessity slow, he had to be content with a deliberate working out of his plans. His exposure to the weather every day braced his frame, and gave his nerves the hardness of steel. It is not surprising that he was elastic, buoyant, and long

lived. A modern Wesley would have rushed to Newcastle in an express train, rushed back to London inside of a week, then have been again to some other point; would have carried on on a correspondence with half the world by telegraph; would have, in short, attempted ten times as much in a given period. Ten times as much undertaken should be accompanied, to keep the balance even, with ten times more of strength than the human body could boast of a hundred years ago; but this increase has not been granted. The implements with which the modern man works continually betray him to his undoing. He handles the resources of a demi-god; but he is all the time only a weak human creature. A hundred years ago the eagerness of men for results was held in check by the conditions under which they wrought. The resources of modern civilization are too much for us; our omniscience and omnipotence recoil upon us, and fling us down broken to the earth.

For this reason, our cemeteries are filling with men who have not lived out their days, and every country in Europe is acquainted with the American who "has overdone the thing," and is wandering from land to land in quest of health. Most commonly, it is for him an elusive chase after the impossible. It is all nonsense to make light of these losses by saying that it makes very little difference whether choice men live long or not. It does make a great difference. The world needs its best men, and can poorly afford to spare them.—*The Methodist.*

Being His Own Pilot.

A bright boy who loved the sea entered on a sailor's life when very young. He rose to quick promotion, and while quite a young man was made the master of a ship. One day a passenger spoke to him upon the voyage, and asked if he should anchor off a certain headland, supposing he would anchor there, and telegraph for a pilot to take the vessel into port. "Anchor! no: not I. I mean to be in dock with the morning tide." "I thought perhaps you would signal for a pilot." "I am my own pilot," was the curt reply.

Intent upon reaching port by morning, he took a narrow channel to save distance. Old, bronzed, gray-headed seaman turned their swarthy faces to the sky, which boded squally weather, and shook their heads. Cautious passengers went to the young captain, and besought him to take the wider course; but he only laughed at their fears, and repeated his promise to be in dock at daybreak. He was ashore before daybreak.

We need not describe a storm at sea, the alarm of breakers shouted hoarsely through the wind, and the wild orders to get the life-boats manned. Enough to say that the captain was ashore earlier than he promised—tossed sportively upon some weedy beach, a dead thing that the waves were weary of—and his queenly ship and costly freight were scattered over the surfy acres of an angry sea. How was this? The glory of that young man was his strength; but he was his own pilot. His own pilot! There was his blunder—fatal, suicidal blunder.

O, young men, beware of being your own pilots! Take the true and able Pilot on board, who can stride upon those waves, who can speak, "Peace, be still," to that rough Boreas, so that, "with Christ in the vessel, you may smile at the storm." To be emptied of self, that is your need. Send a message to heaven for help. Telegraph for a pilot. You will not ask in vain. And, encouraged by the help that is vouchsafed once, you will ask again, and seek grace to help in every time of need.—*Selected.*

What Shall we Offer?

The wise may bring their learning,
The rich may bring their wealth,
And some may bring their greatness,
And some bring strength and health,
We, too, would bring our treasures,
To offer to the King:
We have no wealth or learning—
What shall we children bring?

We'll bring Him hearts that love Him,
We'll bring him thankful praise,
And young souls meekly striving
To walk in holy ways.
And these shall be the treasures
We offer to the King,
And these are the gifts that even
The poorest child may bring.

We'll bring the little duties
We have to do each day;
We'll try our best to please Him
At home, at school, at play.
And better are these treasures
To offer to our King
Than richest gifts without them,
Yet these a child may bring.

Now glory to the Father.
And glory ever be
To Christ, the loving Savior,
Who loved, a child like me,
And glory to the Spirit—
O Three in One—our King—
Accept, 'mid angels praises.
The praise a child may bring.

ITEMS.

The brethren in Augusta, Ga., are

building a new house of worship, which will cost, including grounds, parsonage, etc., not less than \$100,000

We learn from private sources that Eld. Jesse Sewell recently held a successful meeting for the Church at Bean's Creek, Franklin Co., Tenn., the result of which was 18 additions to the congregation. Bro. Sewell, who has been laboring for that congregation for several years past, preached his farewell sermon to them on the 11th inst. He purposes moving this Autumn, from his present home in Warren Co., to Lebanon, Tenn.

Eld. David Walk, of Memphis, Tenn., has been lecturing for the Sunday School of the First Christian Church in Chicago. While speaking of lectures, we must say that the one delivered on Sunday last by Eld. John I. Rogers to the Sunday-School of the Christian Church in this city, cannot be excelled. Bro. Rogers' style is earnest and simple, and his effort was appreciated by both young and old.

Says the *Christian Union*: "Once in a while there comes to light some man with an old fashioned, squeamish, utterly unpractical regard for consistency and truthfulness. This time it is President Jocelyn of Albion College, Mich., who declines a nomination for Governor because "With the ordination vows of an itinerant minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church upon me, I feel that I have no right to become a candidate for any position to which I cannot be appointed by the proper authorities of the Church." And this is in

the United States in the nineteenth century!"

Bro. J. M. F. Smithson was in our office on Monday last. He reports 11 additions at his recent meeting in Columbia Tenn.

We hope that our friends every will bear in mind that we will send the last ten numbers of the present vol. to all new subscribers who send in their subscriptions for 1875 by Nov. 1st.

Constant reports come to us of the flourishing condition of the cause of Christ in Texas, and as a proof that the reports are true we refer our readers to "Church News" in the ADVOCATE of this week.

General News.

Nashville, Oct. 20: At 1 o'clock this morning a woman named Mrs. J. S. Hunter, while in a state of temporary aberration of mind jumped from a window of the second story of the Franklin House, and it is thought, received fatal injuries.

The Jewish fair, for the benefit of the new Synagogue now in course of erection on Vine Street will open to-night.

The Exposition will continue a week longer than the time first announced for it to close. The mayor and city council of Evansville will visit it to-morrow. Among the attractions on Thursday night, there will be a vote taken for the finest girl baby from sixteen years old and upwards.

The building of the Nashville Cotton Seed Oil Company was partially destroyed by fire on Saturday night. It was heavily insured.

Cotton quiet and steady to-day. Low middling 13½.

A majority of the States where elections were held last week went Democratic. The Democrats are beginning to think it barely possible that they will have a majority in the next house of Representatives.

New York, Oct. 19: A Washington dispatch to the Tribune says the conservatives of South Carolina are circulating a petition soliciting the Federal Government to resume military control of the State.

LOUISVILLE OCT. 19.—The convention called to consider the move of the Capit o' from Washington to St. Louis meets in this city to-morrow. But few delegates have arrived.

FOREIGN.

Count Von Arnim, the German ambassador to France, who had been intriguing to supplant Bismarck as Chancellor, is reported to be in close confinement awaiting his trial.

The column Vendome, which is being rebuilt will be completed next month. The statue of Napoleon will be placed on the monument.

Mr. Buckland the correspondent of the New York Times has been shot by the Spanish Republicans. It is supposed that he was shot on pretense that he was a spy.

A Famine is prevailing in portions of Russia.

What can be sweeter to a teacher of youth than the consciousness that his efforts have been rewarded with glittering success and that he has had a part in ennobling the future society of his country? A Sunday-school teacher at Alton, Illinois, can scarce-

ly be said to possess that radiant satisfaction. After a very long and beautiful moral lecture, it occurred to him furthermore to adorn it by desiring all those scholars to stand up who intended to visit the wicked, soul-destroying circus. All but a little lame girl bounded to their feet.
—N. Y. Tribune.

We would call the attention of our readers to the advertisement of Horace Waters & Son, headed, "Water's Concerto Parlor Organs," and for a description of them we can't do better than to copy the following :

"THE WATERS' CONCERTO PARLOR ORGANS.—We are glad to chronicle any new thing, or any improvement upon an old one, that tends to popularize music by rendering its study either easier or more attractive. Lately our attention has been called to a new patented stop added to the Waters Reed Organ, called the Concerto Stop. It is so voiced as to have a tone like a full, rich alto voice; it is especially 'human' in its tone. It is powerful as well as sweet, and when we heard it, we were in doubt whether we liked it best in Solo, or with Full Organ. We regard this as a valuable addition to the Reed Organ.—*Rural New Yorker.*

"John," said a clergyman to his man, "you should become a teetotaler; you have been drinking again to-day." "Do you ever take a drop yourself, meenister?" "Yes, John; but look at your circumstances and mine." "Very true, sir," says John; "but can you tell me how the streets of Jerusalem were kept so clean?" "No, John, I cannot tell you that."

"Well, sir, it was just because every one kept his ain door clean."

A Good Time.

A newspaper correspondent met a city boot black at one of the smaller summer resorts, and writes thus of him :

"Why you're a new comer, aren't you? haven't seen you before," he remarked to a lad of about twelve years, as he was giving him a shine the other day.

"Yes, sir; ain't been here before, but took it in this trip. Lot's of coal here, sir."

"Yes, where are you from?"

"Oh, I'm on my summer trip. I'm from New York—always take a run out o' town in the summer—done it for I d'n know how long. Like the country for a while."

"Well, are you having a good time?"

"Having a good tim? (with a little laugh) Why m' dinner cost me 70 cents to day—had a beefsteak and turmaters and rice puddin, an' got 35 cents yet. Umph! a good time? now you're a shoutin'."

He was the happiest summer tourist we have seen this season, and his cash capital was 35 cents, but who can compute his satisfaction over that "beefsteak, turmaters an' rice puddin' "?—*Selected.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Memoirs of Jesus.....	984
Tardy Justice.....	989
The sin against the Holy Spirit.....	990
How to keep our actions right.....	991
Gospel Success.....	992
Colden Weeding.....	995
Courage and Cowardice.....	996
Whose are the kingdoms the world.....	999
Spiritual Gifts.....	998
Queries on Holy Spirit and Paradise.....	998
Query	999
Obituaries	999
Wayside Words.....	1000
No More Room.....	1000
The Value of Man.....	1003
Being his own Pilot.....	1003
What shall we offer.	1004
Items.....n.....	1004
General News.....	1005

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 43.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, OCT. 29, 1874.

Strange Things.

Bro. Lipscomb: Ill health of myself and family, my school duties, and a hesitancy in deciding the proper course to pursue in our discussion, have delayed a response to your labored effort to escape the absurdities shown in my articles.

Following the injunction "to avoid contention about words to no profit," I had concluded to pass over your sophistries and proceed, at once, to the proof of your proposition, "Is service on the Jury by a Christian, disobedience to God!" but, since Bro. Smithson has pronounced your examination of my article "certainly overwhelming" I am constrained to show that if overwhelmed I am not drowned, and that "truth, though crushed to earth, may rise again." There is one thing I am free to confess. It is exceedingly discouraging to argue with an opponent who, after using *twice my space* in showing my errors, should exclaim "the work is too easily done to keep up interest." After such "a feast of fat things" well may you exclaim with Solomon, "The full soul loatheth an honey-comb."

Whether equal space is just and right *now* I cannot say, but I well remember the time when A. Campbell and the men of *his day* thought so. There were other little items in their code of ethics which I find have been repeated in modern times, but of these I shall not now speak

Your effort to escape the absurdity to which your first proposition was reduced, would be laughable indeed, did it not come from a "Master in Israel" and were it not pronounced "overwhelming" by more than one. You ignore altogether the import of the word *punishment* when you say, "No man is punished for being white, no man is punished for being black—therefore no man is ever punished," and that, "that is Bro. Jones reasoning applied to these premises." Now I hope to show to your readers that this is not my reasoning. Webster defines *punishment*. "Any pain or suffering inflicted upon a person for a crime or offense." Worcester says substantially the same. Now a crime or offense is a transgression of law, a transgression of law is sin, to sin is to be bad.

Hence punishment is inflicted be-

cause men are bad. This comports with what Paul says; first Timothy, i, 9; "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers, murderers of mothers, for manslayers," &c. This settles the question with all who prefer the authority of Paul to that of Bro. Lipscomb. But Bro. L. will doubtless still ask wherein his *white* and *black* argument fails him. It is here. It is no crime to be white, it is no crime to be black, hence no one is punished for being either. But punishment implies a crime, to be a criminal is to be bad and to entitle either one to punishment. But to deny that the bad are punished is to deny punishment altogether, for the good cannot be punished in the true sense of the term. The good may suffer pain, but then it cannot be punishment for they are free from crime, therefore cannot be punished for it.

But to show that my logic is not at fault, let us put Bro. L.'s syllogism about males and females alongside my argument about the good and the bad.

J. Punishment is pain inflicted for crime or for being bad.

L. Punishment is pain inflicted for being males.

J. Human beings are either good or bad.

L. Human beings are either males or females.

J. Therefore to any the punishment of both good and bad is to any punishment altogether.

L. Therefore to deny the punishment of both males and females is not to deny punishment altogether.

Bro. Lipscomb surely can see from this that his fancy consists in denying in the minor premise what is affirmed in the major, and then in his answer about males and females, white and black, introducing what is not included in the major.

But Bro. Lipscomb insists that he uses the terms good and bad "in a Scriptural or religious sense." Let us see, "Governments do not punish men because they are Scripturally or religiously good or bad." Bro. Ramsey was "Scripturally or religiously" good or bad. Therefore the fine, which is "the mildest form of persecution," imposed by Judge Hicker-son was not inflicted because Bro. Ramsey was either good or bad "Scripturally or religiously." If not because he was good religiously, then was Bro. Ramsey not persecuted. No help for you Bro. L. By your own logic you are compelled to surrender your first proposition or the pet idea of Bro. R.'s persecution. Upon which horn of the dilemma will you die? Either is death to your theory.

You "wholly dissent" from my argument about obedience, and say; "*Obedience to human law is the point.* Is it necessarily good, is disobedience necessarily evil?" Our brother assumes it is. We deny, and in the next column you say: "Neither morality nor immorality, neither goodness nor badness attaches necessarily to obedience or disobedience to human law." Here, for once, we have a clear issue. Now for the proof.

To be Scripturally good or bad is to obey or disobey the Scriptures. The Scriptures either authorize obedience to human law or they do not. If they authorize obedience then it is Scrip-

turally good to obey, and bad to disobey. If they forbid obedience to human governments, then, it is Scripturally good to disobey and bad to obey. Therefore, whether the Scriptures command or prohibit obedience to human governments, our actions in the premises must be good or bad "Scripturally or religiously." But this you admit in your exhortation to Bro. Ramsey—"We are bound for conscience sake (conscience toward God) to do all that God requires, to avoid all that he prohibits." How can conscience be bound and yet no morality attach? Then my second point is established beyond cavil, that goodness or badness attaches *necessarily* to every act of obedience or disobedience to human governments. How important then that we know the will of God in the matter.

But let us admit for a moment that Bro. Lipscomb's proposition is true, that "goodness or badness does not necessarily attach "to obedience or disobedience to human government." Then it was not *necessarily* a good act in Bro. Ramsey to disobey, nor would it have been, necessarily, a bad action to obey. Those who vote and serve as jurors are not *necessarily* wrong! Thank you Bro. L. for this concession. It is almost "overwhelming"—almost "a feast of fat things"!

"Goodness or badness does not *necessarily* attach!" Then I suppose it may *accidentally* attach. By what accident? Do we find an answer in this language? "Bro. Ramsey believes God's law forbids his serving as a juror: "To him that esteemeth a thing unclean, to him it is unclean." Rom. xiv. 14. It was then wrong to

Bro. Ramsey at least. Now if Bro. R's believing a thing to be wrong made it wrong to him, my believing a thing to be right makes it right to me. Hence while I believe God's word allows me to vote and serve as juror, it is right in me to do so. Here again my brother has no means to escape, but to abandon his pretext or to deny to me the same right of opiun granted to Bro. Ramsey. This he cannot do.

Bro. Lipscomb thinks I did him injustice in quoting him as saying, the fines &c. of governments were inflicted "for refusing to obey when they conflict with a man's convictions of duty to his maker." He forgets that I said he "might not mean all this, but if he did not, let him explain? "Our purpose was to show that the State of Tennessee had used the same punishment in persecuting Bro. Ramsey for his religion that had been used by other governments in other persecutions." Here Bro. L. assumes the very thing I had denied and proven by Webster to be untrue. Yet he can chide me for assuming things to be proven. The readers will see that the persecution of Bro Ramsey has yet to be shown.

Bro. Lipscomb says, "Bro. Jones' style is here insulting to Bro. Ramsey," and adds a number of reflections altogether gratuitous. Bro. Ramsey, or any one else not blinded by a mania for a pet theory, can see that I only used his name as a means of contrasting Paul and Peter with Bro. Lipscomb and thereby showing Bro. L.'s absurdities, which I had a right to do as Bro. L. had volunteered as the champion of Bro. R. and had labored so hard

to wreath his brow with a martyr's chaplet. No, I can assure you that there was not the least intention or desire of reflecting upon, or insulting an old school-mate, for whose piety I have always had the highest regard; nor did I dream that placing his name between Bro. Lipscomb and Paul would be the least suffering to any ones feelings. No sir; the reader can see where the hurt is. It is not in the use of the name but in the "glaring absurdity" manifested by the contrast. How long Bro. L. since you found out, "This style adds nothing to the force of an argument (?) It helps truth nothing (?) It only shows a disposition to wound the feelings without a cause," (?) Having made the discovery why was your next sentence: "Bro. Jones assumes that his interpretation of Paul and Peter was infallibly right and mine and Bro. Ramsey's wrong." ? And this too when I had not attempted an interpretation—but at the close of my article said, "Truth must be somewhere, let us try to find it. Is it assuming infallibility to ask you to make your words or views harmonize with Paul? Can anything smack more of infallibility than this? "Now we say that Paul teaches precisely the same thing that we do." "We believe and teach exactly what Paul teaches in every point." (!) "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established" !! Who now dares to question Bro. L.'s correctness?

Bro. Lipscomb says we do Webster injustice and make him say what he does not mean. That the reader may know how this is, we quote again.

"Persecute, v. t. 1. In a *general*

sense, to pursue in a manner to injure, vex, or afflict; to harass with unjust punishment or penalties for supposed offenses; to inflict pain from hatred or malignity.

2. *Appropriately*, to afflict harass or destroy for adherence to a particular creed or system of religious principles, or to a mode of worship. Thus Nero persecuted the Christians by crucifying some, burning others, and condemning others to be worried by dogs.

PERSECUTION, n. The act or practice of persecuting; the infliction of pain, punishment or death, upon others unjustly, particularly for adhering to a religious creed or mode of worship, either by way of penalty, or for compelling them to renounce their principles."

Worcester says substantially the same. Hence it is clear that I did no violence to Mr. Webster, but based my argument upon what he said was the *appropriate* meaning of the word and which he illustrated by referring to Nero.

Will Bro. L. class Webster and Worcester with my "partisan historians"? Will he still insist upon a meaning different from the one which the great Lexicographer of the world says is *appropriate*? If he prefers an inappropriate meaning it is no fault of mine. But this is only a type of the argument by which I have been "overwhelmed"

Bro. Lipscomb consumes a large portion of his space in charging upon me small things that cannot be found in my article, nor be deduced from anything in it; such as, "go beyond Paul," "obey the laws because there is good in them," "he is making a

verbal criticism, a display of sharpness," "he strives to show that we are not a very critically correct writer," &c., all of which may tickle the ears of some but cannot, as I said before, be found in anything heretofore said.

I have advanced no theory, have not advised to go beyond Peter, Paul or any other Bible writer, have made no verbal criticisms of any one: but I have shown the discrepancy between Paul and Bro. L. and called for explanations and have received the assertion that the apostles and even Christ might be put in the same category! That "moral good caused Christ and the apostles to violate, disobey law"! And this too from him who "teaches exactly what Paul teaches in every point"! Bro. L. says Christ violated law. Paul says the transgression of the law is sin. Therefore Christ was a sinner if Bro. L.'s position be true. But it is not true for "He knew no sin," "was tempted as we, sin excepted." And now I demand the proof that Christ violated any law of a political or religious government. Not only this, but I want the proof that human governments are a part of, or constitute, the Devil's kingdom. Bro. Ramsey tried to show it, but failed, and now Bro. L. re-affirms the proposition. Let us have the chapter and verse. Remember it is much easier to assert than to prove, and notwithstanding this you "teach what Paul teaches in every point." You will pardon me for asking for more than a mere diction for your own.

This much I have said on the main points in your reply to show that however plausible your argu-

ments may seem they are not only specious but absurd in the extreme, and that if it were proper I might go on to the last item however insignificant. But there is a shorter road to the end of our controversy which I propose, by your leave, to take. That is to accept your proposition to discuss the question, "*Is service on the Jury by a Christian disobedience to God*"? You affirm, I deny. Now my dear brother let us have no beating of the bush. Come square up to the question. Show us God's law forbidding such service and I will walk hand in hand with you and Bro. Ramsey, even if it be to the stake, in obeying God rather than man. If there be such a law you surely can show it. When this is disposed of we can then dispose of the voting question and any others that may be deemed important.

Reader, a word to you and I have done. I have aimed to be brief and have not quoted as freely from preceding articles as may be deemed proper, nor have I examined all the points made by Bro. L. because I desired to avoid a war of words. If you will re-read you will find that my aim has been to show that much assumption and fallacy have pervaded the argumentation of those who oppose voting &c. To get rid of this has been my aim, so far, without committing myself directly to either side of the question. Bro. Lipscomb hastily concludes that I believe so and so, and affirms or denies for me as suits his temper, and because he demolished his men of straw so easily he vainly believes he has won a victory. But "let not him that taketh up his armor boast as he that layeth

it down." We have now a clear and simple question that demands no extraneous matter, and so far as I am concerned shall not be encumbered by it. As I said before so say I now: Truth must be somewhere, let us try to find it.

I. N. JONES.

The foregoing document surprises us in several particulars. In the first place, Bro. Jones says he has taken no position on the question; that he has committed himself to neither side of the question directly. He has been only throwing in objections to our teaching. Yet he had concluded to write no more until Bro. Smithson said he was overwhelmed. We do not see how this would develop the truth on this subject. He had written that he thought the true position had not been presented on the subject, we invited him to present it. He wrote that article to do so. But now it was only an exposure of our error, no presentation of the truth. We do not understand that after the original proposition. Next we are surprised at Bro. Jones' complaint about space. Have we refused him any space? Have we limited him? It is true, we occupied more space than he did, but had we refused to let him have as much space as he desired? Did Alexander Campbell ever complain of another's occupying more space than he did, when all the space he asked was given, everything he wrote was published? Did he or any other man ever confine himself to the same space in replying to objections and challenges for proof that was occupied in making them? Bro. Jones knows he never did.

Everybody knows it takes frequently ten times as much space to answer an objection as to make it, to give the proof as to challenge it. Again, Alexander Campbell never yet put himself in the place of a mere objector, as Bro. Jones does. He never objected to a position without manfully affirming the truth. Not he. If Bro. Jones intends to merely object, and affirm no truth, he is fairly and justly entitled to only half space with a contestant, who both affirms truth and meets objections. He does but half work and that the easier half, a destructionist merely, not a builder of a discussion. We cannot see how a man seeking to present or elicit truth can occupy such a position. It is an unfair advantage of a disputant. Alexander Campbell's bold, fearless, truth-loving nature never allowed him to occupy such a position. Then plainly the complaint is child's twaddle.

Bro. Jones goes back to his rich criticism that because men were not punished for being either good or bad, nobody could be punished, and thinks he finds an escape from the absurdity of his reasoning, by finding that when suffering was inflicted, it was only punishment when inflicted for a crime. But a good man is guilty of no crime, therefore although he suffers he is not punished. That certainly mends the matter! He abandons then the statement, which he volunteered specially to defend, that formerly government punished good men, now it punishes bad. To defend that proposition, against my objection, was the special object of his essay. But now he has turned against Bro. Walling too, and instead

of two against one, to which he demurred, he has given us three against one, or three against two, he being one on each side. We tip our beaver to you on that feat in logic. But our brother imposes on himself here by a fallacy that we are sure will impose upon no one else.

Punishment is suffering inflicted for a crime. Paul punished the Christians in every synagogue, was on his way to Damascus to punish them. But who judges as to whether it is a crime? The government who inflicts or the individual who is inflicted? Who decided these Christians guilty of crime? Certainly not themselves. If the latter, not often is punishment inflicted. Paul adjudged them guilty and punished them. But government never intentionally inflicted suffering without believing it for crime against itself. That is, the design is not to cause suffering, unless it believes crime committed. When Christ violated the law of the Jews, which forbade any one making himself the Son of God under penalty of death—according to that law he was guilty of a crime, and for this crime against their law they punished him with death. The Jews said we have a law and by our law he ought to die. They were judges of their own law. He violated the Roman law under which he lived, which declared that there were many Gods by maintaining in his life and death that there is only one true and living God. To those who held these laws as standards of right, Christ was guilty of a crime. Suffering for lack of fealty to those laws was punishment inflicted by these governments. They were punished then without

being guilty of a crime against God. These examples must suffice. All suffering intentionally inflicted by government, is punishment. The good or the bad are punished as the one or the other violate the laws of the land. The thief was punished and Christ was punished, one good, the other bad. Bro. Jones must find his answer to the query for Christ's violating the laws of the country both civil and political in the foregoing and in the further prophecy and fulfillment that the kings of the earth should be gathered together against the Lord's anointed, (why gather against him if he violated no law?) and in the fact that what a person does through another he does himself, and he sent forth his disciples and his church, with the certainty that they would be called before councils and governors, and with the injunction fear not him who is able to destroy the body but can do nothing more—in the apostolic lives and deaths for refusing to obey human law rather than God. The kings and rulers were the law-making power of that day. What they decreed was law. But the laws were sinful. The rulers and judges of human government, 1st Cor. 6, Paul calls the unjust. What was crime against these laws was frequently obedience to God. No government ever punished a man unless he violated some law of that government written or unwritten. He finds Mr. Webster defines the word persecute, *generally* and then *appropriately* as Bro. Jones' copy reads. Mine simply says, 1st and 2nd, his meanings under *appropriately* are the secondary meanings

as given in the *Unabridged*. Bro. Jones concludes that the general meaning is an appropriate one. It is strange that the first, and general meaning (that means the meaning in its universal use) is an inappropriate one. Is brother Jones ignorant of the fact that the word appropriate has two distinct meanings. Its first meaning as a verb is to take to one's self in exclusion of others. A thief is said to appropriate what he steals. Another distant meaning is "fit, proper," etc. Now in the first meaning it may be contrasted with the word *general, common or universal*. It is the synonym of specially. Inappropriate is seldom used as the negative of the word appropriate in this first sense. Unappropriated in the participial form, negatives that meaning. Then when brother Jones says to use the general meaning is inappropriate he simply deceives himself as to the meaning of the word. It means here *specifically* or when appropriated to a specific use. Bro. Jones very inappropriately appropriates the meaning of the word *appropriately*. Words in law, in theology and in science frequently acquire an appropriated or special meaning. The common or general meaning is not therefore inappropriate, unfit or improper by any means. The appropriated one is frequently the inappropriate meaning. It mortifies us to have to spend time over such verbal—shall we by courtesy call them criticisms?—they are really quibbles, just such too as Mr. Ditzler indulges in, when he takes "to make drunk" as one of the appropriated meanings of baptize and insists all others are inappropriate—

but he did not go so far. He only insisted the appropriated meaning is as legitimate as the general meaning, which is not true. Bro. Jones insists it is more appropriate.

We said the Savior violated the law of the land, both civil and religious. Bro. Jones challenges us for the proof, does he deny it? It is unfair and unmanly to challenge us for proof and then say he took no position. Why was Christ slain by the authorities if he violated none of their laws? We say that the Savior violated the law, Peter, Paul, James, John and many apostles of the Savior violated it just when and where we have contended it was right to violate it, that is when obedience to the human law involved disobedience to any command of God, or contravened the work of God on earth, and all paid the penalty of the violation by death. Bro. Jones solemnly quotes Paul as saying "the transgression of the law is sin." Where did he find it? John says, "sin is transgression of law," and Paul says, "where no law is there is no transgression." Sin is transgression of law—is a very different proposition from "the transgression of law is sin." The first is true, the latter may or may not be. Men are human, but humans may or may not be men. Bro. J. not only misquotes but he attributes what the apostles affirm of God's law to human law. To make it apply equally to God's law and man's is to make man's law equal to God's. John's language certainly applies to God's law, as he proceeds immediately to enumerate different commands of God, that must be observed. Paul's language to Timothy is even more definite. He

tells us the end of the commandment (or law) is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned" and immediately tells for whom the law was made. The wicked, &c. What law is it that is intended to produce charity out of a pure heart, of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned? Did human law ever have that end in view? He then proceeds to affirm that the law was made to correct certain wickednesses, not to restrain the good. We have never seen a more flagrant wresting and perversion of the Scriptures than the applying this language to human law. Bro. Jones applies it to human law, religious and political, Heathen and Jewish. Such an application would have required the Son of God to deny his Father, to refuse to make the good confession for which he died; would have required him and his followers to recognize and worship the manifold heathen Gods of the Roman Empire. Yet bro. Jones seems to think he environs us with difficulties by such applications of Scripture. They are too flagrant perversions to need reply. They are transparent.

The cause must be a hopeless one indeed that requires human law to be made equal to Divine. An indiscriminate use of terms certainly makes Christ a sinner, and the apostles vile criminals.

Neither John nor Paul ever affirmed the violation of human law was sin. Neither had before them human law. It is a very glaring and wresting perversion of Scripture to apply their language to human law. Christ says, "fear not him who is able to destroy the body," &c. "whosoever will save

his life shall lose it"—save it by obedience to human law when it contravenes Divine. Says they should be brought before and condemned and persecuted by the governors and councils, and rulers for his sake, they should be cast into prison and be punished. Showing clearly that in submitting to him they would not only disobey the human government, but antagonize it unto death itself. The world is embodied in this government. In presenting the question, whether the punishment inflicted on Bro. Ramsey was persecution or not to show it was, and must be to bro. Ramsey—we quoted Paul, "o him that esteemeth a thing unclean, it is unclean," that therefore bro. Ramsey, regarding that God's law forbid him to serve as a juror—to him at least the suffering was for God or religion, therefore it was persecution. Bro. Jones seizes this, perverts my argument and says if Bro. Ramsey's believing a thing to be wrong makes it wrong to him, my believing it to be right to vote makes it right for me to vote. I made no such reasoning. It would be persecution to Bro. Jones to fine or imprison him for voting, while he believes it a Christian duty to vote. That is all he could draw from my argument. That it is consistent and according to his standard of right for him to vote, while he believes it his duty, is one question, whether it be right in the sight of God for him to hold that standard or rule is a different question.

Bro. Jones catches at the expression, it is not necessarily wrong to obey, not necessarily wrong to disobey human law, asks may it not have

been wrong for Bro. Ramsey to disobey, may it not be right for me to obey, and triumphantly thanks us for the admission. We did not admit, we have always contended for it. If he calls that reasoning or logic, he has strange ideas of both. He again asks if it is a matter of accident that obedience to human law is right or wrong as it is not of necessity. We answer all at once the accident is, whether it opposes the law of God or not. If not, it is right to obey, if it does oppose, it is wrong. The right or wrong of Bro. Ramsey's course does not depend on whether the human law was obeyed or disobeyed, but whether the Divine law was obeyed or disobeyed. The Divine law requires obedience to God first. The first commandment is to serve God: to love him and obey him first—then so far as consistent with this to obey the powers that be. This we contend for. The harmony with the Divine law is the test of right or wrong, not obedience to the human.

If our readers can see point or logic in much of Bro. Jones' article they are not so dull as we are. So we let it pass. He complains of our contrasting him with Paul and Peter. We only copied him in that. We will not follow his example in telling our readers where he is impaled and when he cannot extricate himself for fear they will not see it,—if they cannot see this for themselves.

If Bro. Jones intends to take a positive position on the proposition he accepts we are willing to discuss it with him. If he simply intends to play upon the different shades of the meaning of words, carp and object without directly taking position, we

decline to discuss with him as we do not regard such a course as logical, fair or honorable in debate. It is a bushwhacking style that shoots from behind an ambush, and refuses to be shot at. We do not like that kind of war, especially when we are the party to be shot at. It is seeking an unfair advantage. We have not counted our words to see whether we have transcended the length occupied by Bro. Jones. We have six pages of large letter. He twelve of fools cap. He writes not so close as we do.

D. L.

Murfreesboro Meeting.

Pursuant to a call for a consultation meeting of the Disciples of Christ, to be held at Murfreesboro, Tenn., Oct. 9, 1874. The brethren met, and opened the meeting by calling Thos. R. Richardson to the chair, and choosing J. M. Witherspoon Secretary.

Prayer by Thos. J. Shaw.

On motion of T. J. Shaw, G. W. Abell, M. Ransom and C. M. Day were appointed a committee on business. The following brethren were then enrolled: Thos. R. Richardson, T. J. Shaw, C. M. Day, W. H. Cook, G. W. Abell, W. B. Lillard, Stokely White, M. Ransom, W. B. Huddleston, F. C. Moseby, W. H. Luke, J. W. Shingleton, N. A. Hall, R. A. Gregg and lady, W. E. Hall, S. J. Graham, L. D. Whitson, J. A. Kirby, Daniel Watkins (col.) The committee on business then reported the following order of business for the consideration of the meeting, 1, Ordination, 2, Spirituous Liquors, 3, Dancing, 4, Discipline, 5, Co op-

eration, 6, Miscellaneous Business. The Moderator appointed the following committees, on Ordination, T. J. Shaw, M. Ransom, Stokely White. On Spirituous Liquors, W. H. Cook, F. C. Mosby, C. M. Day.

On Dancing, W. E. Hall, N. A. Hall, F. C. Mosby.

On Discipline, C. M. Day, Stokely White, S. J. Graham.

On Co-operation, G. W. Abell, C. M. Day, T. J. Shaw.

On preaching, F. C. Mosby, G. W. Abell, Stokely White.

On motion, the Meeting adjourned to meet at 2½ o'clock, P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION,

Thos. R. Richardson in the chair. Prayer by C. M. Day.

The Committee on Ordination reported, and discussion laid over until to-morrow. Daniel Watkins, col., made a report in relation to his labors, and the interest of the colored people, and T. J. Shaw, Wm. Lipscomb and W. E. Hall were appointed on said report. On motion the meeting adjourned to meet to-morrow morning at 9 o'clock.

Oct. 10, 1874.

MORNING SESSION.

F. C. Mosby in the chair: Prayer by W. E. Hall:

The minutes of the 9th were read and received. The following additional brethren were then enrolled: David Lipscomb, J. E. Scobey, J. W. Hall, W. F. George, J. M. Haynes, Asa Alsop, J. P. Grigg, C. P. Morton, A. P. Grigg. The subject of ordination was then taken up, and discussed very ably for some time, the following brethren taking part in the discussion: C M Day, David Lipscomb, J E Scobey J W

Hall, W F George, J M Haynes, Asa Alsop, J P Grigg, C P Morton, A P Grigg. The subject of ordination was then taken up and discussed very ably for some time, the following brethren taking part in the discussion: C. M. Day, David Lipscomb, T. J. Shaw, W. E. Hall, G. W. Abell, J. E. Scobey, M. Ransom. On motion the meeting adjourned to meet at 1½ o'clock P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION,

F. C. Mosby in the Chair, prayer by Asa Alsop.

The discussion on ordination was resumed, and kept up in the most friendly manner during the afternoon. On motion the meeting adjourned to meet on Monday morning at nine o'clock.

Monday morning, Oct. 12, '74.

MORNING SESSION

G. W. Abell in the Chair, prayer by Granville Lipscomb.

The discussion of ordination was resumed, and after a discussion the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, that this meeting recommend to the churches of Chsist, that they choose out from among their members, persons qualified for the work of overseers, preachers, and Deacons, and that they separated and set for that work, with fasting, prayer and laying on of hands.

T. J. SHAW, }
M. RANSOM, } Com.
STOKELY WHITE. }

The following resolution in regard to the col'd Brethren was received, the committee not making any report.

Resolved, that we recommend to our colored brethren who have membership with the whites, whenever practicable to withdraw themselves

and form congregations of their own, believing that by so doing they will advance the cause of Christ among themselves, and when it not practicable so to do, that they receive the attention of their various congregations. That we receive the report of Daniel Wadkins, col'd and commend him to his people as one being qualified to preach the word, and plant and build up churches among them.

AFTERNOON SESSION,

M. Ransom in the chair, prayer by G. Lipscomb.

The committee on Spiritous Liquors submitted the following report, which was received and adopted :

Resolved, that it is the sense of this meeting that the manufacture and sale of Spiritous Liquors, except for Medicinal and Communion purposes, are unchristian practices and should be abandoned by all Christians, and that drunkenness should not be tolerated in the Church of Christ.

C. M. DAY, }
W. H. COOK, } Com.
F. C. MOSBY, }

The committee on Co-operation reported the following which was adopted. Recognizing the unity of the Church of God, as well as the independence of each Congregation, and believing it to be the will and pleasure of the Great Head, that the Gospel should be proclaimed among all the nations of the earth. Your committee respectfully recommend that it be expressed as the sense of this meeting, that there should be a united and co-operative effort on the part of every individual disciple, and all the congregations to do all in their power to effect this divine con-

summation, and affectionately and earnestly exhort all to exert themselves to the utmost of their ability to the same.

G. W. ABELL, }
C. M. DAY, } Com.
T. J. SHAW, }

The committee on Dancing submitted the following report which was adopted :

Your committee on dancing, respectfully submit that it is their judgment that the practice of dancing is unchristian and therefore should be discouraged by the use of all Scriptural means.

W. E. HALL, }
N. A. HALL, } Com.
F. C. MOSBY, }

The committee on the resolution offered by J. A. Kirby made the following report, which was received and adopted.

Resolved, that this meeting recommend to all their Brethren and Sisters, that they pay strict attention to the teaching of the Scriptures in regard to the wearing of costly apparel and jewelry, and endeavor to enforce the teaching of the Scriptures on these matters, by precept and example,

J. E. SCOBEY, }
G. W. ABELL, } Com.
W. E. HALL, }

On motion the meeting adjourned to meet Tuesday morning at 8½ o'clock.

Tuesday morning, Oct. 13,

F. C. Mosby in the chair, prayer by G. W. Abell.

Reading the minutes dispensed with.

The committee on Discipline submitted the following resolution which was adopted.

Resolved, That it is the judgment of this meeting, that the congregations through their Eldership shall most diligently enforce the discipline of the Scriptures on all offenders. That each member of said congregation, cognizant of any offense by a Brother or Sister, shall at once admonish such an one (See Gal. 6: 1.) and should they fail to hear them, they should immediately report them to the Elders of the Congregation, whose duty it is to examine the case, apply the law, and make known the decision to the congregation.

C. M. DAY, }
 STOKELY WHITE, } Com.
 S. J. GRAHAM. }

The following resolutions were adopted :

Resolved, That a copy of the proceedings of this meeting be furnished the GOSPEL ADVOCATE and the *Christian Weekly* for publication. There being no further business before the meeting, it was adjourned, peace and harmony prevailing.

THOS. R. RICHARDSON,
 Moderator,
 J. M. WITHERSPOON
 Secretary.

We publish this week a report of the Murfreesboro meeting: In justice to ourself and others a few comments are demanded. We attended the meeting, although doubting much the propriety of such. We are especially made to doubt the propriety of them by the results of this meeting. In the first place the report of the meeting leaves the impression that what was done, was done by the brethren reported as present.

A number of the brethren present

were utterly opposed to any meeting making recommendations to the churches. They believe it an improper assumption of power and authority. It is the entering wedge of ecclesiasticism that subverts the truth and overturns the churches. We know it will be said that they are only recommendations, and will do no harm. They fail to do harm only as they are disregarded. The announcement of all the decrees of Associations, Conferences, Synods, Assemblies, Episcopal and Romish Councils are given as "recommendations." They were very innocent and harmless as such, in the beginning, but they grew. A decision of an Æcumenical Council is nothing but a full-grown recommendation of churches. If it has no force, it is useless to put it forth. If it has force it is hurtful. It has a tendency, direct, to substitute the decisions of the meetings for the word of God.

Those making the recommendations fail to give a particle of Scriptural authority for them. They are sent forth on the authority of the meeting. Churches are expected to give heed to them on that ground. We had just as soon vote as to whether a man should be baptized for the remission of sins as to whether he should obey any other Scriptures. And no question can ever be decided to be Scriptural by majorities. The attempt to do it is sinful.

These resolutions were none of them acted upon until the mass of the brethren had left. A number of them would have lost a right arm before voting on such subjects in such a meeting, one way or the other. Some who were present could not have been

induced to vote on any such questions we are certain.

The meetings now make recommendations, after they grow strong they refuse fellowship with those who do not heed these recommendations. See what is proposed by W. T. Moore in the Louisville Plan. It amounts to a declaration of disfellowship to those who are unwilling to enter his proposed ecclesiasticism. This has grown in a very few years from simply a meeting of brethren making recommendations. We find no authority in the Bible for any meeting, save a meeting of inspired apostles making recommendations to churches or Christians. It is very safe to keep within Bible limits, unsafe to transcend Scriptural examples.

We are certain that Bros. Wm. Lipscomb, J. E. Scobey, A. Alsop and the writer of this, would under no circumstances have voted on such resolutions one way or the other.

Then a number of the brethren who were present did not believe the truthfulness of the resolutions. They were passed after the majority of the meeting had left. On the first proposition, as to the Scripturalness of the imposition of hands being a scriptural requirement in setting apart individuals to a work, many had doubts. We think a large majority of those present during the meeting doubt the truthfulness of the resolution. We know Prof. Scobey, Cook, J. W. Hall, Mosby, Lillard, Witherspoon, Grigg, Bryan, Wadkins and the writer of this have doubts on the subject, and doubting could not recommend. We think Wm. Lipscomb. and A. Alsop

have similar doubts. Others who left we know not how they stand. Others could not vote on such questions. Other points of the resolution are objectionable but were not discussed.

Other propositions were not discussed we think, but several of them to my mind are plainly unscriptural in their teaching. The resolution in reference to colored brethren forming separate congregations we believe plainly contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures. The Jews and Gentiles had as strong antipathies as the whites and blacks. They were never recommended to form distinct organizations. The course we believe to be hurtful to both races and destructive to the true Spirit of Christ.

The resolution on Spirituous liquors falls so far short of the Scriptural requirement and the demands of the church, its expression will do much more harm than good. It will be construed into a license to associate with the drinking, lay around the saloons with the vulgar and depraved to drink as much as you want, and lead others into the paths of sin, just so you do not wallow in the mud yourself.

The resolution on co-operation was written with a view of being interpreted different ways by different persons. We can approve it without our interpretation. For with us true co-operation consists in jealously doing the will of God as individuals and churches. With bro. Abell's interpretation it may mean, form large organizations with officers and organs unknown to the word of God.

The resolution on discipline assumes it as right for the Elders to

decide questions and execute the law and merely make known their action to the congregation.

A congregation that attempts this course of discipline would keep itself in an eternal broil from discord and division, did not a speedy death of the congregation stop the strife. All are to be of one mind in the church. The feelings and judgment of the humblest are to be respected and have their proper influence.

These things we deem needful to be stated as a matter of justice to all. The report although correct in what was done by the meeting, in failing to tell who were present, who voted, who declined to vote, would leave a wrong impression on those reading it, and not knowing the full occurrences. No injustice was intended. Our brother Secretary himself stood opposed to the first resolution, but in giving results merely, incorrect impressions are made.

It was pleasant to meet with brethren and confer with one another. We heard not an unkind word spoken by any one—but if ten protracted meetings had been held in ten different, destitute neighborhoods—we believe, less harm and much more good would have been done.

D. L.

Burritt College.

We find the following in the advertising columns of the *McMinnville New Era*, which we command to the careful perusal and consideration of Baptists in all sections of the country.—*Baptist Messenger*, of McMinnville, Tenn.

A CARD.

I will inform the people that if they do not want their children made Campbellites, they had better not send them to Mr. Carnes, at Spencer, for he not only teaches it in his school, but he also makes all of his students go to hear them preach. There are none excepted, for I had my choice between going to hear them preach and quitting school; the latter of which I took, with an honorable discharge from him.

C. B.

Spencer, Tenn., Sept. 16, 1874.

When Mr. New's (alias C. B.) card appeared we did not feel disposed to dignify it with a notice, but as the *Baptist Messenger* has reproduced it with an editorial calling attention to it we may be pardoned for giving publicity to the facts concerning it. The rule complained of requires every student to attend church once every Sunday, but it is not true that any one is compelled to hear the "Campbellites" preach at all, unless he chooses to do so. The rule requires all to go to church, but they can go anywhere they choose to go within reach of the college. It is true that the only meeting house in town belongs to the Christian Church, and the disciples meet and worship in it every Sunday unless, by permission, some one else occupies it. This is very frequently the case. During last session a Methodist preacher, who was a student of the college, had an appointment, and preached in the Christian church one Sunday in each month, and the students were required to hear him just as regularly as they were the President himself. And we venture the opinion that no house

of worship can be found in Tennessee, owned by one religious body, that is more freely used by the various parties around it than is the Christian church in Spencer. Besides this there is scarcely a Sunday passes, without preaching by some one or more of the denominations in the country around Spencer, and all are permitted to attend, and many do go to the country to hear preaching in place of to the church in town: but the demands of the rule are met by going to church *anywhere* once on each Sunday.

This rule was adopted by the board of Trustees in 1850 and has been regularly enforced by every President of the College from then until now. Mr. Carnes was President when the rule was adopted and he enforced it until he became President of the University at Knoxville. He was succeeded by Mr. Powell, who was a Baptist, and he enforced it. Then Mr. White, who was not a member of any church, was President and he ran the College under the same rules. Mr. Brown, a Methodist, was next acting President and the same rule was still in force. Then Mr. Powell was again President and the same rule was enforced. Then Mr. Carnes was again made President and he has enforced the same rule up to this time, and I guess will continue to do so as long as he remains President of the College. Whenever it becomes odious for students to be required to attend church on Sunday I guess he will no longer desire to be President of this or any other College. Indeed no one ever objected to the rule until the refined sensibilities of Mr. New were aroused, and his objection

was that he believed it a "sin to hear the Campbellites preach." Why did he not think of this before he came here? He came here, to acquaint himself with the school,—he talked with the students and the President, and was pleased with the prospects. He went home, made his arrangements, returned and entered the class and then became alarmed at the necessity of hearing the "Campbellites preach." No sane man can believe that he did not know the religious views of the President before he entered college, then why should he put himself under the instruction of a man whose views were so monstrously heretical as to make it a sin to hear him preach. Is it not a little strange that he entered the Bible class at his own option to recite lessons daily to a President whom he regarded it as a sin to hear preach?

But Mr. New says Mr. Carnes teaches "Campbellism" in his school. This we suppose is an after thought, for he said while here that he could not tell, from anything he had heard the President teach in the college that he was a "Campbellite" at all, hence this discovery has been the result of his meditations since he left college. But how does the President teach "Campbellism" in the college? He reads a chapter from the Bible without comment and offers prayer at the opening of the exercises in the morning and again in the evening at the close of the day's labor. Is this Campbellism? If so it must be because the Word of the Lord is Campbellism, for there is not a word of comment offered upon what is read. But there is a Bible class which recites a lesson in the Bible daily. Yes

there is ; but it is made up of *such as choose to enter it*, hence no one need be alarmed at anything taught in it for they need not enter this class unless they choose to do so. Yet Mr. New entered it *at his own discretion* and said he could not tell from anything taught in the college that the President was a "Campbellite" at all. Then where is the Campbellism taught in the school? If teaching the Bible is teaching Campbellism then does he indeed teach Campbellism for it must be admitted that he does teach his Bible class pretty thoroughly in the Bible. While it is true that Methodist preachers, Baptist preachers, and Presbyterian preachers, have been educated by President Carnes, and are now occupying honorable positions in their respective churches, we suppose Mr. New is the first to discover that "Campbellism" is taught by the President in his school ; and we suppose that every preacher educated by him, or student expecting to be a preacher, has been a voluntary member of his Bible class and has profited by the instructions received ; and yet Mr. New is the first man known to refuse to hear him preach while connected with his class, or who regarded it a sin to hear him. After calmly reviewing the whole ground, I conclude that if there has been a wrong done by the President in connection with the whole matter it was in giving Mr. New an honorable discharge from the college. When he convened the board of trustees to have the rule rescinded and himself excused from attending church because he regarded it a crime to hear the President preach he ought to have been *expelled for contempt*. Such

bigotry and impudence ought not to have received an honorable discharge. Such are the views of

OBSOURIS.

Spencer, Tenn., Oct. 21, 1874.

Correspondence.

Brethren L. & S: It has been a long time since I attempted to write anything for the ADVOCATE, and feeling now that I can do but little more than to write, I perhaps ought at least to do that.

I have never had to struggle against such adversities in my life as have befallen me the last three or four years. I have never worked so hard nor had so little remuneration for my labor. With a large family it has been with great difficulty that I have been able to provide for them the comforts of life. I have been trying at great sacrifice for the last few years to keep alive the few congregations that I have been instrumental in getting up ; hoping that each returning year would bring relief to our impoverished and disheartened brotherhood, but still the dark cloud hangs heavily over us, we have made another short crop and we are still in debt, no doubt a just rebuke for our disobedience to the divine precept, "Owe no man anything." We propose to put Bro. N. B. Shaw in the field next year as a sort of general Evangelist for our section if we can raise funds enough to support him and his wife.—He says \$350 will enable him to spend the whole year in the work, and surely no one will consider his proposition extravagant.

A good work can be done here if we can only keep a good man in the field. The people gladly receive the word in many places in spite of the

strong prejudice against us. Bro. Shaw has done a good work this year and has added a goodly number to the Lord.

Bro. P. B. Lawson of Marion, Ala. preached for us a few days at Pine Apple, embracing the fourth Lord's day in July. Bro. Shaw was also with us, though Bro. Lawson did the principal part of the preaching, with 26 accessions as the result of the meeting. A few days after the close of the meeting here I paid a visit to my old friends and brethren in Henry County Georgia. Commenced a meeting at Berea on Saturday and continued it till Thursday night following, embracing 2nd Lord's day in August. Dr. N. F. Barrett and myself did the preaching. We had ten accessions, among the number a grog-shop keeper who had been wounded in the right arm in the late war, almost entirely destroying the use of it. In his disabled condition he had resorted to liquor selling as a means of support for his family. But under the teaching of the Gospel he became convinced of the necessity of abandoning his calling and obeying the truth. After a hard struggle—for he was poor and felt that it would be a great sacrifice—he made the good confession and was baptized. Up to this time nothing had been suggested by the brethren in the way of pecuniary relief—but when he had conquered himself and made the noble sacrifice, one of the brethren with soul overflowing with sympathy made a warm and touching appeal to the brotherhood in his behalf. In response a liberal sum was promptly raised and the contents of the Liquor Shop were poured into the street.

The congregation at Berea has been well instructed by bro. W. F. Fears for many years, and it is not strange that a corresponding zeal should be manifested by those taught.

Now in conclusion I want to state that the "Gospel Plan of Salvation" by T. W. Brents has been on my table for a few weeks, though I have not had time to give it a thorough reading, having had but little leisure since I received the work. I have however read nearly the entire work either as it came out in the ADVOCATE or in the volume as it lies before me. I consider it the most thorough work of the kind I have ever read. The intelligent reader cannot fail to be struck with the force and clearness with which it handles every subject, and on the subjects of baptism and the Holy Spirit the work is peculiarly excellent.

I most heartily commend the work to all who feel interested in a clear and lucid exposition of the most important subjects connected with the scheme of salvation.

You will not find in it the speculative conclusions of an ingenious writer—but the clear and natural deductions of an exhaustive accumulation of Scriptural evidences adroitly linked together, so that the unbiased mind will naturally, easily and almost, if not quite-unavoidably yield to the same conclusions. And to such minds many hitherto perplexed questions will forever be set at rest.

DAVID ADAMS.

Pine Apple, Ala.

Dear Brethren: My object is to say, that if you knew how much good the ADVOCATE is doing, you would be encouraged, and if the brethren all

understood this they would certainly be disposed to assist in its circulation. Of course my observation is quite limited; but it is sufficient to fully convince me, that, many are arrested in their downward course by having their minds directed to the Bible by the *ADVOCATE*. Some brethren send the *Advocate* to their neighbors, without their knowledge, and thus bring them savingly to the investigation of the truth. Brethren, why could not one thousand or more of you do this? Of course, these remarks might be just as approvingly applied to our other papers, but in my field of labor, our other papers are rarely ever seen—at least, not near so frequently as the *Advocate*—except in some localities the *Christian Weekly*, ably edited by our educated and highly accomplished brother, J. M. Pickens, assisted by a number of able brethren, every name of whom is a guarantee to the ability of the paper.

On the second Lord's day in this month it was my fortune to see a very fine audience at Liberty, Lawrence County, Tenn., collected from five or six Counties, and my *misfortune*,—apparently so, at least, for apparent evil often results in good—not to be able to present the gospel to them in its power, being disabled by one of the most severe attacks of sickness ever sustained by myself. This prevented my visiting Cathey's Creek, whither my steps were leading me, with high anticipations. So far as my observation extends, the "good cause" is triumphing gloriously. My last week's active labor has resulted in 40 accessions to the "Army of the Lord."

A meeting of one month's duration with the Linden Street Church in Memphis, Tennessee, a Christmas meeting including the 3d and 4th Lord's days in Dec., at Colliersville, Tenn., and a few discourses in Florence Ala., will complete my labors for the present year.

May the "Father of mercies" bless you, and increase your usefulness a thousand fold!

Affectionately and Fraternaly,

T. B. LARIMORE,

Mars Hill Academy, near Florence Ala. Oct. 20, 1874.

CHURCH NEWS.

Brethren L. & S.: I left home Saturday before the third Lord's day in Sept., went to Liberty in Coffee Co. Began a meeting there on Sunday and continued till Friday with nine additions four from the world, one from the Methodists and four restored.

Bro. John Smithson, a young man of fine promise was with me two days and preached three times, Nobly proclaiming the truth. I never saw brethren and sisters work harder in my life; though in the midst of their farm work they came to church every day almost without an exception. They at the same time labored hard morning and evening at their work, as good Christians ought to do.

I went from there to Altamont, Grundy Co., and during a four days meeting had four more additions. Three from the world and one from the Cumberland Presbyterians. Bro. A. G. Logue was with me and assisted in prayers and did the baptizing. The disciples at Altamont seem to b

thoroughly enlisted for the work. Will our preaching brethren remember we have but three male members here, and give them a call in passing. I went from Altamont to Mud Creek, talked to the people once and then returned home and found my family well. Thanks to the Giver of all good for His protection.

Yours in the faith

JOHN B. SMITH.

*McMinnville, Warren Co., Tenn.,
Oct. 1, 1874*

I report briefly a meeting held at Milburn, Ky., (one of my regular points) by myself and Bro. Jno. R. Farrow, of Alamo, Tenn., which resulted in 18 baptized and one by letter—19 in all. This meeting commenced on Saturday night before 1st Lord's day of this month, and concluded on Monday night after 2nd Lord's day. To God through Christ be all the praise. This being one of my monthly appointments, Bro. Farrow did most of the preaching. Bro. F. is a young Bro. who bids fair to enroll his name high in the galaxy of the proclaimers of the word. God grant that the fathers and mothers in Israel may so counsel him that he may be kept humble, that he may be useful. More anon.

R. B. TRIMBLE.

Mayfield, Ky., Oct. 14, 1874.

My meeting closed at Dog Creek Thursday with sixteen accessions, 13 by confessions and baptism, two from the Methodists and one from the Cumberland Presbyterians. Had two yesterday, both reclaimed. With

three in Neely's Bend, makes twenty-one since my last report.

W. F. TODD.

Goodlettsville, Tenn. Oct. 1874.

Dear Advocate: From "Curlee School-house" I went to Lavergne, spoke 8 times, baptized 1. From here I went to Bethlehem in Cannon Co., 1st Lord's day in Oct., spoke 13 times, and had 19 additions. 2nd Lord's day went to Big Springs; met bros. Bowling, Shaw, Croft and others—three additions. Third Sunday I visited the brethren at the Curlee School-house again, preached six discourses, had four additions. The congregation at this place was organized in Sept. They now number about forty. To the Lord be all the praise for the success of the Gospel.

SMITH J. DENTON.

Murfreesboro, Oct. 22, 1874.

Brethren L & S: No news of very great importance only that the disciples are doing their duty, and the cause of Christ is prospering wherever the Gospel is preached; Evangelists are scarce, but as a general thing they are faithful and doing good work for the cause of the Lord; more laborers are needed in the Lord's vineyard in Texas. If some of the young brethren that have taken upon themselves the responsibility of that high calling, the preaching of the Gospel, would come here they would find a field that greatly needs their labors.

Here is the place for them to effectually use their talents; young men who have obtained a first class education, and have well studied the

Bible, this is the field for you to rise to eminence in the divine calling, that of proclaiming and teaching the Gospel.

'Tis a very gross mistake about there being no good society here in Texas. You will find a law-abiding, friendly, sociable people, people from every State in the Union, and as a general thing they are religiously inclined. But our ministers are too scarce for this great territory and its population. Young men of good talent and education come, middle aged ministers who want homes in a good country come, you will find warm friends among all denominations, and honest people who are not professors.

Yours in the bonds of faith,

J. Q. A. CAPPS.

Nechesville, Texas, Oct. 8th. 1874.

Well Done, Good and Faithful Servant.

In the Christian Church, Sunday, at the conclusion of the services, Rev. Philip S. Fall, for years the very acceptable pastor of that congregation, tendered his resignation, presuming in his modesty, as we suppose, that he could not be so useful as he had been in the past.

Mr. Gleaves immediately arose from his seat and asked if there was any one in the congregation who was willing or desirous to have him retire from the pastorate. The question having been put, the congregation voted unanimously to retain him.

There is not perhaps, a more learned man or riper scholar in the United States than Dr. Fall. He is a deep Biblical scholar, and a forcible logical speaker. It would indeed

be difficult to supply his place. There are few men better loved than Mr. Fall, by those who know him best.—*Repub. Banner.*

QUERY.

Brethren L. & S: Is it possible for a man to live and not sin? Please give an answer at your earliest opportunity through the GOSPEL ADVOCATE. The reading of John 1: 8-10; 1 Cor. 10: 13; James 1: 26, and James 3: 2 suggested this question to me. An early reply to the above will be thankfully received by

Your Bro. in the one hope,

J. B. SMITH.

*McMinnville, Warren Co., Tenn.
Oct. 19th 1874.*

There are different grades and kinds of sin. There are wilful sins and sins of weakness. There are knowing sins and sins of ignorance. There are positive sins and negative sins—usually called sins of commission and sins of omission. There are sins of thought, of feeling, of action. There are incipient sins of purpose and desire, the completed sin of action. Sinlessness in every particular and of every kind would be perfection. Perfection would be equal to Christ in life. His life was only perfection. We do not think any human being ever did or ever will attain to the perfection in life of the Son of God. Without this there must be sin. Solomon said, "no man liveth and sinneth not." John says, "if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." Our personal experience, our internal conscious-

ness, and external observation strongly corroborate Solomon and John's judgment.

D. L.

The Rothschild Women.

We take pleasure in referring to the merits of the Rothschild family, not because they are wealthy, but for the simple reason that, in spite of their wealth, they strive to be useful to their kind. The men are immersed in business; they are charitable, but people will say that it is easy to be charitable if you are rich. The women are public spirited, intelligent and warm-hearted, founding hospitals, reformatories, children's homes, endowing scholastic institutions, encouraging struggling professionals, and taking a personal interest in the doings of the poor.—Baroness Lionel makes weekly visits in the meanest portion of London, brightening the home of the Jewish artisan, giving her good counsel to the earnest teachers in the free schools, the matrons and assistants in the various charities. The daughter of Alphonse of Paris, teaches a good lesson to her sisters in faith, and to rich young ladies of every creed, by receiving a well deserved diploma as teacher. Anselm's daughter in Vienna is prominent in music, not only composing songs that attain popularity, but aiding struggling musicians by pen and purse.—*Jewish Messenger.*

PRAJHING AND PREACHERS.

We share in no degree the feeling that those preachers are greatest or those congregations most substantial

that find themselves most noticed in newspapers and most applauded by reporters. A serious, sober ministry, where the public teaching is addressed to the personal understanding and the permanent wants of the soul, and which seeks to subdue the human will to the divine by an unsparing exhibition of the claims of holiness, and by the patient training of the hearers in the foundation principles of Christianity, we hold to be the only truly successful one.

We have seen great congregations blown up to bubble size by the breath of declamation and scented air, and maintained there for years by the same "sound and fury, signifying nothing," and then in a year or two collapse, falling into flat and invisible nothingness, because the gifted inflator has lost his breath! And, on the other hand, we have seen small and humble religious societies, never noticed by the press, and whose ministers passed for hum drum men, which, in twenty years, have educated a body of two or three hundred men and women into souls rooted and grounded in sober convictions of religious truth and duty; who were real powers in the community, commanding deep personal respect and a solid influence of a most regenerating character. Let us note what sort of men and women come out of our churches to do the noble, self-sacrificing and elevating service needed by God and humanity before we call them strong or weak, successful or unsuccessful. We do not believe the most popular preachers are the best. They usually prophesy smooth things. They draw together a crowd of careless people, who are made to feel

comfortable, go away pleased, carry others to be made comfortable and pleased, and that is the end of it. As an entertainment this is well, as a moral power of spiritual efficacy it is next to nothing, or worse.—*Liberal Christian.*

ITEMS.

Elder Jesse Sewell is conducting a meeting for the church in Edgefield.

Says J. T. P. in closing a business letter to us: "Our cause is onward in Texas. Prospects for the Church are gloriously bright."

W. A. Green, of Fayette Co., Texas reports a good meeting in progress at Liberty under the ministration of Elders Dabney and Bush. There were five additions at the time of his writing, Oct. 12th.

Bro. I. G. Barlow of Cainsville, Tenn., called to see us last week. We are always pleased to have the brethren and friends of the Advocate, visit our office when they come to the city.

From the *Christian Weekly* we learn that the preachers of the Christian Church in North Alabama are to hold a meeting at Mooresville, beginning Friday night before the 4th Lord's day in November. Essays on important subjects will be read.

M. W. Sangster, formerly of Owen's Station, Tenn, now of Beebe Station, Ark., encloses us his subscription for the Advocate, saying that he could do without it no longer, but is resolved henceforth to live on shorter rations or have it. He reports 2 additions from the Baptists at a recent meeting held by Bro. V. Y. Wood at that place.

Dr. Jno. T. Walsh will hereafter publish "The American Independent Monthly and Bible Thinker" as a monthly. It has no connection with the "Watch Tower," and is opposed to secret societies of every kind. Subscription \$100 per annum. Address Dr. Jno. T. Walsh, Newberne, N. C.

W. Y. Kuykendall reports 8 additions at Bethlehem, White Co. Tenn., on 1st Lord's day in Oct.

J. M. Morton reports 4 additions at Mulberry village, 7 at Decherd and 12 at Town Creek, Tenn., at recent meetings conducted by himself.

Errata.

D. L.'s reply to Eld. Jones' article, page 1014 in the sentence "Bro. Jones concludes that the general meaning is an appropriate one," read inappropriate for appropriate.

In comments on Murfreesboro meeting, page 1020, the sentence, "We can approve it without our interpretation," read with for without.

Announcement.

The State Consultation Meeting of the colored members of the Christian Church will be held at the second Christian Church in this city, beginning on Monday the 16th of Nov. The brotherhood everywhere are earnestly invited to attend.

A protracted meeting will begin at the second col'd Christian Church in th's city on Thursday Nov. 12th. Services by Elder Harrison and others.

NOTICE.

After the first of January next, the

Postal law requires that postage on all papers shall be prepaid at the office of publication. Our subscribers will therefore please remember when sending the subscription to send with it 20 cts for postage. This will cost the subscriber no more than heretofore. He only pays us the postage, instead of the Post Master. He will then never be dunned for his postage. Please remember this.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL

General News.

New Orleans, Oct. 26. The Democratic and Conservative State Committee have addressed a letter to Gen. Emory protesting against the action of Maj. Merrill in arresting large numbers of the white citizens of Shreveport and vicinity. They affirm that this is done for political purposes

Louisville, Oct 25. A special to the *Courier Journal* reports a fatal duel between Dr. W. A. Eastland and Fred. Norris, two well-known citizens of Mercer Co., Ky. Eastland was killed and Norris twice wounded. A dispute about a land boundary was the cause of the affray.

A body of masked men have been committing various outrages in Shelby Co. Ky., among other things shooting a young girl of sixteen. Gov. Leslie is taking immediate steps to bring them to justice.

Washington Oct. 26. The Secretary of the Treasury has appointed Gen. B. G. Shields Collector of Customs at the port of Galveston. He was formerly a member of Congress from Ala., and was a Union man during the war. A whole-ale change

of government officers is being made throughout the State of Texas.

New York. Oct. 26. In the General Episcopal Convention to-day a resolution was offered requesting the House of Bishops to set apart appropriate religious services to be celebrated on the centennial anniversary of American independence.

FOREIGN.

London, Oct. 26. The *Times* special from Bombay estimates that 2,000 persons were killed in the town and district of Midnapore during the recent cyclone.

Prince Jerome Napoleon has issued a political programme condemning the reactionary and clerical policy of the Imperial party.

DOMESTIC ITEMS.

Col. Fred. Grant, oldest son of the President, was married on the 21st inst. to Miss Ida Honore, of Chicago. Eld. Isaac Errett of the Christian Church performed the marriage ceremony.

There was a \$125,000 fire in Georgetown, Md., on the 26th.

Bret Harte is advertised to lecture in this city.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Strange things.....	1008
Murfr,esboro Meeting.....	1016
Burritt College.....	1021
Correspondence.....	1023
Church News.....	1025
Query.....	1027
The Rothschild Women.....	1028
Preaching and Preachers.....	1028
Items.....	1029
Errata.....	1029
Announcement.....	1029
Notice.....	1029
General News.....	1030

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 44.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, NOV. 5, 1874.

Memoirs of Jesus.

INCIDENTS OCCURRING AT THE CROSS.

It is my wish, in this writing, to avoid indulging in extravagant expressions of veneration for the person of Jesus, or, showing any extraordinary degree of admiration for his exalted character. Not that there is any danger of venerating too highly, or admiring too much, the illustrious Hero of this, our "Story of the Cross." But I think we should ever be careful to have our language express the genuine sentiments of our hearts; implying no greater depth of feeling, or stronger sentiments of regard than really exist in the mind.

There is, perhaps, in most of us, a strong natural propensity to speak and write eulogistically of those moral, military, and other heroes, who have attracted our attention; especially, when by so doing we think to convince others of our great appreciation. To show a lack of appreciation for the wise, the good, and the great, does indeed, betray stupidity, or some more contemptible quality. But, certainly, we should

first be duly impressed with their greatness, wisdom or goodness, before we begin to eulogize them.

This eulogizing, or good speaking, disposition, is particularly manifest in the well-known eulogistic character of funeral orations, obituary writings, and biographical sketches of distinguished individuals generally. But we notice that the Evangelists, in narrating the circumstances of the crucifixion of their beloved Teacher, seem not to have been influenced by their emotional natures, or to have expressed any particular sentiments of grief, sorrow, or admiration. Their times of grief and lamentation, on account of the sufferings and death of Christ, were long since past, when they wrote their Gospel narratives, and there was no longer any occasion to indulge in expressions of sorrow for the death, or admiration for the heroism, of their now risen and exalted Savior.—They there simply narrated the facts, leaving their readers to their own reflections. It was of the highest importance to them, as witnesses, to do so. But how can any thoughtful, intelligent, appreciative person of the present day, who

carefully examines their testimony, and for the first time seriously contemplates the closing scenes in the life of Christ, avoid being deeply impressed by the God-like heroism, the unbounded love, and the spotless innocence of the suffering, self-sacrificing Lamb of God? Such a feeling of admiration and love is natural to the true disciple of Jesus, and necessary to every one who would be benefitted by his teaching.

We are now to fix our attention particularly upon the scene on Mount Calvary, which was opened up for our contemplation in the last chapter. Jesus is hanging, suspended on the Cross, in full view of the vast crowd of people, who have come to witness his execution. The blood is running from his hands and feet. His face shows intense suffering. His friends are weeping in his presence, while his enemies are rejoicing at his suffering. The soldiers, with cool indifference are intent on dividing his clothes among themselves. "The people stood and looked on," says Luke. "And the rulers with them scoffed at him, saying :

"He saved others: let him save himself, if he be the Christ, the chosen of God."

Matthew says: "And those who were passing by reproached him, shaking their heads, and saying :

'You that destroy the Temple, and rebuild it in three days, save yourself: if you are the Son of God, come down from the Cross.'

"In like manner," continues Matthew, "the chief priests, together with the Scribes and elders, made sport of him, saying :

'He saved others! himself, he can-

not save! If he be the king of Israel let him come down from the Cross, and we will believe on him! He trusted in God! let him deliver him, now, if he delights in him! For he said: "I am the Son of God!"'—Robbers, too, that had been crucified along with him, uttered the same reproaches against him." (Matth. xxvii. 39-44.)

THE CASE OF THE PENITENT THIEF.

Matthew's statement that *both* the robbers "reviled" Jesus on the Cross is no doubt true; for, at first, their impressions were the same: but, the circumstances surrounding them, and the occurrences at the cross, had the effect to change the mind of the one, who perhaps, was the *more* *impressible* of the two; possibly the *less* *guilty*. Therefore, Luke is more particular to inform us, that, "*one of the evil doers, that were hung, reviled him, saying: If you are the Christ, save yourself and us.*"

But the other, answering, reproved him, saying:

'Do you not fear God, since you are in the same condemnation?—and we, justly; for we are receiving the due reward of our doings; but this man has done nothing wrong.'

Then he said to Jesus:

"Remember me, Lord, when thou comest into thy kingdom."

And Jesus said to him:

'Truly, I say to you: To-day, you shall be with me in paradise.'" (Luke xviii. 39-43.)

This brief story of the "Penitent Thief" is one of peculiar interest. So often has it been commented on by preachers in their public exhortations to sinners, so frequently is the case of this repenting robber alluded

to to show the pitiful kindness of the Savior in forgiving sinners and saving them, without any further ceremony than a sincere profession of repentance,—that it becomes necessary to pause here, in order to a careful examination of the case and its bearings.

It might almost be regretted, that the *name* of this remorseful criminal, to whom Jesus spoke so kindly, was not written down by the evangelists.

But perhaps it was not necessary that his name should be transmitted to posterity. It was vastly more important that his character, his words, and the words of Jesus to him, should become matter of permanent record. Admitting, then, the importance of the facts handed down to us concerning the "dying thief," I must be allowed to express the opinion, that undue prominence has been given by certain religious revivalists, to the robber: "Lord, remember me, when thou comest in thy kingdom." More weight, methinks, attaches to his testimony to the innocence of Jesus. This point of evidence, is ignored by those who put the greater stress on the supposed repentance of the thief, and the alleged acceptance of him by the Savior.

It can hardly be doubted that the thief was penitent; that he felt, or was conscious of his guilt; and that he was frank to acknowledge it. But *penitence* is not *repentance*. Even if his penitence, or sorrow for sin, or guilty regret, did procure his pardon, (of which we have no evidence, except inference,) he had no time to repent, in the sense of *reforming* his life. We do not know that he was even sorry for his sins: he perhaps

only regretted having committed the crime for which he was suffering.—But his testimony, that Jesus had "done nothing wrong," that his sentence of condemnation was unjust,—is very significant and convincing.—Judas was penitent, self-condemned, and, so far as we know, died unforgiven. But he, also, testified to the innocence of Jesus; and his testimony is of the greatest importance to the student of Christian evidence.

We are not told by the evangelists whether either of these "witnesses for Jesus" was forgiven, or not. We might *conjecture* that they were both pardoned. We might persuade ourselves, somehow, that the Merciful Father would pity and save both of them. But *guessing* is not assuring; and we would better confine ourselves to facts revealed.

But even admitting that the robber repented, sincerely and truly, and that he was forgiven, it should be observed, that the circumstances under which he sought the favor of the Lord were peculiar. Just at the moment when the Jewish institution was about to terminate, and *before* the establishment of the religious institution of Christ,—in the interregnum between Judaism and Christianity—a suffering, dying robber, "comes to himself," acknowledges the justness of his own punishment and the innocence of Jesus, and then simply asks to be "remembered."

In answer to his request, Jesus assures him that he will be permitted to accompany him to "paradise," a region in Hades,—the "unseen" world of Spirits,—where, according to Josephus, the Jews believed the

good are temporarily detained between death and the Judgment.*

This seems to be a favorable answer; and that is all we know about it.

I shall not contend that the "Penitent Thief" was not saved. But I would ask: Is his exceptional case repenting and dying under such peculiar circumstances, to be held up as an example to sinners, as if to assure them that penitence, acknowledgment of guilt, and prayer for forgiveness, are all the essential conditions of acceptance with Christ?

The commission to "preach the Gospel" and "disciple the nations" had not yet been given to the Apostles; and therefore all the Gospel conditions of salvation could not then be fully complied with. If the thief was forgiven, it was because Jesus had authority while on earth, to forgive sins in person.

Again, I would ask: Why should this case be constantly held up before sinners, at "protracted meetings," unless to make the impression on their minds, that the conditions of pardon are faith and repentance, only; or to encourage them to trust in the validity of death-bed repentance?

Repentance, so far as a "change of mind," or heart, is concerned, may, indeed, be acceptable to God, even when it takes place on a "dying bed," on the supposition that it is never too late to come to the Savior, seeking salvation. It will hardly be disputed that many have been forgiven on the bed of dying, and passed happily over "the Jordan of death." But I

doubt the propriety of directing so much attention to these instances of God's mercy, when they do not effect the question of duty.

Much better would it be to dwell on the great theme of human redemption, the evidences of Christianity and the importance of obeying all the commandments of the Lord, from the least to the greatest of them.

THE WOMEN AT THE CROSS.

John mentions a touching circumstance.—

"Now there was," says he, "standing by the Cross of Jesus, his mother and his Mother's sister, Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene."—We are tempted to pause here a moment to indulge the imagination which is wont to picture that solemn scene on the "Mount of Sorrows." And we ask ourselves instinctively: What were the feelings, — what must have been the grief, — of that Mother, as she beheld her Son, the Hope of Israel, suffering, groaning, dying ignominiously on the Cross? And what words of sympathy were spoken by the sister and the other two Mary's!—John, the kind-hearted, comes near to the almost distracted mother of Jesus, we imagine, and speaks consolingly to her.

At this moment Jesus observing his mother, and the disciple whom he loved,* standing near said to his Mother:

'Woman, look upon your son.'

He then said to the Disciple:

'Look upon your Mother.'

And from that hour, that disciple took her to his own home." (John xix. 26-28.)

*See the "Discourse Concerning Hades," at the end of Josephus' History of the Jews. See, also, c. lxxiii., Gos. Adv. 1871. p. 1076,

†See second note to c. xiii., Adv. 1873, p. 1184.

Thus it appears, that "Joseph the husband of Mary," was dead, and that the poor widow took up her abode with John; whose life, Clarke thought, was prolonged, on account of the charge thus committed to his care.

A THREE HOUR'S PERIOD OF DARKNESS.

When two or three hours of crucial suffering are over, the scene is changed; but the end is not yet. We do not know whether the sun shone during the forenoon or not;—it may have been cloudy and dull; but at twelve, the gloom of darkness, as of a total eclipse of the sun, spread over the Land of Judea.† "From the sixth hour,"—12 o'clock, M.,—till the ninth hour,"—3 P. M., "there was darkness over all the Land. And about the Ninth Hour, Jesus cried out with a loud voice, saying:

'Eloi! Eloi! lama sabachthani?'

That is, when translated:

'My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?'

Then those who were standing by when they heard it, said:

'See! he is calling for Elijah!'

After this, Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled said:

'I am thirsting.'

Now a vessel full of vinegar had been set there; and some one ran, and filled a sponge with the vinegar, and putting it on a hyssop stalk, gave it to him, saying:

†Clarke, Lardner, and others, say a good deal about this Supernatural darkness, showing that, as it occurred at the time of full moon, it could be an eclipse of the sun, as some have supposed.—See Clarke on Matthew.

'Wait; let us see if Elijah will come to take him down.'

When Jesus had received the vinegar, he said:

'IT IS FINISHED.'

Then, crying out with a loud voice he said:

'Father! into thy hands I commit my Spirit.'

And having said this, [he bowed his head, yielded up the Spirit,] and expired.¶

What a moment was that, when the Son of God expired on the Cross! Well might the sun refuse to shine, and darkness envelop the Earth in gloom, when the light of the "Sun of Righteousness" was thus being temporarily extinguished by the "children" of the Wicked One. And O, what a period of suffering was that, which caused Jesus at last to exclaim: "Why, O my God! hast thou left me alone?" (Ps. xxii.) It may have seemed to him, that his Father had left him alone with his enemies. And why may not the feeling have come over him, as the Spirit and the body, were about to be separated, that God's power and presence were taken from him? But why indulge in further reflections, only to deepen the impression that the scene should make on the mind?

Let us inquire: What did Jesus mean, when he said, "It is finished"? What was finished? The work his Father had given him to do was accomplished. His mission was fulfilled, so far as making a sacrificial offering for the world of mankind was concerned.

The work of human redemption

¶Matth. xxvii. 45-50.—The words in brackets are added from John xix. 30.

was completed, and the former dispensation brought to a close. But we shall not comment extensively here, for we must notice, now, that as Jesus was in the very agony of death, his last words uttered, and the Spirit leaving the body, "the vail of the Temple was torn in two, from top to bottom; the earth did shake; the rocks were broken; and the tombs opened, so that many bodies of sleeping saints arose." "And," adds Matthew, "they came out of their graves, after his resurrection, entered the Holy City and appeared to many."

Here we might indulge the imagination for some time about those resurrected saints, who must have passed away again from the earth, without the second time having to die of disease.—but we must forbear.

The Centurion, who commanded the soldiers there, becomes a "witness for Jesus." Now when the Centurion, and those who were with him, watching Jesus, (during those hours of darkness,) observed the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, and said :

'Truly this *was* the Son of God.'

Also, many women were there, looking on at a distance, (who had followed Jesus from Galilee :) among whom were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children;" "And all the people that came together to that sight, struck their breasts and returned."

What a number of witnesses there were of the awfully impressive occurrences of that hour! Who, that witnessed those miraculous exhibitions of divine power, could for a moment

doubt the divinity of Christ, or the genuineness of his character? If we can only place that awful scene vividly before the mind, we must surely be ready to exclaim with the Centurion: "Truly, this was the Son of God."

W. PINKERTON.

IS FAITH A COMMAND?

Gospel Advocate: Bro. S.'s reply to my communication of Aug. 1st, has been carefully studied, and the Scripture proofs presented by him carefully examined. And on account of the importance of the subject of faith and the Scriptures introduced by him, I beg leave to be heard again.

I am not convinced that 1st John iii: 23, is a command to believe, in the proper acceptation of the term: I understand that as he explains John vi: 29, "He only means that God ordained that men believe on his Son." For "without faith it is impossible to please God." But, what is faith?

"Faith is the assent of the mind to the truth of what is declared by another, resting solely and implicitly on his authority [i. e. testimony] and veracity . . . or on the ground of the manifest truth of what he utters. . . . Reliance on testimony." (Webster.) Belief and faith are synonymous terms. There can be no faith or belief except as the mind is persuaded or convinced of the truth of what is uttered. "Persuasion is the state of being persuaded or convinced; settled opinion or conviction proceeding from arguments and reasons offered by others, or suggested

by one's own reflections." To be convinced is "To be overcome by argument; to be forced to yield assent to truth: to be satisfied by proof. . . . The understanding is convinced by reasons; the will is persuaded by motives." (Webster.)

Now, if men must be persuaded or convinced (i. e. "forced to yield assent to truth") that what is uttered is true, how is it possible to believe without proof? There lives not a man under heaven who can believe any word except as it is proven some way. And as divine testimony was necessary to the proof of the divine nature and mission of the Son of God, God furnished that testimony by ancient prophecies and by the miraculous powers exhibited by Jesus Christ. And John wrote his whole "gospel" to give this testimony. He says, Jno. xx: 20-31,—“And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book: But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name.” Doubtless Matthew, Mark and Luke wrote for the same purpose. Now why all this trouble if man could believe voluntarily? In every revelation that God has made to man he has recognized the impossibility of voluntary belief; in that he has given abundance of proof with every revelation intended to influence human actions. And from the above definitions it will be seen that faith or belief is always related to the truth of what is declared, and has no reference or relation whatever to authority, as to rulers and governors.

But to obey, is “To give ear to; to execute the commands of; to yield submission to; to comply with the orders of. 2nd. To submit to the government of; to be ruled by. Obedience is compliance with that which is required by authority: subjection to rightful restraint or control. . . . merely a proper submission to authority.” (Webster.)

From these definitions it will be seen that obedience has reference to authority alone, and has no reference or relation whatever to the truth of anything.

Bro. S. evidently understands the issue, for he describes faith as “A mental act performed by man; . . . in some sense a voluntary act; one that in some way depends upon the will.” Such a command as I asked for must enjoin faith as an act within the power of the will. But nothing that I know of faith gives any warrant for calling it an *act*. An act is “That which is done or doing; the exercise of power, or the effect, of which power exerted is the cause; performance; deed.” (Webster.) When an act is performed that is the last of it. The deed is done. But not so of faith. Faith is a passion or emotion, or something else, of the mind, that is known to be as lasting as a man's intelligence—the same from day to day. And not only is it impossible for man to begin to believe voluntarily, but it is impossible for him, being once convinced, to cease voluntarily to believe. “Faith comes by hearing (i. e. is produced by testimony,) and hearing by the word of God.” Hence faith is not an act of the mind but an effect wrought in the mind by the word of God.

Nevertheless, man does the believing. The patient feels and suffers, but it is the surgeon who inflicts the pain.

Now, as I have shown that faith has reference to truth, and no reference to authority; and have shown that obedience has reference to authority only, and no reference to truth; let the reader judge for himself whether faith is obedience or not.

The Philippian Jailor asked Paul and Silas what he must do to be saved; they answer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," &c. This assurance of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ to a penitent sinner, Bro. S. calls a positive command to believe. But the "Oracles" don't, and I don't. That's the difference. (See Acts 16: 31.)

On the day of Pentecost when Peter was testifying to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, and proving it by the prophets, as well also as his exaltation to heaven, the convicted Jews asked what they should do, and Peter told them, and said that the promise (of the Holy Spirit) was unto them, and to their children and to all that were afar off even as many as the Lord our God should call, (for God calls men as well as commands them) and he continued his *exhortation* and *testimony* with many other words, "Saying, save yourselves from this untoward generation." Bro. S. refers to this famous occasion and thinks that he finds a command for something in the 38th ver. of the 2nd chap. of Acts, Look for a promise, ver. 39, see the words "exhort" and "testify," ver. 40. No man thought of a command on the day of Pentecost.

When the Lord Jesus commanded

his apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, he told them who should be saved and who should be damned. And Bro. S. finds that faith is a command, by Jesus telling them "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But he also told them, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Is that a command to believe not? But Bro. S. says that it is every way equivalent to a command to believe. But an equivalent is not the thing itself. The "Oracles" don't call it a command; neither do I. That's the difference.

Bro. S. refers to the Athenians, some of whom believed while others mocked, and thinks they furnish examples of voluntary believing and voluntary *refusing* to believe. I think very differently. Paul said they were "in all things too superstitious," and that the city was "wholly given to idolatry." These superstitious and idolatrous people were, most likely, sufficiently corrupted and demoralized to so pervert their understanding as to render right reasoning impossible to them. And I think it remarkable that any of them should believe. Preconceived opinions, founded in error, deep-rooted prejudices, hearts abandoned to the love of sin, with lives devoted to wicked practices, under the lead of popular false teachers, are sufficient to account for men's "rejecting the counsel of God against themselves." "He that believeth not" is under the dominion of error, and is full of the "lusts of the flesh," and "cannot cease from sin" without the truth. Hence I see in the unbeliever sufficient wickedness, wilful and deliberately prac-

ticed to justify the sentence of his condemnation. Men can and do refuse to give attention to what purports to be the gospel of God our Savior, the consequence is unbelief. But ninety-nine per cent of the population of the United States believe the gospel. But not one half have faith in Christ, because they do not love God well enough to obey his Son; and no man can believe on his Son or trust in him who does not obey him. I may believe every word that the Lord has spoken and yet I cannot trust in him except I obey him. For salvation is to them that believe and obey, not to them that believe and disobey.

Bro. S. seems not to understand two sentences in my letter. It also seems to me that he does not understand "Scriptural phraseology" to perfection, else he would not confound faith and obedience. As I may dilate a little on the positions taken in these two sentences, at some future time through the Advocate I will not extend this article by any explanation.

And having glanced at the subject under consideration and the principal points in Bro. S.'s reply, I will close abruptly by courteously asking for any further light that may be reflected on the case.

In the hope of Heaven, your Bro.

DR. A. V. WRIGHT.

*Devil's Bend, Wadeville, Tex.,
Sept. 24, 1874.*

Bro. Wright says he is not convinced that first John iii: 23, "is a command to believe." We here give the passage again. "And this is his commandment, that we believe on his

Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment." Now if brother Wright will not believe John, of course he will not believe anything we may say on the subject. John says *this is his commandment that we believe* on his Son Jesus Christ, and we do not know how anything can be more positively expressed than is this. If this passage does not mean that God commands people to believe on his Son then there is certainly not a command in the Bible. He has just the same right to say that Christians are not commanded to love one another, that he has to say we are not commanded to believe. When John says by inspiration that *this is his commandment that we believe* on Christ, and then an uninspired man says it is not a command to believe, it is simply a conflict between the word of God and uninspired man. We cannot see it in any other light. So this controversy is not between me and Bro. Wright, but between him and the word of God. And again when Paul said to the Philippian jailor, *Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, there is not a more positive command among the ten commandments issued from Mount Sinai. Here the declaration of Paul is in the imperative or commanding mood, just as when God said, Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. And if the one of these is a command of God, so is the other.

But bro. W. says that faith is an involuntary act; very well, then God has commanded an involuntary act, if bro. W. is correct. But he also says, which is the same thing in effect, that faith does not depend

upon the will. Very well again, God has commanded a thing that does not depend upon the will; for He has commanded us to believe, and tells us if we do not believe, we shall be damned. And this amounts to saying that God has commanded us to do what we cannot do, and then condemns us for not doing it. For he may just as well take the broad ground that there is not a command in the Bible as to say that to believe on Christ is not a command. But bro. W. takes Webster, and goes through a number of definitions, and comes out with the final conclusion that faith is not an act of the mind, but an effect produced or forced upon the mind, by testimony. His course in this reminds me of the manner in which our Pede friends get sprinkling out of baptidzo. Webster defines baptism to be the application of water to the subject, and this of course can be done by pouring or sprinkling. So you can prove sprinkling by Webster just about as easily as you can that faith is not a command of God, or that "faith is not an act of the mind, but an effect wrought in the mind by the word of God." But when Webster defines baptism to be the application of water to the subject, he leaves out of view the original meaning of the word, and gives an accommodated meaning drawn from the practice of the times in which he lived, which is not the Bible meaning. So you have done regarding faith. You take faith, and give Webster's definition of faith and find nothing in that at all like your position. You then take up *persuasion*, and give Webster's definition for that, but that still gives nothing

like your definition; but you find that persuaded means *convinced*, and tracing out the meaning of the phrase "to be convinced," you find it means *to be overcome by argument*, to be forced to yield assent to the truth. Thus to reach your conclusions, you have to leave the word faith, and travel through two or three other words and phrases, and manufacture your conclusions out of something else entirely. Now if you cannot work your conclusion out of a legitimate definition of *faith*, you cannot get it legitimately at all. In your far-fetched definition of faith, you leave out of view the Bible meaning of the command to believe. Faith comes by hearing the word of God. So *hearing*, is included in the command to believe, for no one can believe without hearing. And in hearing and examining the word of God, we are in every way responsible, and it is a voluntary matter. We may hear and give our attention or not, as we may prefer. In the days of the Savior there were some who closed their eyes and ears, and would not hear; and so it was in the days of the apostles, and the consequence of those who would not hear was, that they did not believe; and no one can believe, who will not hear. But you claim that the will has nothing to do in the matter. If that be true, it is very strange that the Lord should declare that, "he that believeth not shall be damned," when we could not help ourselves. If the will has nothing to do with believing, then there are many passages that have no meaning in them. Paul says, "But without faith, it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God,

must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that dilligently seek him." Here it is declared that we *must* believe, and yet if the will has nothing to do with it, we cannot believe. But you write as though I had taken the position that man can believe without testimony, and ask why the word of God should be given, if man could believe *voluntarily*. I never thought of any man believing the gospel without the testimony of God's word, nor did I ever intimate such a thing. In order to prove your theory, that faith is not a command of God, but an effect forced upon the mind by testimony, you have assigned to me a position that I never occupied, and you have defined faith, till you have defined it all away, and left it a mere negative quantity, without any power to act, either positively or negatively. When God commands man to believe, he includes in that command all the means necessary to enable him to believe. When Paul commanded the jailer to believe, he immediately spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house, and the believing was done when they heard the word, and not till then. For without the word, no one can believe. Hence it is said of the Corinthians, "Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized." Hearing and believing always go together. But when people hear the word, it depends upon their own *will*, as to whether they will heed, examine, and receive that word as true or not. The following is an example of this. "And it came to pass in Iconium, that they went both together into the syna-

gogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude, both of Jews and also of the Greeks believed. But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren." Acts 14: 1-2. Here the people of the same town, who heard the same word, acted differently. Some of them yielded themselves to heed, and examine the word, and they believed. But there were others there who would not heed, and therefore did not believe, but persecuted those who did believe. The command of God to believe, requires, therefore, that we yield our minds willingly to hear, examine, and receive the word of God as true. We must believe with the heart, and this includes the will. The whole mind, the *will* must be yielded to the word of God, the glorious gospel of Christ.

So all that you have said in defining *obedience*, applies in all its fullness to belief. The command to "love one another" is no more a command of God, than is the command to believe. Christ says, "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." Jno. xv. 12. And in 1 Jno. 3: 23, faith is positively shown to be a command of God, as is love. Just as well say that repentance is not a command of God, as to say that faith is not. There are still thousands of people who hear the word of God for a lifetime, and who will not believe it. They allow something else to fill up their hearts and crowd out the word, and so *will not* believe, and condemnation at the last day will be the certain reward of all such. But you also object to faith being called an *act*, and then proceed

to define the word act, as something *done*, or *doing*, and you seem to suppose that this cannot be said of the mind regarding faith. You certainly know that the mind acts as well as the body. The mind acts in exercising love, hatred, envy, jealousy, and such like, and just so the mind acts in exercising faith, which is an act of the mind. The mind has to examine the word, the testimony, and then yield a hearty assent to its truth, and this is faith. You must be careful bro. W. or your learned definitions will carry you clear beyond the bounds of common sense, and leave you out in the cold..

You imagine, too, that you have shown that faith has reference to truth only, but not to authority. This is something new under the sun. I have always thought there was authority in everything that God says. Christ spoke as one having authority and not as the Scribes. Everything that God requires, has the authority of God connected with it. He requires us to believe, and when we do believe we submit to his authority just as much as when we repent. Faith therefore has as much reference to the authority of God, as any act of obedience we perform. I did not refer to the day of Pentecost for a command to believe, but for a command to repent and be baptized, but to the jailer for a command to believe, and one is just as much a command as the others. All are the commands of God. But enough of this for the present.

E. G. S.

There are no revelations from God to the pulpit, which are not given to the pew.

Away up in Tennessee.

A little letter with the name of Wm. J Moss to it, after wandering around to my home, reached me away out on the prairies of the West. I learned from this that the brethren of Beech Grove and Hillsboro wanted me to visit Middle Tennessee again. After preaching and withdrawing from the scene of action for the night a council of war was called into the secrets of which my wife and I alone entered. It was agreed, the Lord willing, Tennessee must be seen again. Information looking to this end was immediately dispatched and arrangements were made for a return to our home in Alabama. Two weeks and two days at home, a short time indeed, and again the valise was packed, and everything was made ready for leaving. Directions for two months were given to the first lieutenant of the home guards and sub-officers, as well as could be done, viewing as we did into the dark future. Sammie is coming said some one. Maggie drew the buggy right up to the gate, a sad goodbye is said, and what the mouth cannot speak the eye expresses, and I took a seat by brother Sammy Jordan in his buggy. Let us tear away and well enough, for late we drove up to Tankersly's school house and found an impatient audience waiting, looking and doubting. The outsiders and insiders were collected in the house, and twice we addressed them that day upon the soul's eternal interests. There is only a small band of soldiers here, but some as true as steel. They meet regularly, break bread and study the Scripture. The

brother that visits in may ee to be called upon to answer many questions. This is right. Two of their number were at a Methodist experience meeting not long since. The preacher proceeded to unbosom his heart-felt religion thus. My religion is something like this day. I did not see the sun rise or know when it rose this morning for the clouds, but I know it is up, on account of the light. So I do not know when my sins were pardoned, but know they are by the light in my soul (that is feeling.) One of the aforementioned two, said his religion was like that morning too. He did not see the sun arise but he had an almanac at home, in which he had great confidence, from this he learned at what time the sun arose. Now continued he, allow me to call my Bible my religious almanac, from it I learn just at what time my sins were pardoned. Peter told the Pentecostians this, and the information is good yet. Now a man cannot doubt or disbelieve this without setting aside the book. The other having also the privilege of relating his experience, gave a Pentecostal one and proffered some advice to the mourners by telling them they might "*get through*" after the manner of the three thousand on that memorable occasion, or the Samaritans, or Paul, or the Eunuch.

Tuesday morning we took up the line of march for Montgomery, early. I perceived that this city in all things was too political. Where the carcass is, there will the vultures go, and where there is filth thither will the flies collect. One important little editor learned that I was trying to keep all my brethren from voting, and he had

said he intended to ask me if he ever saw me again, now he wanted to hear for himself. But in order to environ me with the strongest surrounding he went on to say: "Just look at our condition, and it is growing worse." I admitted things are in a bad condition (and greedy, ambitious politicians will always keep things in bad order,) and suggested a better remedy than voting. What is it he inquired. Well, let the land owners cease to employ negroes on their plantations. The negroes will go off somewhere else and all this excitement, confusion, enmity, and threatening will cease right off. "But *they* will not agree to it," said he. That is so. Well is that people, who for the sake of money, will hire, feed, furnish shelter for those who are to make laws for them, to their detriment (as they say) and dissatisfaction, deserving sympathy? Not a bit. But after weighing tranquility, peace, and all attendant blessings, then on the other hand the gain, the latter predominates in their minds, and they say, Egypt we love thee still. Oh cursed money, what wilt thou not cause man to do. One sold his Lord for it why may not others sell their happiness here for the same, also the prospects of the next life? That is not all, there still lingers a faint hope that our wives and daughters may with tender hands and fair complexion, remain parlor ladies, our boys and fathers with pointers, or hounds hunt foxes or birds whilst the indolent freedman butcher up farms and stock plantations with weeds and grass. The thing we need is work. Our young men in our days look around and around for business,

not work. Business means a clerkship, a book-keepership, a lawyer-ship, doctorship, and perchance a pastorate. A one horse, two horse, or three horse or four horse office will do. Anything for a shade. In religion the trouble is hydrophobia in agriculture, sun-stroke. Oh, that burning sun! The best country I have seen is where the girls and mamma do the house work, and dad and the boys do the out work. There is no lazy waiting here for lazy negroes to do it. Work is healthy and wholesome and no country can prosper long without it, and the greater number at it the better. It keeps heads and hands out of mischief. Just as long as there is one darkey about, all will try to hire him. The South presents a sad scene for the eyes of philanthropists. Her fair fields almost valueless, once the desire of the world; civil commotion in all directions; a jealous watching and anxiety; a constant preparation for worse things. Here is the spectacle. I tell you 'tis not patriots we want, or zealously biased politicians, or loyal subjects of any man's scheme or projects; or voters, but true lovers of the human family. Is there, oh! is there not enough salt in this so called Christian land to save it from such bitterness and blood-shed. We need light and love, we need wisdom. The negro is as a general thing kind-hearted, humble, willing to do a favor ignorant, indolent and just ready to be molded into any shape by men, who, getting his confidence, having no love for country, party or people like that of self, would make heaven a pandemonium and earth a butcher-

pen for their own promotion and advancement. He will be harmless or dangerous depending upon the character of those who lead or incite him. San Domingo is a fair example. Are there any who have the seeds of love in their heart? Then give them culture, that they may look out for the interest of man in this land. Christians need not vote but they should let the light of peace, and good will to all men beam upon all around. Now that the sullen cloud of trouble gathers and darkens is the time for not only moderation, but wisdom. The negro has been the innocent cause of confusion and ill feeling ever since he came across the ocean. A wise people still let him disturb the minds of the nation. The South has been ruined by him. It may be that he has been gainer, but the future alone can reveal whether it will turn out to his good.

There never was a greater curse entailed upon the Master's children than slavery. It transformed the sons into well dressed boobies, the daughters into squeaking playthings and both into effeminate puppets moved as others move them. But these things have passed and still the trouble does not cease. Would not reformation be better for all, bringing safety, peace and quiet? I think so, and therefore advise it. Oh for peace! But I must return to my editor. I told him the Christian Character is pure and unspotted, all admit that politics is a filthy and unclean thing. Now it is impossible to bring two such together without the pure becoming impure, the unspotted, spotted. No Christian can engage without damage in the intriguing, trick-

ery, selling and buying men, fraud and corruption of the political world. Men cannot, no will not be, honest when money is to be handled, so they are going at their different prices. There are some who sell out for a few dollars. It takes thousands to purchase others. I cannot agree "that all men have their price." Oh, no, there are some like the precious jewel that money cannot buy. The cynic took a torch and went through the streets of Athens in the day time. For what are you looking? An honest man was his reply. They are getting scarce, and ordinary light will not I fear, soon enable the seeker to find one. All in the church should be of this character. All who are Christ's are of this kind. Therefore remember "evil communication will corrupt good manners. 'Tis best to abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul. The devil takes men upon some high mountain and some fall down and worship him for a pittance, others want kingdoms, others still the glory of them. Offices seem to be the best means at his majesty's command for getting worship. What think you, said a young sister, to me once while traveling, of a brother's being Sheriff. I replied it does not look like a fit position for a man to be gentle, nor does such love work no ill to his neighbor. "Well, continued she, I saw one of our brethren not long since carrying some convicts to the Penitentiary and he had two great pistols belted around him." Did he look like one of God's blameless and harmless sons without rebuke and did he shine as a light to the world? Was he holding forth the word of life? She did not think he

sued the character set forth by the apostle. The man who falls down to worship Satan takes a terrible fall. 'Tis said the devil fell from heaven. The Christian who leaves the level—the high plain of holiness, purity, righteousness and finds himself in the low places to which mammon consigns him has made a great descent. 'Tis easily made, but getting back is the work of trouble. Farewell Montgomery.

Soon I was going, away away from home. The iron charger drove madly along.—Houses, fields, hills, valleys, trees, rocks, workmen, idlers were passed without even a How do ye do sir, or a goodbye. They seem to fly behind us. People living on the R. R. see the train everyday, and still it is seldom that the whole family, pa and bud do not stop to look at it. There is something grand about it that man knows not how to express but stops to wonder at and admire. There is another member of the family that seems never to get used to the cars. The dog will often fly out at the train, chase it for a distance, with bristles up, looking savagely and seemingly saying "if you don't mind how you dare trespass on my dominion, I'll take you down and make hash of you." Then curling his victorious tail over his back, either trot or walk back with a triumphant air as some preachers who, having been charged with adding to God's word and found guilty, still claim to have vanquished the enemy, and with as much show as the dog. There is one thing you will see at every station. There is always a supply of them and if the place is overstocked with anything it is sure to be this one evil.

I believe I never saw a place that had anything more than a name without what they chose to call a "saloon." What an abuse of terms. The devil uses sweet terms to seduce. I have an idea his language to Eve was very insinuating and inviting. I am reminded when I look at the various sweet names for saloons, of the song;

Will you walk into my parlor.

Said a spider to a fly,

'Tis the prettiest little parlor

That e'er you did spy.

I thought I would remember some of these names but when I came to examine memory's pages, all are gone rubbed or crowded out. I wanted to show the young what pretty snares r their feet. But what an abuse of terms. Saloon i- defined by Webster as an elegant hall for the reception of, distinguished guests. Just think then of these little filthy, dirty, sloppy, spitty, tobacco stained concerns aspiring to such importance. And oh the guests Look at that high hat, slick hat, broad-cloth "gentleman" yonder leaning upon the counter. He tries to look sober and sensible, but his sleepy half open eyes betray the power at work in him, shows that evil spirits have come and entered him again, he makes an effort to talk smart, discusses day themes, but a thief has crept into his mouth and stolen away his brains. He is a fool now, and why because he sold his reason for grog. Man can get understanding, get wisdom, and so can he get drunk which is the same as getting to be a fool. Listen to the obscene and profane language used here. Hear the foolish and unmeaning conversation of this house and it called a "saloon." 'Tis

a little hell, a tartarus, tophet, or something for punishment of those who sell their birthright to be noble pure holy, sober, wise, for the drunkening beverage. 'Tis a trap where men spiders catch, men flies to feed upon their pockets. I saw out West another distinguished guest receiver¹ at one of these "saloons." The proprietor to make his snare a more tempting retreat had loafing benches out in front of his house. There lay upon one of them a manly form, of strong muscle, but his face swelled and of livid hue, made a sad revelation. A fiery red belt showed itself from his eyes not wholly shut. The unkempt locks strayed about in great carelessness, an arm lay across his forehead. The flies of the community seemed all invited to the feast and not one refused to come on account of more important business or other engagements. A slow stream was flowing from the corner of his mouth to the bench. "Is this the temple where a God may dwell? Said Byron to the skull and so say we to this unfortunate wretch. Was he once a model of decency, modesty and intelligence? What mother's son is he? She is in the East probably thinking well of the boy. He has been trapped in a "saloon." Is it not strange that a wise law-making country will license such dead-falls as these. Doctors, Rail Road men and all into whose hands the lives of others are trusted should especially never touch spirituou. liquors. But R. R. hands are allowed to drink, 'Tis not the man who cannot walk for his liquor, who is to be feared. but he that is rendered reckless, hazardous, devilish, fiendish, by being full of it all

the time I saw some hands who had found a fine hat which some unlucky traveller by taking a peep out at the window had lost. With it in hand, the finder at the first station made his way to a "saloon" whilst many comrades fell in and marched on to exchange the prize for drinks. So they drink. We came to Birmingham. There is something in a name, Mr. Shakespeare to the contrary notwithstanding, This little city was named, in bright anticipation of its being, in importance, like the one across the waters of the same name, but like some children a big name is about all it has received. So we see that it is not all in a name. So many stupid dunces and bad men have worn the name George Washington, that few parents now give it. The name of a Campbell will be worn by the sons of many a Campbellite, until it will be no honor to name bad children after the great reformer. But there is another kind of Campbellite. I have always denied the existence of such a people but will have to give it up. A man writing about wrongs, happened to suggest that one of the mistakes A. Campbell made was in being too rich. From the ink and paper wasted, one would have concluded surely this man had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, the unpardonable sin, or sin unto death. There was a rush of Campbellites to the scene of action: Much zeal and heroism (I do not know how much sense) were displayed in defending the character of the great man from any charges whatever. I learned that he made no mistakes. Wrongs in others are rights in him. 'Tis dangerous to be rich but it was altogether right for him, and it was a righteous thing, for him to grow rich. The means justified the end. 'Tis unwise in others to leave children great legacies, he, in so doing, did a wise thing: Now for my part I was really sorry they whipped so unmercifully the poor unknown, who dared tread, with his heavy, rough shoes, this holy ground, for I really believed he was going to use this great and good man, whom he could not have injured and did not want to injure, to reprove many of our brethren for a great wrong, and correct the same to the extent of his power: Our Savior said, "How hardly shall a rich man enter the kingdom of heaven:" From the attention paid to monied men, the conclusion must be drawn that they get in easier than any others. There is more rejoicing on earth, over one rich man, who they think gets into the kingdom than over ninety and nine poor ones? No one seems to fear, being kept out of the kingdom by being rich. Every one seems to be willing to risk squeezing in, and so there is a rush for money and who knows how many are saying, A. C. was a rich man and he has gone to heaven. If he went I can go too and riches are allowed to increase. Jesus said it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, but preachers do not think so, for this character with them does not, like others have to receive the kingdom as a little child to enter it. But he goes in with the pride wealth gives, and when the rich get in (as 'tis thought for they that trust in their riches never get in) not satisfied with the simple

things of the kingdom, its humility, meekness, longsuffering, forbearing and forgiving spirit, they look out for progress, keep pace with this fast age, try to be like other people and so lust after the organs, fine churches, baptizing "gowns," baptisteries with warm water in them, of Egypt. All the aid of B. F. Leonard's litter was neutralized by the weak alkali of the Campbellites. The dust raised about a man hid the danger of being rich from view. Every editor, Scribe, preacher, teacher, overseer should warn the brotherhood of the dangers of this wild, money-loving, money hunting age. They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil, which while some coveted after they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. We are told not to to keep company with the covetous men and extortioners. There are either none of them or we fail to carry out God's will, for none are withdrawn from on this account. We can never expect to grow healthily until we purge out the old leaven and keep the lump pure. A man is covetous when he loves money too well. There are many ways of finding out when he loves it too much. When his Lord wants a sacrifice and he clings to his earthly goods and refuses, then he is in love with his money and has no place in the family of God. This being true, would not whole churches have to be rejected? Men of the world in their organized societies are putting the church to an open shame

by their liberality. The kingdom is built up no longer in many places, and the standard of the great captain at a stand still. The man who loves money so much he will not take hold and push along the interests of human salvation is certainly covetous and should forfeit his place in the body. The church is full of such. The temple is again defiled with money changers, oxen, mules, greenbacks, banks, mortgages, and many other things, and the thongs of the Lord's making should whip them until they are driven from their improper habitation. The hearts of the children of God are no places for the love of the world, or the things of the world, for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not of the Father, but is of the world, and the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever. I am sorry that any effort to destroy the influence of money in the church should be interrupted, but enough this time.

J. M. BARNES.

Commands vs. Traditions.

Men who change the laws of God, who presume to set aside the positive commands of Christ, and substitute therefor, the traditions of men, must expect the displeasure of God.

The traditions of man sets aside the ordinance of baptism, and substitutes the "mourners bench" or "anxious seat." Jesus says "whosoever believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." Traditions of men say: "believe and come to the anxious seat" and you "get religion." Peter told penitent believers (Acts 2: 38.) "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

Traditions of men say, "Repent and come to the anxious seat and you shall find pardon." Now, if this is not clearly substituting the "anxious seat" for baptism, what would the reader call it?

But again—Christ says (John 3: 5.) "unless a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Traditions say, "water is not necessary. If a man be born of the Spirit only, this is enough. Baptism is not essential."

Paul says, (Rom. 6: 3.) We are "baptized into Christ." Traditions of men, "We believe into Christ." (Gal. 3: 27.) "Baptized into Christ." Traditions of men, "We believe into Christ."

Peter, (1 Pet. 3: 21) "Baptism saves us." Traditions of men, "baptism is nothing."

James—(Jas. 2: 24.) "Man is justified by works, and not by faith only." And some traditions contend that this is a very wholesome doctrine, and full of comfort.

Paul says (Rom. 6: 4.) We are buried with Christ by baptism into death, and are raised to a new life. Tradition, "We get the new life by faith, and baptism is only a sign of the same."

These are a few of the erroneous teachings of men. It may be inquired now, if these doctrines so different from the word of God are taught, why is it they should find any advocates?

The reason is plain. But few men are willing to read the Bible for themselves, and a large majority of those who do, allow some one else to do their thinking. The church holds a certain doctrine, "whatever the

church holds is right." Or, "the preacher says so, therefore it is so."

Now how much better to believe God, how much better to put our hand in His—as it were—and willingly submit to his guidance—trusting Him to lead us safely through this life, and into the life eternal.

J. T. Poe.

CHRISTIAN CONVENTION.

TO BE HELD WITH THE LINDEN STREET CHRISTIAN CHURCH, MEMPHIS, TENN., NOVEMBER 24-26, 1875.

At the close of the consultation meeting of the disciples of Christ held in Trenton, Gibson county, Tennessee, July 28-30 inclusive, the following resolution was *unanimously* adopted:

Resolved, That another meeting, for consultation, investigation and spiritual enjoyment, all in the interest of the Savior's cause, be held; and that each church in West Tennessee be earnestly requested to send a full delegation authorized to report the condition of the church, &c., and that the delegates bear a certificate from the church of their appointment in order that they may secure the advantage of reduced fare on the railroads, should such be granted; that a committee be appointed to notify and *specially* request each church to send delegates to said meeting and submit questions upon which the delegates will be expected to report; to arrange a programme of exercises and order of business, and time and place of said meeting, and whatever else may be necessary.

Whereupon B. W. Lauderdale, J. H. Roulhac, and W. E. Hall were appointed said committee, who submit the following :

DEAR BRETHREN :—In obedience to the foregoing resolution, we take pleasure in notifying you that the next meeting will be held in Memphis, Tennessee, on the 24–26 of November, 1874.

The object of said meeting is the investigation of the word of God, consultation with reference to the interest of the cause of Christ in our midst, and for our mutual encouragement and spiritual enjoyment.

That such meetings accomplish great good we presume no one will deny. We feel assured that every brother who attended our last convention will gladly testify to the spiritual benefits and enjoyments of the occasion and we appeal to them for confirmation of this.

To make these meetings still more beneficial, all the churches and preachers should take an interest in them.

You are, therefore, earnestly requested to send a full delegation to our next convention, authorizing them to report on the condition of the churches by submitting written answers to the following questions for the year 1874.

Brethren, please send perfect reports.

QUESTIONS.

- 1 What is the name of the church?
- 2 Where is it located?
- 3 What is the nearest post office?
- 4 When, and by whom, was it planted?
- 5 How many members?

6 Who are your Elders and Deacons?

7 Who is your regular preacher?

8 How often do you have preaching?

9 Do the brethren keep up their weekly meetings?

10 How many additions within this year?

11 How much diminished by death, withdrawal, or removal?

12 Has the church a house of worship? if so, its value and kind?

13 Has the church a Sunday school? if so, how many teachers and pupils, and how conducted?

14 How much money does the church raise annually, and how is it disbursed?

15 How many contribute to this amount?

16 How much is raised by weekly contributions?

17 How many hold family worship?

18 How many members in the community who have not united with the congregation?

19 What is the average attendance at the weekly meetings?

20 How many take public part in the worship?

21 How many preachers has the congregation sent out? who, and where are they?

22 How many are in process of training?

23 What are the general prospects of the church?

We hope, brethren, that you will not deem these queries impertinent, for they are asked only in the interest of the cause we love.

We also hope you will promptly attend to them, though it costs some trouble and time. For, if we can

afford to write them, have them printed, search out all the churches and send to them, which is expensive and laborious and without compensation, surely you ought to reply to them. This we earnestly request and feel that we have a right to expect.

We are authorized by the Church of Christ, in Memphis, Tenn., to extend a cordial invitation not only to the brethren of West Tennessee, but to the brethren everywhere, to attend the meeting and to participate in the exercises. Those who may attend will be gladly received and entertained by the brethren in Memphis at their homes. Those who determine to be in attendance are *requested* to notify Bro. David Walk, Memphis, Tenn., in writing at least ten days beforehand, in order that prompt and suitable arrangements may be made for their reception and entertainment.

Delegates on their arrival in the city will report at once to the Linden Street Christian Church, corner 2nd and Linden streets, where they will be met by the reception committee. Street cars from all the Depots run to within a square of the church.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The meeting will convene in Linden Street Christian Church at 10 o'clock A. M., Nov. 24th, 1874.

1st Reports from Delegates.

2d Essay on "Church Letters," by J. H. Lauderdale, of Covington, Tenn.

3rd Does a failure, on the part of the subject, to understand that baptism is in order to remission of past sins, affect the validity of the ordinance? by Alex. Ellett, of Thyatira, Miss.

4th Lord's day Worship, by T. B. Larimore, of Florence, Ala.

5th Qualifications and work of deacons, by R. B. Trimble, of Mayfield, Ky.

6th The relationship of members to the church of Christ; and the relation of the church to members withdrawn from, by B. F. Manire, Winona, Miss.

7th Christian Culture, by T. A. Crenshaw, of Hopkinsville, Ky.

8th Church Discipline: how administered and the design thereof, by David Walk, of Memphis, Tenn.

9th Whiskey making, whiskey selling, and whiskey drinking by members of the church of Christ, by J. M. Pickens, of Mountain Home, Ala.

10th Prayer, By W. Y. Taylor, of Florence, Ala.

After each essay criticism and brief discussion will be in order.

The investigation of the questions thus suggested, we feel sure, will prove of great interest to the brethren; and they are respectfully submitted for the serious consideration of all. If any have difficulties, note them in a few words, and after the essays, present them. This method we have found to save time, and avoids random talking.

B. W. LAUDERDALE }
J. H. ROULHAC, } Committee.
W. E. HALL, }

Discussion.

Arrangements have been made for a discussion of some of the points of difference between the M. E. Church South and the church of God. Rev. D. F. Fuller represents the former

and Eld. J. C. Matthews the latter. The following propositions were agreed upon.

1 Ought infant children to be baptized and received into the church?

2 Baptism is scripturally administered by aspersion.

3 The penitent sinner is justified by faith alone. Fuller affirms the above.

4 Baptism by immersion is the only baptism authorized by Christ and practiced by his apostles.

5 Baptism is for the remission of sins. Matthews affirms. The discussion commences at Shady Grove, Wood Co., Texas, on Monday the 16th Nov.

CHURCH NEWS.

Bros. L. & S.: Some time has elapsed since I wrote to you. During the past summer I have had a long and protracted spell of sickness, and am now just getting on foot again. We had a meeting at Black Jack Grove, Hopkins Co., continuing from Saturday until Monday night, with 4 confessions and 3 immersed. Bro. DeSpain preached and I aided him by exhortations. The attendance was large, and a fair prospect of much good being accomplished at that place. When completed, they will have a good house. The cause is prospering in this country.

Yours in the one hope,

J. A. DICKSON.

Miller Grove, Tex., Oct. 27, 1874.

At a meeting embracing the first Lord's day in Oct., at Corinth church in Wilson Co., Tenn., there were fif-

teen accessions to the congregation of disciples there.

G. L.

Bros. L. & S.: Bro. B. W. Lauderdale from Bailey's Station, on the Memphis & Charleston R. R. commenced a meeting here on the 4th Lord's day ult., and continued his regular discourses until Friday following, when he left for another appointment. The result was 21 confessions, one from the Baptists and 19 baptized up to the time of his departure. The congregation was much edified and encouraged. On the following Lord's day morning we went to Hatchie River to baptize two persons. When about going down into the water an amiable old lady stepped forth and said she wanted to be baptized too. "I believe with my whole heart," said she, "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and I want to be baptized in his name." We of course helped her with the others to obey the Lord. At eleven o'clock we spoke the word of the Lord at a school-house near by. Two more confessed the Savior and were buried with him in baptism on the afternoon of that day, so we have had 25 accessions in 8 days. To God be all the praise. Bro. Lauderdale is a well-read and logical teacher of the Christian religion. His greatest power is in presenting the Christian life in its native purity, simplicity and blessedness, while those without, seeing what it is to be a Christian and how they may become such are moved to obedience, and those within are stirred to a sense of their duties and obligations as the Disciples of Jesus.

W. L. TOMSON.

New Hope, Hardeman Co., Tenn., Oct. 17, 1874.

ITEMS.

Our venerable brother, J. T. Barclay, late Missionary to Jerusalem died at his home in Ala. last week.

We see it stated that Bro. T. W. Caskey is preaching to more people at Bonham, Texas, than any man ever preached to before at that place.

Bro. D. S. Wills writing from Fort Mason, Texas, says that they need some one to teach and preach for them. Plenty of good land can be bought at \$1.00 per acre, and there is an abundance of vacant land which can be taken as homesteads. He thinks that a permanent preacher could do a vast amount of good at that place.

R. G. Glaze of Athens, Ala., sends us a club of ten new subscribers. We hope that others will imitate his example and secure us at least enough new names to take all the extra copies which we began to issue with No. 41. Almost every day we receive letters from our friends assuring us that the Advocate is accomplishing much good; and it will accomplish as much more, in proportion as its circulation is increased.

Sister Lucy J. Blankenship, writing from Giles Co., Tenn., gives an account of a meeting conducted by Bro. T. Larimore near Lawrenceburg. Twenty were added to the church and a good impression was made by bro. L.

S. J. Moore sent us, some time since, an account of a meeting at Smyrna, in Maury Co. Tenn. There were seventeen additions. J. M. F. Smithson did the preaching.

Errata.

In Advocate No. 43, page 1008, in the sentence "Therefore to any the punishment of both good and bad is to any punishment altogether." Read deny for any.

SIR WALTER RALEIGH ON WINE. Take special care that you delight not in wine, for there never was any man who came to honor or preferment that loved it, for it transformeth a man into a beast, decayeth health, and poisoneth the breath, destroyeth natural heat, bringeth a man's stomach to an artificial burning, deformeth the face, and to conclude, maketh a man contemptible, soon old and despised of all wise and worthy men; hated by thy self, thyself and thy companions; for it is a bewitching and infectious vice, and remember my words, that it were better for a man to be subject to any vice than to it, for all other vanities and sins are reeovered; but a drunkard will never shake off the delight of beastliness; for the longer it possesseth a man the more he will delight in it, and the older he groweth the more he will be subject to it; for it dulleth the spirits and destroyeth the body, as ivy doth the old tree, or as the worm that endangereth in the kernel of the nut.

General News.

T. J. Hopkins' wholesale grocery was destroyed by fire on Saturday night.—The annual assembly of the Grand Council of Royal and Select Masters of the Masonic Fraternity met in this city on the 2nd of Nov.—The fine residence of Mrs. Andrew

J. Polk near Columbia, Tenn, was totally destroyed by fire last week. It was valued at \$40,000.—Eld. W. J. Ellis of the Free Protestant Church in this city delivered a discourse on Sunday upon the following subject: "A Religion which fears no science, depends on no books, needs verification from no Ghosts."—The first snow of the season fell in Wheeling, Va., Oct. 31—It is not believed that the President will renew his recommendation that the Civil Rights Bill be passed, in his forthcoming message.—F. J. Dickens, son of the novelist is in New York and will probably take up his residence in Ottawa.—Bret Harte left this city for Atlanta, where he lectures on 2nd Nov.—At latest accounts the election in La. was proceeding quietly.—Fred Douglas' oldest son has been appointed a special agent for the Post Office Department.—In the Ohio Penitentiary, 462 of the convicts have joined the Young Men's Christian Association.—Jerome Bonaparte, second son of the Great Emperor's nephew is a lawyer at the Baltimore bar.—The lawyers of Nashville are taking steps towards forming a Lawyer's Life Association.—There is no truth in the report of the assassination of Buckland, correspondent of the New York Times.—Almost the entire town of Greencastle, Ind., was destroyed by fire, Oct. 28.—Bailey, the Danbury News man, writes from England that the English are generally bow-legged, notwithstanding their advances during the past three centuries. He attributes it to their standing on their feet at an extremely early age, admiring the aspect of their public debt.—Hon. Jer. White, one of the

editors of the Houston (Tex.) Democrat, was assassinated by John H. Hubbard on Friday last.—An estimate has been made of the cotton crop in three States. In La. there will be a gain of 10 per cent over last year's crop. In Miss., and Ark., a falling off of 25 per cent.

Elder G. Lipscomb is holding a protracted meeting this week with the church at McWhirtersville, Tenn. There were two additions at latest accounts and interest still increasing. Verily, the church is alive at that place.

NOTICE.

After the first of January next, the Postal law requires that postage on all papers shall be prepaid at the office of publication. Our subscribers will therefore please remember when sending the subscription to send with it 20 cts for postage. This will cost the subscriber no more than heretofore. He only pays us the postage, instead of the Post Master. He will then never be dunned for his postage. Please remember this.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Memoirs of Jesus.....	1031
Is Faith a command.....	1036
Away up in Tennessee.....	1042
Commands vs Traditions.....	1048
Christian Convention.....	1049
Discussion.....	1051
Church News.....	1052
Items.....	1053
Errata.....	1053
General News.....	1053
Notice.....	1054

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 45.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, NOV. 12, 1874.

Laying on of Hands. Inspiration.

The discussion of the question at Murfreesboro of imposition of hands caused some new thoughts and showed the importance of impressing some that have already been suggested.

Our chief argument was made just before leaving. Difficulties were presented, questions asked, that induced new trains of thought while up, without opportunity for examination. During this time, the question of Paul's degree of inspiration before and after the laying on of hands at Antioch was under consideration. Bro. Abell quoted Paul's language, "I am not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles" as evidence that he was an apostle before the laying on of hands. We responded, this was spoken after the hands were laid upon him; before that time he went up to Jerusalem to communicate with the apostles and that he counselled with those of reputation in the gospel which he had preached lest he had run or should run in vain. We said this doubt and uncertainty characterized his course before the laying on of hands, afterwards, he could boldly

say, I am not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles and withstood Peter to the face. We attributed this confidence to the effect of receiving an apostolic measure of the Spirit. On an examination of the matter we find it possible that both expressions were used with reference to what occurred, after the imposition of hands. The visit of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned Gal. ii : 2, is usually regarded to be the same as that mentioned Acts xv; when he went up to confer on the subject of circumcision. It is by no means certain that this is the same visit, yet it is possibly the same. If so, he sought the counsel of the apostles after the laying on of hands. We mention it, because unwilling to use a bad argument or even a doubtful one.

We also mentioned the fact that Paul was advanced from an inferior position to a prominent one, by the laying on of hands. Stated that in Greek, in enumerations of names, it is a rule the most important comes first, the least last. We gave as illustration of this, the name of the apostle Peter always stood first, Judas last. Bro. Abell, although a Greek

scholar, claimed he had never heard of such a rule and clearly intended to discredit it. He based a very strong objection to our argument on his lack of knowledge here. We certainly are not responsible for Bro. Abell's lack of knowledge on these points; yet it was used to set aside the force of the rule. Lange and Conybeare & Howson both speak of the rule and the fact of Paul's advancement. The latter, page 121 says, "Not only is he mentioned after Barnabas, but that he occupies the lowest place in this enumeration of 'prophets and teachers.' Prophecy of the New Testament does not necessarily imply a knowledge of things to come, but rather a gift of exhorting with a peculiar force of inspiration. The prophet appears to have been ranked higher than the teacher. We may perhaps infer, that, up to this point of the history, Barnabas had belonged to the rank of prophets, Saul to that of teachers, which would be in strict conformity with the inferiority of the latter (Saul) to the former (Barnabas) which as we have seen has hitherto been observed." Here is a distinct recognition of the rule. Our author recognizes him not only inferior as a prophet but infers he belonged to a lower grade of inspired men.

On page 135, they say, "From this point of the apostolic history, Paul appears as the great figure in every picture. Barnabas henceforward is in the back-ground." How does he know this? Paul is henceforward mentioned first. Here is a recognition of the rule and the fact of the advancement of Paul from the lowest to the first place by the laying on of

hands—from that of a teacher to the apostolic position. There are two exceptions to this order of their names after this. Barnabas is placed before Saul on two occasions. Our author explains that as being done at Jerusalem, where from old habit and association with Barnabas and prejudice against Paul, Barnabas naturally took precedence of Paul in their minds, note 4, page 197. So these authors recognize the rule so fully that they allow of no exception to it.

Another point, over which we learn the brethren after our leave had considerable amusement was our position that Paul received additional power after his first reception of the Holy Spirit. They quoted, "he was filled with the Holy Spirit," and additional quantities made him more full. How to compare full, was the point of amusement on the part of two old teachers and scholars. The fun at our expense, we are perfectly willing they should enjoy. The ignorance on which that fun was based and the error it left upon those who heard, is that to which we object.

In the first place granting that one filled with the Spirit, was necessarily fully inspired and endowed with the gifts of the Spirit, (which neither of those brethren believes) and that once inspired, the fullness of the Spirit in its inspiring and wonder-working power was always present with them; still as the gift was according to the grace given us, Rom. xiii: 6. Eph. iv: 7. as he grew in grace the individual developed his powers and capacities. The measure of the Spirit that filled him when a beginner would not fill him when he had grown to maturity in grace. But

men are frequently said to be filled with the Spirit who possessed no spiritual powers. To be filled with the Holy Spirit in a sense of empowering them to work miracles, was a different thing from filling them with the Spirit as the ordinary gift. Paul was filled with the Spirit yet was inferior as a teacher to many others. His gift was not of the high apostolic order. Stephen, Philip, Prochorus and Nicanor all were full of the Holy Ghost yet they were not the equal of Peter, or James or John. Were they full, the apostles fuller, fullest or more fuller, most fullest? Let us have your fun here, my revered and scholarly brethren? More than this, gifts were bestowed on the apostles to work miracles, but the power was not always present. Christ empowered the twelve to work miracles.

"Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils, freely ye have received, freely give." Mat. x: 8. Yet we find at times they were unable to do this work. Their lack of faith, their lack of prayer and fasting incapacitated them for the work. The spiritual power was not always present with them. A slight attention to the lives of the apostles will convince any one that this was true of them after they were empowered on the day of Pentecost. My opinion is that individuals could wholly lose this power. Judas lost it, we think. The Spirit was present on all needful occasions and revealed all needful truths to them. All truth was not theirs. They were not omniscient. All truth needful to the salvation of man was given them, at all proper times, with all needful confirmatory power. Paul gained

knowledge on all subjects, except inspiration needful for the salvation of man, just as we do. He learned the condition of the churches at different points just as we do. A truth once revealed needed not a second revelation to the same apostle. The apostles were said at times to be "in the Spirit." Why did John say he was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, if he was always in the Spirit? Was Peter filled with the Spirit when he dissembled and Paul withstood him and rebuked him? Why did the inspired historian tell us, Paul was filled with the Holy Spirit, when he rebuked the sorcerer, if he was always filled with the Spirit in its wonder-working power? Was it the Holy Spirit in Peter dissembling and the same Holy Spirit in Paul rebuking himself dissembling in Peter?

The sooner we get to the true idea of inspiration the better. Abnormal and incorrect views on this subject produce infidelity. Many say, how could Peter dissemble, Paul and Barnabas fall out and separate, if they were under the guidance of the Spirit? Inspiration revealed the truth to them on the subject of duty to God, and left them with that knowledge, to struggle with human infirmities and frailties just as other human beings do when they are taught the truth. Their perception was clearer and their confidence more assured, was their only advantage.

It seems an odd way of writing, to say Paul, on a notable occasion was filled with the Spirit, when he had been for fourteen years constantly full of the Spirit and it constantly manifesting its presence. They were not in an ecstasy of spiritual revela-

tion all the time. To be so would have destroyed their individuality and would have dispossessed their own spirits, and destroyed permanently their spiritual being. Then every time a man or an apostle came into an ecstasy of the Spirit, he was said to be in the spirit or filled with the Spirit. A man then could be in the Spirit or filled with the Spirit time and again. Conybeare and Howson say of the gift of tongues conferred in some instances after baptism, "It was a result of the sudden influx of supernatural inspiration and recurred afterward at uncertain intervals. While under its influence the exercise of understanding was suspended, while the Spirit was rapt into a state of ecstasy by the immediate communication of the Spirit of God. He was to pour forth in words, yet the words were not his own, he was even sometimes ignorant of their meaning." Inspiration is the substitution of God's Spirit for one's own spirit. To make this perpetual would be to destroy man's spiritual identity. Where is the room for the ridicule here, save in the misconception of those who made the fun? Timothy needed to stir up the gift in him to keep it active. When Paul had hands laid upon him, he received a higher degree of spiritual power, the apostolic measure of the Spirit, with apostolic gifts. He had it not before. The simple statement of the case is this. There are but seven instances of imposition of hands in the Bible. Five of these are said to be for the purpose of imparting the Spirit. The reasons for the other two are not given. They occur in connection with the separating of persons to cer-

tain work, but are immediately followed by the exhibition of gifts not before exercised, which would indicate they were for the purpose of imparting spiritual gifts to qualify for the work to which the persons are called. On the other hand, ordain and ordained to certain work or position are used 39 times in the Bible. Not a single reference in any case of ordaining is made to the laying on of hands, as having any connection with it. Only in two cases can it be inferred as possible. And this inference in these cases, is based upon the supposition that laying on of hands was a necessary part of ordination. This being more than doubtful, the whole practice is doubtful in my mind. But only doubtful practices need the recommendation of meetings. Where Scriptural authority for any practice is clear, no recommendations are needed. Where Scriptural authority is wanting, the recommendations are sinful and presumptuous impertinences. We do not say the brethren intend them as such, but still they are nothing more nor less than either an attempt to bolster up the authority of God by the authority of these conventions, or to impose untaught things on the churches by their authority. Either of which is reprehensible.

D. L.

Correspondence.

Brethren Editors: Since I wrote you, I visited La Guardo, the residence of Brother Granville Lipscomb and spent several days very pleasantly with the brethren and sisters of that vicinity.—I baptized brother

Lipscomb's wife, an Old Virginian, when she was a child about 11 years of age, and tried to act the part of a father to him, as far as I could, during his visit to that State, a few years since.

While at his house during our meeting, I could but be reminded of the maxim true to every generous heart, 'Kindness never loses its reward,'—by their assiduous efforts, to provide for my comfort and happiness. There were five immersions in this neighborhood, one of whom has since passed into the unseen state.

Our 'little' consultation meeting at Murfreesboro,'—closed with five accessions embracing our Post Master, brother Booker, of whom all speak in the highest terms, as being an upright, conscientious man. This "little" meeting may have 'spoiled the work of 10 preachers for a whole week'—but many of us are of the opinion, the pleasure enjoyed, the benefits achieved, the good accomplished by it, would far more than overbalance all 'the spoiling' done. We are very willing to to enjoy another like season of such 'SPOILING.'

I am spending a few days in proclaiming 'the plan' of heaven's redemption, at this place, Wartrace N. & C. R. R. some 25 miles from Murfreesboro, my present adopted home. When I consider the stations Depots, villages, springing up all along the great thoroughfares of our States and observe the great zeal displayed by our religious contemporaries, to have them occupied in their infancy,—I am impressed very sensibly with the importance of our having at least one efficient evangelist to

devote all his time to the proclamation of the primitive Apostolic gospel, along these lines. I can see very well, how preachers, possessed of good and comfortable homes, and abounding with the blessings of this life, can travel at their own expense, and proclaim the Gospel to the destitute; nor have I any difficulty in understanding, how a poor preacher may visit rich and flourishing churches and administer to them; but how a preacher, destitute of a home for his family, as many preachers are, and other earthly comforts can visit the poor, the needy, the destitute,—the very class to which Christ desires, above all others, to have the glad tidings proclaimed; I say, how this is to be done,—without assistance, is more than I can comprehend; and, if another 'Consultation meeting' whether 'little' or 'big,' could throw some light on, or afford some aid in this matter, I would joyfully attend it, though it might be suggested, by some poor, strange wandering brother, even from some 'foreign State.' Nevertheless, Paul seems to teach, "ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." Eph. ii. 19.

On my way home, I called and delivered two discourses at Foster-ville, another station on the above line, and organized a church with 13 members. Bros. McElroy, Sr., as Elder, and Elam, and McElroy, Jr. Deacons. Some four or five more in the neighborhood are expected to unite. May God greatly bless them in their efforts to build up the good cause at this point. Brethren we should meet together, consult together

er, co-operate together,—unite our hands, our heads, our hearts, our means, to spread far and wide, the light of the glorious gospel of the Son of God. God grant to us, his divine aid, to enable us so to do; and may we receive the welcome plaudit, “Well done good and faithful servants.”

Faternally, your co-laborer in the Lord,

G. W. ABELL.

Wartrace, Oct. 30th. 1874.

Unspotted From the World.

The main principle of Christianity, is to build up humanity. This was manifest, in every word, and every act of our Savior. If Christians possess the Spirit of Christ, (and, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his,) they will do as Christ did. They will constantly aim at building up humanity. And when a disciple of Christ, is willing to engage in anything which pulls down mankind, rather than to build it up, he is going in direct opposition to Christ, and the principles he taught, and is in perfect harmony with the devil, and all his teaching. Now, it is clearly evident, that such a course should be avoided by all who love the Lord. That no disciple of Christ should be willing for one moment, to engage in a pursuit, or calling, which does not give promise of benefit to man, and glory to God.

It is often the case, that men do so, and frequently disciples of the Lord turn away from allegiance to him,—engage in pursuits which have for their object,—their end—the death, and destruction, of fellow

mortals. This is awful—it is depressing to the Church—as is often the case. Because a man may happen to be, a jolly companion, gives bountifully to charitable objects, and has plenty of money, he is allowed to serve the devil with all his might, while he retains his membership in the church. And for fear of losing his monied influence—the Church refuses to deal with his sin, permitting him to go straight to hell, and themselves to destruction. This is wrong, and should not be tolerated for a moment. The true design of the Gospel, is to purify from all that is debasing, and to strengthen the soul against sin in every form, and while it cleanses and strengthens the whole moral nature of man. Its language is, “let him that stole, steal no more.” “Lie not, one to another.”

The Gospel takes hold, even of the very thoughts of the heart, and commands us to think on things that are pure, lovely, honest, and of good report. Because our thoughts constitute the fountain from which flows our actions—mainly. If the fountain be pure, so the stream may be pure also, and *vice versa*.

“Little children, keep yourselves from idols.”

J. T. P.

The Sin Against the Holy Spirit.

Bro. Lipscomb: In reference to “The Sin against the Holy Spirit,” you say “we were all perfectly aware that the Holy Spirit inspired all the prophets in olden time, that he had descended on Christ.” I knew you and all were aware of this fact. But you think the passages you quote

from John xiv. xv., "Show plainly that the Holy Spirit would come in a sense, and in a way, that he had not come; and in which he could not come, before the ascension of Christ to heaven." You truly say he was to come "as the law-giver, guide, divine ruler of the Church, and the representative through which God dwelt in his habitation through the Spirit, and through which he revealed his law to the world. In that character he could be reviled, blasphemed, sinned against." But did not God give all the laws, and all the revelations he ever made to mankind by, or through the Holy Spirit? Paul says, in reference to what had not been seen "God has revealed them unto us by the Spirit." "What man knoweth the things" (thoughts) "of a man save the spirit of a man which is in him? Even so the things" (thoughts) "of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God" does know them. Paul and others taught what the Holy Ghost taught *them*. See 1 Cor. 9 to 14. Thus, so far as we know, all God ever revealed to mankind was given, up to the birth of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ which is recorded in the Old Testament, as it is called. From that time, all he revealed, up to the day of Pentecost, is recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. From the day of Pentecost, the remainder of his laws and revelations are recorded in the Acts of Apostles, in the Epistles, and in the Book of Revelations. But much of God's will is recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, as it was communicated to them by Jesus Christ, and brought to their remembrance afterwards by the Holy Spirit,

who was to guide them into all truth. The Holy Spirit did not come in a different sense to the writers of the New Testament, from that in which he came to the Old Testament writers, but he came for a different purpose, which was to give laws and make revelations for the New Covenant dispensation. I am unable to see any reason why the sin against the Holy Spirit could not have been committed before the Holy Spirit came on the day of Pentecost, as well as after he came, especially during the *personal* ministrations of Jesus Christ. He had the Spirit without measure in him. The sin against the Holy Spirit is *one* specific sin. All sins are sins against the Holy Spirit, but there is *one* sin called *the* sin against the Holy Spirit." Then if men are liable to commit that sin, *all* ought to know what it is. I think the passages I will quote will show what that unpardonable sin is; and that it was committed by some of the Scribes and Pharisees. Jesus Christ "cast a devil out of one who was blind and dumb, so that he spake and saw. All the people were amazed, and said is not this the son of David? When the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils." Jesus said to them, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? Therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. Wherefore" (for which reason) "I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the

Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Matthew xii: 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 32. "And the Scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He has Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils. And he (Jesus) called them unto him and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme. But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation, *because* they said he has an unclean spirit." Mark iii: 22, 23, 29, 30.

Now, if it was because they said he cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils, Jesus Christ said all that is recorded by Matthew and Mark, to the Scribes and Pharisees about blasphemy, and all other sins, then I conclude what they said about his casting out devils by Satanic power was *the* sin against the Holy Ghost. If what they said was not said sin, why did he not tell what it would be, when, according to Bro. McDonald and Bro. Lipscomb, the time would come, in which it could be committed, which is all time, after the day of Pentecost? Why talk to them about it, if they had not committed it? The Scribes and Pharisees must have known that Jesus Christ performed all his miracles by the power of the Spirit of God; but to depreciate his standing—his repu-

tation among the people, they said "he casts out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils." This was not the first time they said he had Beelzebub in him. See Matt. x: 25, and ix: 32-34. This case of healing, or casting out devils is nearly exactly like the case mentionrd Matt. xii. and Mark iii.

Jesus Christ called these wicked leaders among the Jews hypocrites, blind guides, blind Pharisees; said that they appeared outwardly to be righteous, but were within, full of hypocrisy and iniquity. He called them serpents, vipers, and said to them, "how can you escape the damnation of hell?" John the Baptist said unto them, "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" These were the great and learned men among the Jews; but I fear but few of them had the honesty of heart that one of them named Nicodemus had, who said to Jesus, "We know thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do the miracles that thou doest except God be with him." I am satisfied that what is revealed by John viii: 37, 38, 39 is not generally understood. He does not mean, when he said what is therein recorded, that the Holy Spirit had not yet been given, for all admit he had been given. But he means he had not yet been given to "any man" who believed. He was not given to any of John's disciples, but he had been given to John. He was not given to any of Christ's disciples, but the twelve, and the seventy. But when the day of Pentecost was fully come, the one hundred and twenty who were assembled together in that upper

room "were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance," so that the Jews who were there, from many countries said of them, "we do hear them speak in our tongues, wherein we were born, the wonderful works of God." This one hundred and twenty was made up of males and females, old and young. It was the promise of the Savior, made John 7 : 37-39 was commended to be fulfilled. Peter told the Jews to "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call." This was a continuation of the same promise, which continued to the end of "the last days" spoken of by the Prophet Joel; or to the end of the apostolic age. Then here Spiritual gifts ceased, after which, Paul said would abide "faith, hope, charity—these three." From that time to this, no man has ruined any one of the gifts predicted by Joel, by Christ, and promised by Peter, and mentioned and explained by Paul in first Cor., and in some of his other epistles. As I said before, I say again, if we cannot learn from Matth. 12, and Mark 3, what the sin against the Holy Ghost is, we can never know what it is, certainly. There are many great men who think they have been baptized with the Holy Ghost. But I say they have not. But if they could show by supernatural signs, as the Apostles, Philip and others did, that they had been thus baptized, if I were to

say they did these miracles by Beelzebub, I would commit the sin against the Holy Ghost. So I understand it.

Most affectionately and Respectfully,

DELANCEY EGBERT.

We do not know where Bro. E. learned any one act is the sin against the Holy Spirit. D. L.

Elder D. Lipscomb : DEAR BRO., Your paper of the 8th inst. has been sent me, with the article headed "The Sin against the Holy Ghost," marked.

This is a subject that I have investigated for some years, and if I have come to a wrong conclusion, it was not from a want of moral honesty, but that of a purer light in regard to God's will on the subject.

I believe if a well informed Disciple of Christ disobeys any command of God *presumptuously*, it is the sin against the Holy Spirit and therefore unpardonable. I refer you as follows. viz :

The 15 : 30, of Numbers. Deut. 17 : 12. Ps. 19 : 15, Heb. 10 : 26. 2nd Peter 2 : 10, and Acts 5 : 1-11. You will in the third verse notice they had lied to the Holy Ghost—4th v. lied unto God. It appears to me if the above sin had been pardonable, our heavenly Father would not have punished them. Please give me one instance in the Bible where a presumptuous sin was pardoned.

For the edification of the brethren and myself, you will please answer the following questions, viz :

1. If two unconverted persons marry and afterwards separate, could either of them marry again ("only in the Lord") and not violate God's Law?

2. If a brother or sister puts away

or departs from their wife or husband when there is no fornication involved, will God forgive them for it, provided they will not marry again?

3. If they will not forgive the first sin of putting away or departing what reformation is required of God, in order to their justification?

4. If either refuses to make the reformation required of them, what disposition must the church of God make of them?

5. Does immersion into Christ, or giving the right hand of fellowship put us in the body or congregation of the Lord?

In hope of Eternal Life,

J. H. HUNDLEY Sr.

Mooresville, Ala., Oct. 20, 1874.

THE "LOUISVILLE PLAN."

We have given but little attention to the "Plan" and its operations in the *ADVOCATE* of late. We have nevertheless noted its progress and working. Until recently its friends have boasted its success as great and overwhelming. They now unite in a wail of despair over its present failure. It is acknowledged a failure and amendments and discussion of change, is the order of the day. It never satisfied the men who first favored the "plan." They adopted it as an expedient to be used until the brethren could be educated to a willingness to accept a higher and stronger form of ecclesiasticism. Some have grown weary with the waiting and one at least of its earliest and most earnest advocates has gone to the Episcopalians. We refer to W. E. Dawson. Our readers will recollect the articles

he wrote for the *Apostolic Times*, abusing roundly and bitterly all who opposed the "plan" and recommending a refusal to sustain the papers which opposed it. At this time the *ADVOCATE* was the only paper among the brethren opposing the "Plan." He afterward through the *Standard* denounced the *Review* and *Times*. But becoming tired of the slow growth toward ecclesiasticism, sought an established ecclesiasticism. Others pursue a different course; they propose to form a strong organization and ecclesiasticism of and over the churches that must have some kind of compulsory power, to force those who accept the plan to comply with the requisitions. We rejoice at this development. It will open the eyes of the masses of the brethren to the real designs of the leaders. They wish an organization through which they can obtain money.

Elder R. Graham, President of the Kentucky department first proclaimed the operations a failure in Kentucky.

The annual meeting of the society in Missouri proclaimed its operations a failure in Mo.

The *Christian Standard* says: "Two things we need, 1st. To secure from our membership generally regular contributions, however small.

2nd. To obtain from the wealthy, contributions proportioned to their means. We are failing in this latter particular almost entirely. We receive sums worth mentioning from men of wealth only as we go outside of the plan we are working on and make special appeals for special missions. * * * Let us fall back on our former plan which certainly worked

much better than this; or let us ascertain some method superior to either of these. Elder W. T. Moore, who stood as God-father to the plan discusses it lengthily in the October number of the Quarterly, and gives as reasons for its failure,

1st. The plan has met with a persistent opposition from brethren, who declare it to be wanting in Scriptural authority, and, entirely opposed to the principles of the religious movement in which they are engaged.

2nd. "The preachers and officers of the church have failed to do what was expected of them."

"The inherent weakness of the plan, in permitting the churches to direct their own contributions instead of giving the boards, State and General, control over them."

He says, "whatever has been accomplished has been mainly through individual effort or by the efforts of single churches." He says, "the only thing left for the disciples to do is to go forward. And this is precisely what they ought to do. They have already progressed beyond the possibility of working on the plans of the past, and yet they have too much of the past in the present to make their work effective. What is needed now is to cut entirely loose from obsolete things, and adopt such measures as will meet the exigencies of the present hour.

1. Throw aside all the plans that have been tried, and at once form such an organization of the churches and ministry as will be strong enough to do whatever is needful to be done. * * Men get tired of being responsible for a work when they have no authority by which they can possibly make it a success.

2. It might help matters very much if such an organization of the preachers only was effected as would bring them frequently together in counsel, and solemnly pledge them to the support of whatever measures are needful for the success of the missionary work. * *

We will now briefly present what we believe to be the true idea. * *

First: Let section 7 of Article II. be changed so as to require that all money raised for missionary purposes shall be sent to the respective State boards, instead of allowing it to be disbursed according to the notion of the contributor.

The change proposed would remedy the weak point in the plan which we have already noticed. It would entirely do away with the idea that every contributor can be his own missionary society; and it would at the same time greatly strengthen the hands of those who have been appointed to superintend the work. Every contribution would be subject to the unembarrassed direction of the respective boards. This is precisely what should be, and would scarcely fail to give greater efficiency to the plan.

To assist in solving this difficulty, it might be well to do away with the district boards entirely. But whether the districts should be abolished or not, it is certain that the money should be disbursed by the State boards. We understand well enough how this proposition will be received in certain quarters. We know that some brethren will regard it as a fearful sin against the freedom of the churches to deny them the privilege of saying where

their money shall be used. But to listen to these men any longer is to compromise success with the unreasonable demands of those who have already too long illustrated the fable of the "dog in the manger," by not eating themselves nor letting any one else eat.

Second: Let the plan, as thus modified, be *formally presented to all the churches for their adoption*, with the distinct understanding that such adoption fully commits the churches to its hearty support, and binds them to a faithful observance of all its provisions. Let it be understood also, that every church coming into the co-operation shall be held responsible to do its full share in bearing the burdens, whatever they may be, and let *only such churches as will do this have representation in the conventions*.

This is the only way in which the churches can be committed to the work. Heretofore they have not felt much responsibility in the matter. They have sent delegates or not, money or not, to the conventions, just as they felt inclined. Having assumed no responsibility, they have generally acted with great indifference. It is useless to say that the plan was adopted by the respective State conventions, and therefore the churches are committed to it, when, perhaps, not more than one third of the churches were represented in these conventions; and even those that were represented did not feel bound by the action of their delegates. What is needed is to bring the matter before *each church*, and have it decided *by a vote* as to whether the church will co-operate or not. An

affirmative action will place the church in the co-operation, entitle it to representation, and commit it to the action of the convention. Churches voting in the negative *must remain out*, and work as best they can in their own way, until they shall reverse their decision. This, we think, is fair for all. It gives every one the right of choice, but thoroughly binds those to the provisions of the plan who formally agree to work under it.

Third, and finally: so soon as these changes are made, let discussions about plans cease, and let earnest work begin. * * The time has come when they ought to have something settled with regard to this matter, and if they cannot settle anything, they had better stop the discussion at once, and give up the whole case as hopeless. Organization is certainly the normal state of the church, but active-work is essential to its life. Almost any thing is better than the present uncertainty. What is needed is a little brave *doing*. There has been brave *talk* long enough. If the days of babyhood are passed, let the disciples put away their playthings, and assume the responsibility of a true manhood. We think the time for decisive action has come. No matter what the result may be, *something must be done*. True, there may be danger ahead. There is danger in everything. But the worst danger now is to hesitate. To go backward is impossible; to stand still is eternal disgrace: to go forward has at least the promise of victory with all the inspirations of a glorious contest. Let every faithful Disciple of Christ at once determine as to where the future will find him.

The *Standard* commenting upon it says: "The question to be disposed of is one of expediency and must be dealt with as such." * *

Many of us are growing weary waiting for the time when something worthy of us shall be undertaken. The years are passing away from us. Golden opportunities, that may never return, are neglected. The world lies before us—God's providences are opening mighty fields to be occupied—and we content ourselves with doing a little work in our own neighborhoods. It will not do. We say, with the *Quarterly*, let us go forward to something more practicable and effective, or let us give up all attempt to co-operate, and subside into the methodless performances that marked our infancy.

McGarvey of the *Times* comments:

"Would the abolishing of the District Boards, and the denial to the churches of the privilege of saying which way their money shall go, tend to remove the first cause of failure mentioned by Bro. Moore, by breaking down the opposition of those brethren who say that the plan is wanting in Scriptural authority? Would it tend to remove the second cause of failure by making the preachers and officers of the churches do more effectually what was, under the plan expected of them? Would the change not rather intensify the opposition, and make the old causes of failure still more efficacious than before? Bro. Moore himself seems to anticipate this result, for he says: "We know that some brethren will regard it as a fearful sin against the freedom of the churches to deny them the privilege of saying where

their money shall be used." He not only foresees this result, but he sets it at defiance in the following words: "But to listen to these men any longer is to compromise success with the unreasonable demands of those who have already too long illustrated the fable of the dog in the manger, by not eating themselves nor letting any one else eat." The amount of all this is, that the Louisville Plan has failed on account of certain opposition and indifference, and now we must make it succeed by giving strength to the causes which have hitherto made it a failure. The camel's back has been broken by loading him too heavily, and we will mend it by making the load still a little heavier.

The second change proposed by Bro. Moore would doubtless secure more select conventions, but we doubt whether a single church which now declines to contribute would do so for the sake of sending a delegate to the Conventions. Missionary Conventions are not highly prized by the non-contributing churches. In short, if you provide that "every church coming into the co-operation shall be held responsible to do its full share in bearing the burdens, whatever they may be, and let only such churches as will do this have representation in the Conventions," you will simply reduce the attendance at your missionary conventions, and proportionately the number of co-operating churches.

The third proposal, that when these changes are made we shall "let discussions about plans cease," is an old proposal which we heard annually for lo, these many years. It will

never be practically adopted; for never while the world stands will men cease to discuss the merits of plans which are purely human. Differences of opinion on matters of expediency will continue to exist, and discussion will be a perpetual consequence. Only when you are dealing with matters divine and authoritative can you demand a cessation of discussion."

All of which shows the **ADVOCATE** has been right from the beginning. That the brethren who work according to God's word are freed from all these difficulties, harassments and trials. And that Eld. Moore and W. C. Dawson are seeking a strong authoritative ecclesiasticism, and distinct combination of the clergy to control the laity. They only take different courses to attain the end Dawson seeks one already formed. Moore to bring those now free under this yoke of bondage. We think Dawson's course much the less pregnant with evil.

D. L.

CHURCH NEWS.

Bro's. L. & S: As you and readers may like to see or hear from us here how the good cause is progressing, I will that I am preaching almost constantly and am the only man in this County who even tries to preach the ancient Gospel, and all the Sectarian ingenuity can invent is thrown in my pathway, yet I am rejoiced to see even so near "Satans Seat" men and women occasionally confess the Savior and occasionally and bow to his authority. On Friday evening before the third Lord's day in this month,

at the earnest solicitation of a few friends (not professors of religion I commenced a meeting at Prospect Church, nine miles from here, in a strong Baptist neighborhood, in which we had one member only, and that a lady, I continued my labors till Tuesday evening and organized a congregation numbering twenty-five and left them in fine spirits with bright prospects of an increase at the next meeting which is to embrace the fifth Lord's day in November.

The Baptist Pastor attended from first to Sunday evening discourse, at which time I gave the first opportunity thirteen, among whom was three or four Baptists whom he had recently baptized into the Baptist Church, at which the good man seemed to take umbrage and left in disgust, nor did he return during my stay. I understand the people of that neighborhood are reading generally, and little else is talked of when neighbors meet.

At my regular appointment at Bumam in Ellis County, embracing the fourth Lord's day in this month. I took the confession of a gentleman and wife and immersed them into the one faith. To God be all the praise.

Yours in the one hope,

V. I. STIRMAN.

Kaufman, Tex. Oct. 27, 1874.

Bros. L. & S: Bro. John. T. Hawkins has just closed a series of meetings with the congregations at Liberty, LaFayette and Lebanon, two weeks at each. The immediate result of which, was forty added to the saved at Liberty, thirty-three at La Fayette, and twenty-three at Lebanon, total ninety-six. Some of these

were from the Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists, but mostly from the world, by confession and baptism. To the Lord be all the praise!

Bro. Hawkins is a young man about 26 or 27 years of age. He is a noble defender of the ancient gospel, and knows well how to wield the sword of the Spirit so as to do execution against its enemies. May the good Lord spare his life many years to do service in His cause.

Your Bro. in Christ,

J. G. HESTER.

La Fayette, Ky. Nov. 4, 1874.

Brethren L. & S: Allow me in your popular paper to announce the success and influence of the gospel at Liberty, a Christian Church, situated five miles North of Lawrenceburg, near the highway leading from Lawrenceburg to Nashville."

Our eminent Brother, T. B. Larimore, commenced a meeting there the second Lord's day in this month, delivered seven discourses which resulted in about eighteen accessions, five of whom were from other churches.

Well may we say "the good cause is triumphing gloriously" when such results are reported.

Fraternally in Christ,

W. W. VICK.

Mars Hill, Near Florence, Ala.
Oct. 30, 1874.

Bros. L. & S: A meeting was held at Cathey's Creek, Maury Co., commencing Saturday night before the third Lord's day in Oct. and closing Wednesday night following. There were 11 additions. Bro. Davie Sowell and John Morton did the preaching.

During this meeting I preached three times at a school house near by and had three additions. To the Lord be all the praise.

T. J. BROOKS.

Oct. 23, 1874.

Editors Gospel Advocate: I give you a brief report of my labors in the Gospel since the first of August, 1874. I held a meeting at Liberty Church, Marshall Co., Tenn., embracing the first Lord's day in August, which resulted in four additions to the congregation at that place. I then held a meeting at the Holcrom School-house in Warren County, which resulted in eleven additions. From this place to Salem in Warren Co., and preached a few days and had two additions. Thence to Bellwood, Wilson Co., Tenn., to hold a meeting, which resulted in two additions to the congregation. While at that place Mr. Nichol, the Methodist circuit rider, came and proposed a discussion with me, which I declined, stating to him that I had been invited there to hold a meeting, and that I would not stop my meeting to debate with him unless my brethren desired me to do so. He then called out some of the brethren, and insisted on having a debate, which the brethren at first declined; but, through the persuasions of Bro. Huffman, they finally consented, and we discussed the following propositions:

1st. A sinner or ungodly person is justified from past sins by faith only. Nichol affirmed.

2nd. Water baptism administered to a penitent believer is for (in order to) the remission of past sins. I affirmed.

I found Mr. Nichol to be a strange being. There seemed to be no system about his mind. He would strike at everything, and hit nothing. Would scatter everywhere, and make no points on anything. He could neither make an argument, nor reply to one. He showed that one of two things was true of him; that he either did not have discrimination enough to understand the plainest argument, or else he had wickedness enough in his heart to misrepresent it. At any rate he misrepresented nearly every argument I made. His whole aim seemed to be to turn everything into jest and ridicule, and to laugh at an argument that he could not meet. He indulged in low slang, that bordered on vulgarity, and beamed and abused the disciples of Christ to an extent that is beneath the dignity of a gentleman, much less one claiming to be a Christian minister. And there are hundreds who will testify to the truth of all that I have said about him.

I went from Bellwood to Alexandria, and held a meeting which resulted in four additions. I then went to Woodbury, Cannon Co., and held a meeting there, with eight additions to the congregation. I then went to Salem, Franklin Co., and preached about one week and had eighteen additions. Thence to New Smyrna Church in Warren Co., where young brother Gillespie and my son, C. W. Sewell, had begun a meeting, and had added nine to the church before I arrived. I then continued the meeting a few days longer and had twenty additions more. I then went to Pleasant Plains in Coffee Co., and preached a few times and had two

additions. Thence to Lewisburg, Marshall Co., and held a meeting which resulted in sixteen additions. To the Lord be all the praise.

Your Bro. in Christ,
J. L. SEWELL.

Bro. Lipscomb: I have just returned from a visit to West Tenn., delivered 7 discourses in Burnett's Chapel in the vicinity of Trenton, and one in Trenton in the Christian church. The attendance was good, and I think the truth was respected and appreciated. We had 4 accessions by confession and immersion. Brethren Dr. C. T. Love, H. B. Hall, Dr. S. W. Caldwell and J. R. Biggs appear to be more interested in the colored people *hearing* for themselves than *they* do to hear. This I regret but hope for amendment. We also visited Brummer's Grove, delivered 4 discourses there to large audiences of both white and colored. I am very much mistaken if more attention and study of the New Testament do not prevail there than when I first visited that place. It is certainly encouraging to learn that my people are beginning to study for themselves God's will. May they by a patient continuance in well-doing, so seek for glory, honor and immortality as to obtain eternal life. Burnett's chapel contributed \$11.25, Brummer's Grove with the aid of some of the white brethren and sisters \$8.25—\$19.50. Paid out \$13. One of the contributors caused my thoughts for a while to roam and essay a glimpse of the future. On an envelope was Ross Ozier. We asked who he was, and was told, a little son of our good Bro. John Ozier. The fact of his

contribution being voluntarily and cheerfully made for the instruction of the colored people set me to thinking. I pray that the little fellow will be preserved and eventually saved by Him who suffers not even a sparrow to fall without his notice.

DANIEL WADKINS.

Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 28, 1874.

Co Education.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: Your article under the above caption, in No. 38, I must make the occasion for a few words in favor of that which you so decidedly condemn. The question of separate or social training for the youth of both sexes has been, so far a life study with me. I thought I had about mustered the lesson, when, lo! a brother in whose judgment I have confidence and whose aim I am persuaded is for the good of society, sets it all down as learned amiss. My investigations have been conducted, it is true, with a view to personal interest. But this interest is not of a teacher having either a mixed or separate school. Neither is it that partial interest of a parent having only sons, or daughters. It is that complex interest of a father having both sons and daughters to educate.

I may say that the course of my investigation embraces observations on my own course in the schools—counting myself about average for a boy, and the influences about average,—a careful study of the moral and social results of the two characters of school as exhibited in individuals and communities from Canada to the interior of Mexico, and also a slight dip into the theories pro and con.

What seems to me your leading objection to the association of the sexes in the same school, had never occurred to me as a probable evil, attendant upon such association under ordinary school restraints. The association of the sexes under the eye of the multitude is not likely to engender such familiarity as to be detrimental to native modesty. And it must be borne in mind that any well regulated school does not admit of the association of the sexes except before the school and under the eye of the teachers. And who does not know that the presence of the opposite sex under such circumstances has a healthfully stimulating effect on either boy or girl? There can be no better monitor to good behavior. And that it should have a tendency to looseness of morals is far from credible with me.

That you believe it has an evil influence upon both sexes seems not at all strange to me if you give heed to the representation of parties having separate schools to maintain. Thus they represent it; opposing interest so requires. And your observation of some fearfully evil results in exceptional cases may incline you to believe misrepresentations. If I were to judge separate schools by the representations of men interested in mixed schools I should certainly not give a favorable opinion.

I am persuaded there is something of the danger which you dread somewhere, but I am inclined to the opinion that you have made a mistake analogous to that of a good lady, whom I met during the late war. She said she liked the Disciples very much and would have joined them in preference to the Baptists but for

the fact that she understood they taught that one should be baptized because his sins had already been pardoned, whereas she believed with the Baptists that one should be baptized for the remission. You strike at an evil much to be abhorred, but your blow is aimed in the wrong direction.

I need not attempt to give you an idea of the flagrant forms of vice that afflict the separate schools. If you have investigated you certainly know enough. What school-boy who has gone through them does not? I refer to those for males. (The very terms male and female reveal a brutish conception that bespeaks disparagement to the dignity of moral intelligencies. Let there be boys and girls men and women, but not mere animals.) Of course we know but little of the other animal side. I, however, have heard enough to be satisfied that girls and women, without the natural counterpoise of the opposite sex, are not much nearer the angelic state than men and boys, under like circumstances.

It may be objected that we rarely have a *Female* school of higher order without some *male* teachers; and consequently, seldom without the presence of the opposite sex. Very true, I admit; but so much the worse for this truth. The idea of a harem is not the most pleasing thing for me to contemplate. Human nature is human nature till perverted; then I can't say what it is or what it will do. I am not going to say what it has done in Tennessee, Kentucky, Texas, Mexico, Spain or France. Many of its brief incidents of history should never be repeated, either in word or

fact. But what I would do is to suggest a return to the normal condition of society—boys and girls, brothers and sisters, rational, conscientious beings, Christian ladies and gentlemen, brought up together, on terms of respectful intimacy and confiding regard, so that the evil suggestions and temptations of the abnormal condition may be avoided. Nature declares this right by the production of both sexes in the same family. If it should have been otherwise the Creator could have arranged that only boys or only girls be born to the same parents. Since both are born into the same family, let both be reared in the same. And since schools are only an aggregation of the children of families, let not the families be broken by them.

Away with the irrational and unchristian thrust at the manhood of our noble humanity. *That boys are too coarse and rude to associate with girls.* There never was a baser slander perpetrated against human nature. There never was a popular error fraught with more bitter fruit to society. It is the poison shaft that kills self respect and cripples moral courage in the heart of youth. Teach the boy that he is a brute and unfit for companionship with his sister whom his manly nature prompts him to love and protect, and you leave him no foundation on which to rear the proud pillar of a manly character. Outlaw him by banishing him from the genial association of sisters and other lady friends and dooming him to a term of years sojourn with a herd of similar outcasts, and you have set him on the certain road to perdition. Yet such is the thrust made at the heart and hopes

of most of the boys sent to the *male* school. No wonder that boys are bad. Parents and public opinion say they are, and must be. They usually come up to the standard set for them; if one does not, he is not as wicked as the civil (public opinion) would have him to be. The teacher that consents to devote his energies to the tuition of such a demoralized herd has not much respect for himself or that humanity which he thus helps to outrage.

With the girl sentenced to the Papal or Protestant nunnery the case is not much better. She is decided as too weak, girlish or womanish to take care of herself in the presence of the coarser sex. She is likely to fall a victim to sexual passion without the intervention of a stonewall or a face of flint to frown away all moral force out of her character. She must not be allowed to look on a man or hear his voice, lest she should be overcome by that dreaded passion, love, which is thought to unfit the young for all noble aim and effort. Thus is she impressed with the demoralizing idea of imbecility and animalism. Instead of fortifying her nature with those lofty moral sentiments that make her a being of worth, a blessing and blest, an honor to herself and society, she is encouraged to lean upon the bars of physical restraint set up for her carnal security, leaving her moral being to dwarf, for the want of proper exercise. Such a course of training may develop animal and intellect—may make an intellectual *female*, but I apprehend that paragon of moral perfection, that conscientious individuality, that well-adjusted treble chord that sustains the song of

human society, which we in truth and reverence call WOMAN, is not thus produced. This being does not grow under glass nor in the shade, but in the open sun-light of society. And of society she is the soul and support. But enough now.

J. R. WILMETH.

McKinney, Tex.

We have not the least disposition to discuss the question of co-education. We only wished to stand right before our readers on this as on all questions.

The progressive, radical element, that upturns and overturns all the existing affairs of society, is based chiefly on the idea of the inherent nobility of human nature. It is not to be restrained by authority nor to be controlled by power. It is to be put upon its honor. It always fails thus when tempted. It does it in politics, in social and civil and business relations, in religion, and it fails in the school-room. Human nature is weak and frail and needs the sense of responsibility to authority, to power, to train it to habits of right, truth and honor. But it seems to us that the theory utterly fails even on their own premises.

The idea is to relieve human nature of the sense of being distrusted and of the degradation of forced restraint, if we properly get our brother's meaning. Then the question turns on this, are these evils attained better by placing them in circumstances that they will be free from temptation and need not the constant sense of enforced restraint or placing them where they will need to be continually watched as worse than slaves. No

man ever collects girls and boys together without watching them constantly. Sometimes in new countries the lack of facilities necessitates the toleration of things not desirable. But when it is practicable we believe that virtue, purity in manners and thoroughness in scholarship are promoted by separate schools for boys and girls, especially when sent from home:

Co-operation Meeting in Ellis Co., Tex.

Eld. Elijah Elgan, with the consent of Eld. H. Douglass of Liberty Congregation, invited the churches of Christ in Ellis, and those in the Southern portion of Dallas County, to meet with the Liberty congregation for the purpose of taking counsel together on the subject of Evangelical Co operation. The Meeting convened at Liberty on Friday, Sept. 4th, 1874. After reading and prayer Eld. E. Elgan was invited to preside over the meeting, and H. G. Orr to note the proceedings.

Congregations represented by delegates, or visiting brethren: Union Hill, Siloam, Moyer's Grove, and Liberty, in Ellis County, and Hutchins and Salem, in Dallas County.

Preaching brethren present, E. Elgan, J. M. Rawlings, N. B. Gibbons, and — Cole.

A committee of one from each congregation was appointed to consider, 1st, our want of evangelizing, 2nd, our ability to sustain an evangelist, and 3rd, our willingness to do so.

On Saturday, the committee made the following report, which was unanimously adopted. Questions:

1st, Do we want evangelizing?—
Ans. Yes.

2nd, Can we sustain an evangelist?—
Ans. Every one of the Committee think and say, *we can*.

3rd, Will we do so?—Ans. We will make the effort. And to this end we suggest that messengers be appointed to churches not fully represented here, to solicit contributions for this purpose, and to report the result of their efforts to Eld. H. Douglas at Liberty by the 1st Lord's day in Oct.

4th. That we will discharge our obligations in money, or its equivalent in such things as the evangelist or his family may need at his home, quarterly or oftener.

5th. That Bro. E. Elgan is our choice for an evangelist.

Bro. Elgan reported that since Oct. last he had preached 108 times. There had been 95 added during this time—all by confession and baptism except about 20. He had received only about \$225 for preaching to this date.

It was resolved that our evangelist be left free to preach wherever in his judgment he thought best for the good of the cause, whether with the churches co operating or outside of their limits. Also, that this Co-operation hold Quarterly Meetings and an annual one. That the first quarterly one be held with the church at Hutchins, Dallas Co., embracing the 3rd Lord's day in Nov., at which time the 2nd will be appointed, and that our evangelist call the annual one.

On the 1st Lord's day in Oct., reports were received from all the congregations in Ellis, and from Hutchins, Salem and Mountain Creek, in Dallas, and pledges to the amount of

\$625, which was more than was expected in view of the fact that several of the congregations were few in number, and many poor in this world's goods. Brethren let us prove true to our obligations, trusting that God will bless our efforts to honor him, and to have the gospel of Christ, in its original simplicity and purity proclaimed in this land.

It was resolved that a copy of the proceedings of this meeting be sent to Bro. Kendrick for publication in the A. C. Review, also one to the Gospel Advocate and S. C. Weekly, inviting them to publish it.

ELIJAH ELGAN, Chairman.

H. G. ORR, Secretary.

QUERY.

Bro. Sewell: Please give me your views from a Scriptural stand point through the GOSPEL ADVOCATE of this first verse in Ephesians—

"One Lord, one faith, one baptism" &c.

Yours very Truly,

A. N. STROUDE.

Nov. 7th 1874.

The one Lord spoken of is doubtless our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who was born in Bethlehem, crucified at Jerusalem, and raised from the dead the third morning, and now reigns in heaven, where he will reign till the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed. The one faith spoken of, is faith, or belief in Christ, as the Son of God, and that he died, was buried, and rose the third day according to the Scriptures. This one faith does not consist in a belief in some creed or system of religion as taught by un-

spired men of modern times, but in that grand system of life and salvation prepared by Jesus Christ, and preached to the world by the inspired apostles of the Son of God, and written down in the New Testament. All who obey the gospel of Christ, and become Christians, have this one faith, and none can become Christians without it. The one baptism we understood to be the immersion in water of a proper subject, into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. This is the baptism commanded by the Savior in the commission, and practiced by the apostles everywhere they went. Philip taught this one baptism to the Eunuch, for he said, "see, here is water, what hinders me to be baptized? Peter, at the house of Cornelius said: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" This water baptism continues in force at the present time, and will continue while time lasts.

E. G. S.

Obituaries.

Our beloved Bro. H. C. Sinclair departed this life at his residence $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles North of Franklin 22nd Sept. 1874, in the 54th year of his age after a long and painful illness—which he bore with great fortitude. Bro. Sinclair confessed his faith in Jesus as the Christ, and was baptized, during the meeting held by Bros. Day and Caldwell of Ky.—about eighteen months before his death, and I am sure that he was an earnest, devoted Christian He said to me just before his death that he had no idea that the Christian religion would give so much joy and consolation as we neared the journey's end—that all he had to regret was, that he had not sooner entered into God's service. He died in the full triumphs of the Christians faith—leaving a devoted wife and several children to mourn his loss—I feel his loss greatly, for his place was rarely ever vacant in the church on Lord's day—and he so often had a word of encouragement for me,

so often went with me to the country to des-
tinate places, doing what he could to hold up
my hands while I stood as watchman upon the
watch tower of Zion. But he is gone.

"Gently the passing spirit fled,
Sustained by grace divine;
O, may such grace be on us shed,
And make our end like thine.

E. B. CAYCE.

FRANKLIN NOV. 7, 1874.

Truly it may be said of us "one by one we
are passing over." One by one places are left
vacant in our congregation, by loved ones that
are leaving us. On the 19th of Oct 1874 our
much loved sister, Mary M. Brandon departed
this life in the full triumphs of the Christians
Faith after a long and painful illness--of that
fell destroyer of our race, consumption.--She
was a good mother, a good wife, a good neigh-
bor and a good Christian. I am sure that with
the poet we can truthfully say

Sister, thou wast mild and lovely,
Gent'e as the Summer breeze
Pleasant as the air of evening,
When it floats among the trees.

E. B. CAYCE.

FRANKLIN, TENN., NOV. 7 1874.

Bros. L. & S: It becomes my sad du-
ty to record the death of our
aged and highly esteemed brother, James
Cathy. He died at his residence on Cathy's
Creek in Maury County, Penn., of Typhoid
fever after an illness of 17 days, Oct. 5, 1874.
Was born March 15th 1804, made the good
confession over fifty years ago was baptized
by a Bro. whose name was Abner Hill) This
was in the early days of the reformation when
those who obeyed their Savior in his ordinan-
ces were looked upon with contempt, and in
this portion of the County were called by the
odious name of schismatic. He was a devoted
and consistent Christian from that day for-
ward until he departed to be with Christ which
for him is far better. Bro. Cathy's member-
ship has been with the Church of God worship-
ping at this place known as the Cathy's Creek
Congregation, during his Christian service.
He leaves his second wife to mourn his depart-
ure, who is a kind hearted and devoted Chris-
tian lady. He left no children by his last wife.
He leaves one son behind, the only member re-
maining of his family, who is a pious Chris-
tian gentleman. He has left only one grand-
child, little Willie Stanfill. The son has lost
a fond father, and little Willie a kind grand-
father, his relatives and neighbors a kind as-
sociate, the County a valuable citizen, and the
church one of its brightest ornaments, Bro.
Cathy remarked to his friends who were at-
tending his bedside during his illness, that he
had no fears of death, and that the gloom of
the grave presented no terrors to him: because

he had lived in all good conscience before
God, and that he had not wronged, cheated nor
defrauded any one. He now sleeps in the old
grave yard with his first companion, and the
eleven children that God had given them--
Blessed are the dead who die in
Lord they cease from their labors and their
works do follow them.

Peaceful be your silent slumber,
Peaceful in the grave so low,
You no more shall join our number,
You no more our songs shall know.

Yet again we hope to meet you,
When the days of life are fled.
Then in heaven with joy to greet you,
Where no farewell tear is shed.

R. GOOCH.

CATERS CREEK, TENN. NOV. 5, 1874.

Weddings.

As the semi annual bridal season
is at hand, it is the time to plead for
a reform in weddings. Every year
this sacredest of all occasion is turn-
ed more and more into an opportunity
for display, and for replying to some
fancied social obligation. Instead
of the time when a few of the closest
friends meet to witness the solemnest
compact human beings can frame, it
is chosen as the moment for bring-
ing together the larger part of a fam-
ily's social circle, to show the bride
in her bridal garments; to prove
how many flowers and refreshments
the family can afford; and, with
shame be it said, to exhibit to criti-
cism and light comment the precious
tokens that should have come with
tender regard to the maid on the eve
of her new life.

A wedding must not be uncheerful;
but it must certainly be solemn to all
who realize what it is. On the one
side it is renouncing old ties, promis-
ing to begin with faith and hope, a
new and untried existence. On the
other, it is the acceptance of a sacred

trust, the covenant to order life anew in such ways as shall make the happiness of two instead of one. Can such an occasion be fitting for revelry? Is it not wiser, more delicate to bid only the nearest friends to the marriage ceremony, and leave the feasting and frolic to a subsequent time? We are sure there are few girls who, if they reflect on the seriousness of the step they are about to take, will not choose to make their vow merely within the loving limits of their home circle. All our best instincts point to the simplicity and privacy of wedding services; only a perversion of delicacy could contemplate the asking of crowds of half sympathetic or wholly curious people to attend the fulfillment of the most solemn of contracts. Let there be as much party making, rejoicing and pleasure-taking after wards as hearts desire; but let the solemn vows be made in the presence only of those nearest and dearest.—*Scribner's.*

ITEMS.

W. C. Dawson, late pastor of the Christian church in New York City, publishes a letter in the "Standard" explaining why he left the Disciples and applied for Holy Orders in the Episcopal Church.

The last No. of the *Christian Weekly* contains an extended notice by the editor (who was with him a short while before his death) of Bro. J. T. Barclay. Bro. Barclay's life was spent in the Missionary cause, and his last efforts at writing, were some articles on this subject, recently published in the *Standard*,

Clark Braden is to publish a new book. See his card in this number of the Advocate.

Josephus Latham reports in the *Review*, a meeting at Old Ford, Beaufort Co., N. C., resulting in 47 additions.

Eld. Jere. Biggs of the Trenton *News Gazette* graced our office with his presence last week.

One of the editors of the Advocate last Lord's day preached to six persons, four members of the Christian church and two belonging to other churches. One who had been a Baptist united with our brethren.

W. S. Fears of Bear Creek, Henry Co., Ga., reports 26 additions at Berea and County Line, through the labors of other brethren and himself. He has appointments ahead and promises to let us from him again soon.

J. T. Holloway in a business letter gives an account of a meeting at Hallville, Tex., the 2nd Lord's day in Oct. Bro. Cain, Major, J. P. Holloway and himself were present. There were seven accessions. The people gave good attention and the brethren were greatly encouraged. They have prospects of a good house of worship soon.

NOTICE.

After the first of January next, the Postal law requires that postage on all papers shall be prepaid at the office of publication. Our subscribers will therefore please remember when sending the subscription to send with it 20 cts for postage. This will cost the subscriber no more than hereto-

fore. He only pays us the postage, instead of the Post Master. He will then never be dunned for his postage. Please remember this.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL,

A JARD.

To the brotherhood: At the request of many of our leading brethren I shall prepare and publish a concise work on Evolution Development and Darwinism, of from 100 to 150 pages, costing from 60 to 75 cents. All brethren and persons wishing a copy will please address me at Perry, Ill.

If any want to take more than one copy, or act as agents, they can notify me by letter as above.

Fraternally,
CLARK BRADEN.

General News.

The elections held last week in a number of States and Territories resulted in almost a complete victory for the Democratic and Opposition party.—Hon. John W. Head, congressman elect from the Fourth District, died suddenly of Pneumonia at his residence in Galatin, Tenn., one week after his election.—Samuel Brockman, a prominent citizen of Clarksville Tenn., committed suicide by hanging, Nov. 8th.—Charlotte Cushman has retired from the stage. Twenty-one foreign governments have accepted the invitation to participate in the Centennial at Philadelphia.—David Stinton of Cincinnati recently presented the Young Men's Christian Association of that City, with \$30,000.—The village of Wittsburg Ark. was almost en-

tirely consumed by fire on Saturday night. It was caused by an incendiary who fired the office of the *Gazette*, newspaper of that town.—The total strength of the United States Army according to Gen. Sherman's report is 24,441 men.—St Louis is taking active steps to furnish relief for the Nevada sufferers from grasshoppers.—Despite of hard times real estate in Cincinnati continues to hold its own or advance.

Confiding in God.

When a man maketh his complaint and openeth his need and grief unto his special friend, he feelth a certain ease afterwards; so that his pain and grief, by the rehearsing thereof, is somewhat relieved, remedied and taken away. Much more comfort and ease shall we receive by telling and opening our grief and complaint unto God. For man is soon weary and irk of our complaining; but if we would spend the whole day in praying, crying and complaining unto God, He would love, comfort, and strengthen us the more.—*Coverdale.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Laying on of hands. Inspiration.....	1055
Correspondence.....	1058
Unspotted from the world.....	
The Sin against the Holy Spirit.....	1060
The "Louisville Plan".....	1064
Church News.....	1068
Co-Education	1071
Co-operation Meeting in Ellis Co. Tex.	1074
Queries.....	1075
Obituaries	1075
Weddings.....	1076
Items.....	1077
Notice.....	1077
A Card.....	1078
General News.....	1078
Confiding in God.....	1078

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 46.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, NOV. 19, 1874.

Memoirs of Jesus.

REMARKABLE FULFILLMENT OF
PROPHECY.

In that section of the Law of Moses, according to which the Jews pretended to be acting, when they put Jesus to death, we find the following requirement :

“And, if a man have committed a sin, deserving death, he is to be put to death, and you hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night on the tree ; but by all means you shall bury him that day ; (for he that is hung is a curse of God ;) in order that your country, which the Lord your God is giving to you, may not be polluted.” (Deut. xxi. 22, 23.)

On account of this provision of the Law, and, as John informs us, “lest the bodies should remain on the cross on the Sabbath, (for it was the preparation, [Friday Evening,] and that Sabbath was a great day,) the Jews entreated Pilate to have their legs broken, and the bodies removed. And the soldiers came, and broke the legs of the first, and of the other, that was crucified with him. But

when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. One of the soldiers, however, pierced his side with a spear ; and instantly blood and water issued [from the wound.]

And he who saw it has testified ; and his testimony is true ; he knows that he is speaking the truth, that you may believe : for these things were done, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, [which reads :]

‘Not a bone of him shall be broken.’ (Ps. xxiv. 20.)

And again, another Scripture says : ‘They shall look on him whom they pierced.’” (Zech. xii. 10.)

Whatever *human* thoughts may have been in the minds of David and Zechariah, when they penned those prophetic sentences, it is evident that a Divine Forethought was guiding them in their writings ; for else, how should the words of both be so signally verified ? But we must now read about

THE BURIAL OF JESUS.

“And now, evening having come, [since it was the Preparation (Day) that is, the day before the Sabbath,]

a rich and honorable counselor, named Joseph, of Arimathea, (a Jewish city) who was a good man, a disciple of Jesus, but secretly through fear of the Jews, and had not sanctioned the counsel and deed of those (who condemned Jesus to die;)—who also was expecting the Reign of God,—came, and went in boldly to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus.”*

“And Pilate wondered if he was dead so soon; and calling the Centurion to him, he inquired of him whether he had been dead any length of time. And having ascertained the facts from the Centurion, he gave the body to Joseph.” “Nicodemus also, who at first came to Jesus by night came, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds weight.”

Those two distinguished men in accordance with the Jewish custom of embalming, took down the body of Jesus from the Cross, wrapped it in linen, (which Joseph had bought,) and laid it in a new tomb, hewn out of a rock, in which no one had ever been interred. This tomb was in a garden on the hill; and Mary the Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Jesus, were sitting opposite the tomb, and saw where and how the body was laid. “And they returned and prepared spices and ointments; and rested on the Sabbath, according to the commandment.”

THE SECURITY OF THE TOMB.

“And on the next day, which follows the preparation, the Chief Priests and the Pharisees came together to Pilate, saying :

* This long and complex sentence is a blending of the of the complicated statements of Luke and John. By a very careful reading of the passage, the reader will get the sense.

‘Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet living, “After three days I will arise.” Therefore, give orders that the tomb be made secure till the third day; lest his disciples come in the night and steal him away, and [then] say to the people, “He has risen from the death state;” and the last error be worse than the first.’

Pilate said to them :

‘You have a guard; go along, and make things as secure as you know how.’

So they went, and made the tomb secure, sealing the stone. This precaution, together with the guard which was placed there, made the security of the body doubly sure.]”§

It might be remarked here, that all the work of embalming, entombing and securing the body of Jesus, seemed ordered so as to prevent any possibility of doubt about the resurrection. For it is evident, that the Disciples showed no design of secreting the body; and that the guard left nothing undone which might prevent them from practising imposition, had anything of the kind been attempted. The certainty of the resurrection will appear more evident, as we proceed to consider the circumstances and sequences of that event; but before doing this, let us once more look back to that fatal hill, to see, (if possible,) what became of the crucified robbers.

The Evangelists have not informed us what disposition was made of the bodies of the two evil-doers, after they had been deadened by the breaking of their legs. Perhaps it does not concern us to know; but we may

§ These quotations conclude Matth. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii. and John xix.

be allowed to *conjecture*, that they had friends who took proper care of their "remains." It is not likely,—we shall not, surely, guess,—that they were burned to ashes, and bottled up! Modern ideas of "cremation" were not entertained then; the philosophy of burning and treasuring up the ashes of the dead, to prevent pestilence, was not talked of then and there! The heathen nations did, indeed, sometimes burn their dead; and many martyrs have been burned, in so-called Christian countries. Even the Jews, in a few instances, burned up the bodies of the dead.¶ But if the robbers' bodies had been burned, would not some of the Evangelists have mentioned the fact?

It might not be sinful to burn the bodies of the dead; as God can certainly raise the dead who have been burned, as well as those who have simply rotted in the ground. But it is certainly shocking to the finer sensibilities of enlightened, civilized, christianized people, to think of consuming with fire the bodies of those we have seen and known, and loved? Paul foretells of persons who, "in the latter times should be destitute of natural affection." (2 Tim. iii. 3.) May they not be cremationists? Is it not natural,—is it not because of our affection for the "lost and loved ones,"—that we show our fond remembrance of them, by carefully and decently putting their bodies "out of our sight," as Abraham did, when his beloved Sarah died? (Genesis xxiii. 4, 8.) But we must return from this digression, and examine the sacred records concerning

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

Although nothing is recorded of the burial of the evil-doers, it is a striking feature of evangelical testimony, that it embraces so particular an account of the burial and resurrection of Jesus. And this feature is of the greatest importance, as a matter of Christian evidence; for our faith in the Gospel rests mainly on the correctness and harmony of the statements of the witnesses who have testified, that "Jesus died for our sins, according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.) Indeed, so much importance attaches to the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, that we may risk the whole controversy with the unbelieving world, on the correctness of the evangelical testimony on this vital point. If it cannot be proved, that Jesus rose from the tomb, as foretold by himself, and afterwards proclaimed by the Apostles,—being constantly held up by them as the most prominent fact of the Gospel,—then nothing in the entire Gospel Narratives will bear investigation. But if, on the contrary, we can be assured beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the resurrection took place on the third day after the crucifixion, then we shall not doubt the truthfulness of the entire evangelical record.

Let us, therefore, attentively read and carefully weigh the testimony on this point.

The Jewish Sabbath closed at six o'clock on the seventh day or Saturday evening. "Then, after the Sabbath," says Matthew, "as it was beginning to dawn towards the first day of the week, Mary the Magdalene, and the other Mary, came to

look at the tomb." (Matth. xxviii. 1.) Mark mentions "Mary, the mother of James and Salome," who had "bought spices that they might come and anoint him. And very early on the first day of the week, when the sun had risen, they came to the tomb.

And they said among themselves: 'Who will roll away the stone for us from the door of the tomb?'

(For it—the stone—was very large.) And looking up, they saw that the stone had been rolled away." (Mark xvi. 1, 2, 3.)

Before the arrival of the women,—before daylight, it appears, according to John, (xx. 1,) "there had been a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord having descended from heaven, came and rolled away the stone, and was sitting on it. His appearance was like lightening, and his clothing was white as snow. From fear of him, the guards trembled, and became like dead men." (Matthew xxviii. 2, 3, 4.)

Here is a circumstance, attending the uprising of Jesus from the tomb which strongly impresses our minds with the extraordinary character of that event. The whole scene opens up wonderfully before us. The soldiers are stationed around the tomb, guarding the body of Jesus. When the brightly-clothed Heavenly Messenger comes down to open the grave the guards fall back, stunned, and scared almost to death. The stone is rolled from the rocky tomb; the grave-clothes and napkin are as quickly removed from the reviving body of Jesus, and the Holy one arises, and quickly walks away.

Then the women came.—John tells Mary the Magdalene came early on

the first day of the week, while it was still dark; and, observing that the stone had been rolled away from the tomb, she ran and came to Peter and the other disciple whom Jesus loved, (that is, "John,") and said to them:

'They have taken the Lord away, out of the tomb, and we do not know where they have laid him.'

She does not appear to have seen the angel then; but, seeing that the door of the tomb was open, she imagined that the body of Jesus had been taken away by his enemies, and immediately started off to tell Peter and John. (The other women had the same idea, as we shall presently see.—John xx. 13, 14, 15.)

While Mary, the Magdalene, was gone to tell the disciples that Jesus was missing, the other women who remained at the tomb, "went into the tomb and saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a white robe; and they were frightened. But the Angel, answering, said to the women:

'Why do you look for the living [One] among the dead? Do not be frightened; for I know that you are looking for Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here; for he has risen, as he said. Come! See the place where the Lord lay! And go, quickly, and tell his disciples that he hath risen from the death-state: and look! he is going before you into Galilee.—There you will see him. See! I have told you.' The women having told Peter and John about the resurrection, as directed by the Angel, those disciples "went out, and came to the tomb. And the two ran together; and

the *other disciple*," writes John, "out-ran Peter, and came to the tomb. Then he stooped down, and saw the linen cloths lying; but he did not go in. Then Simon Peter came, following him; and he went into the tomb, and saw the linen clothes lying and the napkin that had been on his head, not lying with the linen clothes but folded up in a place by itself. Then, therefore, the other Disciple, who first came to the tomb, went in, and seeing believed. For, as yet, they were not aware of the Scripture [prediction], that he must rise from the death-state. Then the [two] disciples went away again by themselves.

But Mary stood outside, near the tomb, weeping; and when she was weeping, she stooped down and looked into the tomb, and saw two angels in white clothing, the one sitting at the head, and the other at the foot, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they said to her:

'Woman, why do you weep?'

She said to them:

'They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.'

Having said this, she turned back, and saw Jesus standing; but did not know that it was Jesus. Jesus said to her:

'Woman, why do you weep? For whom are you looking?'

Supposing that it was the gardener she said to him:

'Sir, if you have taken him from here, tell me where you have laid him and I will take him away.'

Jesus said to her:

'Mary!'

She turned and said to him:

'Rabboni!'

[This Hebrew word "means, Teacher."]

"Jesus said to her:

'Do not touch me; for I have not yet gone up to my Father: but go to my brethren and tell them, that I am going up to my father and your Father; even my God and your God, (John xx. 1-17.)

"Mary the Magdalene came and told the Disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had said these things to her." "But," says Mark, though they heard that he was alive, and had been seen by her, they did not believe." (Mark xvi. 11.)

Luke says: "It was Mary the Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and others with them, that told these things to the Apostles. And their words seemed to them as idle tales; and they did not believe them." (xxiv. 10, 11.)

Here let us pause and reflect, till another Lord's day morning.

W. PINKERTON.

Nov. 1, 1874.

Our Murfreesboro Meeting.

Bro. Lipscomb: It appears from your review of our 'little' Consultation Meeting at Murfreesboro, that its 'results,' at least, were *big* enough to demand a *right smart* slice of your attention. Well, my brother, we are taught 'not to despise the day of small things.' Bethlehem, Micah v: 1, was but a 'little' affair, and yet out of it, came a mighty Leader. This mighty effort in which we are all engaged, was once but a 'little' thing. Indeed, the Kingdom of Christ itself, in one of its states, is compared to a 'little' stone: a grain of mustard

seed, 'the smallest of all the seeds'; and yet it is destined to become a mighty tree, in whose branches the birds of the air may rest; beneath whose shade, the beasts of the field may repose; a mighty mountain, whose dimensions are to fill the whole earth. So that, considering the mighty influences which have been brought to bear against 'consultation meetings,' 'co-operative efforts,' from high places, in these quarters, we are led to regard the one recently held here, though 'little,' like the 'grain of mustard seed,' and 'the little stone' and 'little' Bethlehem, nevertheless, under the circumstances, as being quite a success; so much so, we are altogether satisfied, "thank God, and take courage."

But it appears, it is the 'results' of the meeting, and not the *meeting* itself, by which you 'are especially made to doubt its propriety.' If the decisions and 'recommendations' of this 'little' meeting, had all been in accordance with your views, constructions, conclusions—then the meeting would no longer have been of 'doubtful propriety.' But these decisions and 'recommendations' happen to be rather opposed to your conclusions and recommendations, and hence, in your own language, "We are especially made to doubt the propriety of them (consultation meetings) by the results of this meeting." Aye! that tells *exactly*, 'where the shoe pinches.' Well, my brother, you and I, and all of us will have to learn this good, plain, practical lesson, that, '*We can't always have every thing precisely like we want it.*' Others have a right to their conclusions, as well as we. It appears, and

that 'especially from the results of this 'little' meeting, that it is not safe and proper, for the brethren to meet, and consult together, and make 'recommendations' to the churches, as the result of these consultations. There is great danger of a fearful, terrible 'ecclesiasticism' growing up; a mighty Image, greater in proportions than the one set up in the 'plains of Dura,' by the King of Babylon; some modern Moloch, to which the liberties of the churches are all to be victimized; yes, the 'little' consultation meeting, to grow up into a mighty 'Œcumenical council,' absorbing all authority, in itself. But it does not seem to occur to him that there is any danger at all, or any want of propriety, in *one man*, sitting in his editorial chair, wielding his editorial pen, passing censures upon 'little' and 'big' consultation meetings, and conventions of States, and issuing and sending forth his 'recommendations' if not 'decrees' to the great body of the brotherhood. In the days of Solomon, the son of David, and King of Israel, and by the way, regarded as at least a '*tolerably wise man*' in his day, 'In the multitude of counsellors there was safety.' Prov. xi: 14, xxiv: 6; but in this day of progress! progress!! progress!!! all the wisdom has been extracted from the multitude, and condensed and concentrated into the One man, and safety is found only in *his* 'recommendations.' Brother Lipscomb, in his ecclesiastical researches, has discovered, that the mighty decrees of the Œcumenical Councils of earth, with their unlimited potency, had their 'little' beginnings in the 'recommendations' of

churches. But strange to say, he failed to perceive, or perceiving, to let us know, that the mighty thunders of the Vatican, issuing from the seven-hilled-city, reverberating through the length and breadth of earth, and making kings, and Emperors, and princes, tremble upon their thrones, are but the 'full grown recommendations' of *one single man*, and his headquarters at a Capital. And while we have no more use for Œcumenical or any other kind of Councils, issuing decrees' or even 'recommendations' to be binding upon churches, or individuals, without their consent, than brother Lipscomb; at the same time, we would very respectfully and deferentially inform him, that we have just as little use for Prelates, or Popes; to set another Vatican to work, to blowing his bellows, and fulminating his thunders in our midst. If it be the will of God, when Pio Nimo 'gives up the ghost,' let him be the last of the race. And if the Head be taken off, you need not fear the body, whether 'little' or 'big.' As to brother Lipscomb's particular criticisms on the proceedings of this 'little' meeting, I deem it unnecessary at present, to enter into details. But I will say for myself, I did the best I could; and I doubt not, the same is true of all the other good brethren who participated in them. I would only suggest, in conclusion, to my brother Lipscomb, the next meeting we have, instead of deserting the field of battle, entrenching himself behind his bulwarks, and opening his long-ranged batteries upon us, he had better stand his ground, like a brave and faithful soldier, fight it

out to the bitter end; and if he can not succeed in gaining a glorious victory, why just make an honorable surrender.

Instead of forsaking us, and sending forth his censures and criticisms, let him abide with us, and direct us by the counsels of his superior wisdom.

Respectfully and fraternally,

G. W. ABELL.

Murfreesboro, Nov. 3rd, 1874.

We dislike to see Bro. Abell advertise himself of the temper he does in the foregoing. We regret very much, the spirit manifested. We meant no offence to any one in calling the meeting a little one. We only aimed to be truthful. In speaking of it in comparison with others at which five or six hundred delegates attend it was a little meeting. Truth will not allow it to be spoken of in any other way. It is no offence to any one who desires only truth, to have the truth told. It was a small meeting, with but few over a dozen attendants from a distance. Did Bro. Abell wish us to call it a large one, or make such an impression? To do so would be to falsify. Bro. Abell did not wish us to do this. Then why the sensitiveness? Why not speak of it, just as it was? We do not know how our brother can say if the meeting had agreed with us, we would not have doubted its propriety, when he knows we spoke disapprovingly of the meetings before this come on, that we distinctly declared there, when a decided majority of those present were with us fully in sentiment (as they were at the fulness of the meeting) we would not vote on

any questions coming before the meeting, under any circumstances, not even for adjournment, believing these minor matters properly under the control of the church calling the meeting. We believed and advocated this at Clarksville but a year ago, that it is a gross outrage on the rights of a congregation and the proprieties and decencies of life, for a number of invited guests of a church to assume to direct the management of the meeting called by the church. It would be as great an outrage as for a number of invited guests of a family, to displace the head of the family and the matron of the household, and direct the entertainments of the family themselves.

Besides, on Saturday evening, the full day of the meeting, when two thirds of those present were favoring our position and urged us to remain and vote down the propositions we told them, and all present we never expected to vote on any such questions, as did Bro. Wm. Lipscomb. We are a very base and hypocritical man if Bro. Abell's evil surmises have the slightest shadow of truth, and are utterly unworthy of the compliments we learn he paid us for candor after we left. Those compliments on this charge in justice to yourself ought to be retracted. As to his insinuations of our popish aspirations and proclivities, it fails in this. We never made a recommendation to a church or individual in our life, nor asked them to do aught on our judgment. We have endeavored to present the Scripture teaching on subjects before us, nothing more. His anxiety to make a case against us is without a particle of founda-

tion. Besides no pope or other individual ever attained any authority or power save as he rose on the shoulders of a convention or council. Even the Pope himself, now enforces his edicts by the sanction of a council. Besides, while this serves as an occasion to show his ill-nature and make ugly personal insinuations, it stands as an historic fact that no individual ever was able to subvert the church to any extent or attain power, save as he did it through a council or convention of churches. He might exert influence but not power without this. The one man power comes through and is inseparably connected with conventions as a means with which to control the churches. He cannot possibly do it otherwise. On the other hand history records no continuous conventions, that did not sooner or later subvert the churches.

Then we say to brother Abell and to all, we are human and frail as are all others. We have all the faculties to love and abuse power that others have. We are just as unwilling to trust ourself with the authority and power that conventions bring to their favorites as we are to trust him or any other man. We are opposed to being thus tempted ourself, lest we be led into treason against God. Others have fallen, why not we as well? Bro. Abell does us great wrong in charging us with such low and degrading motives, he does himself a greater wrong by indulging in such unworthy suspicions.

D. L.

CHURCH NEWS.

Brethren L. & S.: I will write you a short letter relative to the success

of the truth on this delightful frontier. On Saturday before the 4th Lord's day in Sept., Bro. H. D. Bantau began a meeting at what is known as the Black Creek Church, and continued it until the following Thursday. Six obeyed the gospel, one came over from the Baptists, and 3 from other congregations united with us—amounting to ten in all. Bro. Bantau did the preaching, Elder Calloway, our local preacher, the baptizing, and also aided much by prayer and exhortation. It was indeed, a feast to me, to be permitted once more, after the lapse of 15 years, to listen to that old soldier of the cross as he presented the claims of the gospel to a dying world, and to hear his soul-cheering words of admonition, exhorting us all to be faithful until death.

I have never met with a more devoted band of brethren and sisters, than those composing the Black Creek church. They number over 75 members, are in good working order and contemplate building a large stone house of worship. They also have prospects of establishing, ere long, a high school in their midst. I feel confident that they will succeed. Any brother who contemplates moving to Texas can do no better than cast his lot with these brethren. They have a delightful country. Bro. Calloway preached at my house the first Lord's day in Oct., and a beloved sister-in-law made the good confession and was buried with her Lord in baptism. To our Heavenly Father be all the praise.

Your Bro. in hope,

H. L. WILSON.

Oliver Creek, Tex., Oct. 5th, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: Our protracted meetings of this vicinity have just closed with the following results: At Sparta Bro. Kidwell commenced preaching Monday after the 4th Lord's day in Sept., and continued over the 1st Lord's day in Oct., resulting in 8 additions, all from the world. At Bethlehem, 4 miles south of Sparta, Bro. W. Y. Kuykendall commenced Saturday before the 1st Lord's day in Oct., and continued 5 days, resulting in 9 additions, 7 from the world, and 2 took membership. At Spring Hill, 10 miles north of Sparta, Bros. O. P. Carder and W. L. Acuff commenced Saturday before the 1st Lord's day, resulting in 31 additions, 3 from the Christian Baptist and 2 from the Cumberland Presbyterians, and 26 from the world. To the Lord be all the praise.

Your brother in Christ,

JOHN S. RHEA.

Sparta, Oct. 12, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: The glorious cause of the Redeemer is still progressing in this part of Texas. I preached at Denson's school-house the second Lord's day in this month, also Saturday evening before; the result of which was one added to the good cause, from the Presbyterians.

On the third Lord's day I preached at Pleasant Grove in this county (Houston,) where Methodism is the ruling power. It was thought that they would lock their door, but I preached the night before at a private house, at which time I let them know that I would not trespass upon their rights; and that I would preach the Gospel just as I found it recorded in the New Testament.

After my discourse on Lord's day, I exhorted those who knew their duty to come forward and unite with us upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; after which two came forward and made the good confession, one from the Methodists, the other from the world. I think that I succeeded in removing a portion of their prejudice in regard to the cause. To God be all the praise.

Your brother in Christ,
T. F. DRISKILL.

San Pedro, Houston Co., Tex., Oct. 22, 1874.

Bros L. & S.: Bro. Huffman met with the little congregation worshipping at Bro. James' house, 1½ miles west of Statesville, Wilson County, on Saturday night before the 4th Lord's day in this month and delivered five discourses. Three very intelligent ladies were added, two Baptists, one Presbyterian. Should any one wish to know how these were added, he can learn by consulting Acts ii: 37 to 42. Bro. H.'s last discourse was mainly for the benefit and encouragement of the brothers and sisters, which caused many tears of joy and gratitude. May the blessings of the Lord Almighty remain with this little band of brethren and sisters, also with him, who has labored so faithfully in building them up.

Your brother in the one faith,

B.

Cainsville, Tenn., Oct. 30, 1874.

Old age is a blessing when adorned with Christianity; it is selfish, mean and contemptible without it.

Away up in Tennessee. No. 2.

"Only a nickel sir," said a little boy, "only a nickel." I stopped as I was going on the train and took a look at this specimen of the human family. It seemed that commissaries might have been a little short with him. He appeared meek and had one of those woeful faces, his very appearance met you begging. He saw, I suppose, that I was on the inquiry and he said, "only a nickel, sir, for a shine." He held the rack on which to rest the foot, while blacking, in one hand and his brush in the other. I halted for a moment longer, and he pressed his claims. "Let me give you a shine, mother is sick and we have nothing to eat." "Let me give you a shine, please sir, let me give you a shine?" With one eye sore, and more gloom than nickels, I did not feel much like "a shine" or shining. You have nothing to eat? I inquired. No sir, not a thing. Why do you and your mother not go to the country and work and get something to eat? "I don't know sir." Well I know—because it is too much like work. There is a rush to towns and cities to live easy. The pig pen, the milk piggin, the chicken coop, the cabbage, potato, pea, bean and roasting-ear patches, go far to help life on smoothly, but it is too much like work to keep or have them. There are too many of our people in towns, not enough making something to eat. Even the little boys have found out the weak places of this glittering age, the love of shining. There is gloss on everything, but it is not all gold that glitters. Men shine, women shine, parents want the children to shine,

and teachers put it on thick. They must study French, music, and many other ornamental branches. The mother tongue, not having the shining principles about it, is often neglected for these things, but it is right laughable how soon the squalling of a few pathetic visitors of the infantile stripe to the house of the daughters in after days, makes them forget all the piano knowledge they ever had. How few study that which is really ornamental and that which will make them shine as a light to the world that God may be glorified. "Pretty is as pretty does" comes in right here, a valuable old saying. Fur and cloth, grease and kid, rattan and calf swells, bows, scraping, graceful gesticulation make the shine for the young man. Some others find the same, in gold, plats, barks, old hair, ribbons, straw, leghorn, morocco, powder, paint, "bloom of youth," and other things beyond my knowing. The Yankees stop up the cracks with putty, paint over, make a shine for the money. The little boy is learning to be a man. He is satisfied there is money somewhere, a nickel is as high as he can raise his sights just now. How can he pick a pocket. He answers his own question, "with a shine." He addresses this weak place and out comes the poor money that will not jingle.

Blount Springs is on the rout to "Away up in Tennessee." Here the people were coming, going, stopping leaving, staying. These are reputed health hunters. Grantees, bankers, lawyers, big merchants, shipwrecked speculators, iron-mongers, coal-miners rail-road men, and others who have money to scatter around, gather here for this purpose. Some, and a "right

smart" sum of them are wife hunters and lookers after husbands, whilst there may be pleasure seekers in the number. Going to popular places, where there is high life and a grand display of fashions and finery, is far more pleasant than taking bitter pills, tinctures, drops, essences, or being blistered and poulticed. Notice how careful men are of their old bodies—their earthly houses. What will a man give for health? Any thing. What will a man give in exchange for his soul? This question, the most important of all others, never has its proper proportions in the minds of men until death comes along. All would like to have friends, who would receive them failing, into everlasting habitations. Why be so careful about the body, give so much money for its preservation, comfort, and pleasure, and neglect the most important part of man, the soul. What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul. The gay crowd from the veranda of the hotel and the platform looked on at us as we stopped for awhile. Anxious friends met anxious friends, husbands met wives, beaux, belles, some took leave on the train. They were not a sickly looking set at all. Yet it is fashionable, and like the Jews of old, the human family will make themselves miserable to be like other folks. The rich go for pleasure and to deplete their treasury. The poor with rich ways go to be like somebody else, whose ways fit their eyes and to keep up appearances. Some pockets, and it may be somebody's credit got hurt by this carrying on. Another boy brought around some mineral water, a glass for a

nickel, only a nickel, sir. I had but one disease, sore eyes, and as I did not think a glass would do my eyes any good I let him pass, besides I had some of Thompson's eye water. All aboard and we left the place of pleasure and health, and the people of smiles and grins. Soon they sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. "Nothing else to do, nothing else to do, so they all go a courting (or playing) for they have nothing else to do." So much to do in this world and yet it is so hard for some people to find it out. There is work for all, but it is impossible to convince some of the fact. What a pity! I read of a man shooting himself not long since because he could find no "business." There it is again that word "business." Going to the springs is "business" but not work. How about shooting one's brains out? If this belongs to the business family it must come under the head of "bad business." I tell you one old corn-making farmer, or one old yarn-making woman, a rail-splitter, a plowboy or a ditcher, does the world more good than these fashionable leeches, sucking the best blood circulating in the great body of society, all the time making nothing, furnishing nothing, bringing nothing back, still they act as if the world could not get along without them. Pleasure-seekers, agents and do-nothings are having a great feast now. I know nothing they add to the world. But I leave them.

I do not know what I was thinking about. I know I had gone into a car in which there was not a soul but myself and that man who bawls out, drawls out, or squeaks out, or yells out, or hollows out, or screams out the stations, without an equal, unless 'tis a New Orleans oyster man, a Richmond charcoal man or an Indiana papaw boy, or the universal newsboy. In came an old man stooped much by age or hard work. He was dressed in a countryman's unpretending style. He seemed much excited, and annoyed the conductor by telling him not to forget to put him off at the right place. He had never traveled on the cars before. All this was supported by the testimony of his countenance. A kind word from me brought him down to my side, for as yet he had not set down. He soon found I was a preacher, for some how I cannot keep that a secret, and still I verily believe none of the clergyman or pastor is visible or otherwise sticking out in any word or deed of mine. He asked me to what denomination I belonged. I told him, the same one to which Paul belonged. "Ah"? Said he, "Well to what church do you belong?" The same one of which Paul was a member? This was strange to him. Yes very strange that I should claim such high ground. But again is it not strange that men have so "corrupted the way of the Lord" that it is thought marvelous for a man in this bright day, far advanced time and enlightened age to claim the heaven granted privilege of being just what Paul was, no more, a Christian, no more, a member of the church of God, no more. But it was strange to the unsophisticated Dowling, not because it is at war with anything taught by the word of God, but from its being so unlike the religions of the day. He thought to be a Christian is enough. All the common sense of this world is not found in the schools

and in the higher walks of life. This old man had read that one book, thought much, and twenty miles of talk was spent, seemingly to his delight and not unpleasantly to me. At last he asked me if I was a Mason. I answered no, but I am a Christian. Well, said he, cannot a man be both? In turn I asked him if he could? Oh yes, said he earnestly. I asked him, after repeating some of the sixth chapter of Romans, if God did not place the "servants of righteousness" under obligations to do righteousness? He thought he did, as all sane men must conclude. Then a man is a servant of righteousness or ought to do righteousness because God says so. It is right to visit the sick and it is righteous to do so. Now why do you visit your Masonic sick brethren, because God says so, or because Masons command it? Or if the Masonic obligation did not place you under obligation would you do it? Here the old man began to wriggle I thought. He contended that God gets the honor of Masonic righteousness when we know that Masons claim it and we have heard our brethren boasting that their human institution was doing more good than the church. Many questions were propounded in Tennessee, with reference to members of the church belonging to the Grange sons of Temperance, good Templars, Masonic and Odd Fellows lodges. I had some use for my old man and I illustrated the case thus: I love to see my wife with a neat, clean dress on, a linen collar and her head combed smooth, not frizzled up after the lazy fashions of the day, and she knows it. I come home and find her

thus fixed up. I say, Lucy, you look very nice. When she replies to me, I did not do this to please you or because you like it but because Mr. Jones is delighted with this kind of an outfit. How would I feel and how would I regard such treatment. The church is the bride, the lamb's wife and the bridegroom wants her to be without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, he wants her a glorious church, He is jealous of the affections of his bride. When the church does things that Christ commands, not because he orders it done, but in order to keep the laws of some man-made institution how do you judge it looks to the heavenly beings or how do they look at it. Mr. Granger Christian, why did you go to see the sick man last night? Because the by-laws of my society make me do so. There it is. Mr. Good Templar Christian, why did you look after that wretched sot, ruined by drink? Well, I entered into an obligation or took a pledge to do so. Mr. Mason Christian, why did you assist that widow and orphan? Because she was the wife of a brother Mason and this was his child. There is a law of Free and accepted Masons, binding us to assist one another, and the families of the brotherhood. I ask, if Christians are not made servants of all this righteousness by God, or does he not command them to do all these good things? Is the obligation to these things imposed by men more binding? Does the touch of the human make it more powerful? Is it changed by having been enjoined by mortals? In vain do you worship me teaching for doctrine the commandments of men. "Ye are bought with a price, be not

ye servants of men. Does not Christ make it the bounden duty of every Christian to visit the sick man in the church and out of it; to save all he can, drunkards as well as others; to feed and clothe all the poor he can? Certainly. To admit, practically, that we are not bound to do such good things, and place ourselves under another power, and do the very things God commands, strictly for the sake of that power and in the interest of that power, looks to me just like insulting Christ who bought us with a price. I found brethren, some of them preachers, who said the argument is not a correct one and the illustration does not suit the case. I cannot see it. Wherein? It is mortifying to me to hear one of these claiming citizenship in the kingdom of Christ saying, "If Christians would do their duty, there would be no use for Temperance societies," another will say, "there would be no occasion for Masonic lodges or Odd Fellows if Christians would carry out the Bible. Men of the world might say this with some show of propriety but shame on the professed Christian, delinquent and thoroughly derelict, who would dare thus talk. If long-faced preachers would be as friendly, as followers of Christ, as they are locked up in their secret devotions to a man-made institution, if all those who have taken their money, their zeal, their time, their talent, their influence and carried them away from the church into granges, societies and lodges, will carry them back to the place of the Lord's appointing, then the church might do her duty. But when men profess to love God and give five dollars to get into the

grange and not a cent to further on the interests of the Master's cause, are always ready to pay their dues to societies and lodges and fail often to give for the salvation of man, how can the church do her duty with such friends? Is it not a public shame for brethren to throw this into the teeth of the church, when no one brings so great a disgrace upon the cause of the Redeemer as these very men, who live daily willing to do more when men tell them to do a thing than when God himself commands it. That is not all, when the great Jehovah tells them to do things they neglect it and go right off and join men and then do it out of respect to men. This is certainly fornication. 'Tis the bride having two husbands, and that which is not her husband getting the respect, honor, reverence that belongs to the legitimate Lord. There are societies now, filled with members of the church, instituted to preach the gospel, to keep men from getting drunk, to visit the sick, clothe the naked, feed the hungry, to keep peace, to convert men in a way not known to the Bible; and if a few more can be numbered, one to keep down dancing and gambling, another to restrain swearers, one to keep down fornication, one to choke out covetousness and extortion, God and his Son will be released of nearly all the burden and nothing will remain but to save a people made ready by the plastic hand of man. But who has required all this at your hands. By human invention the church is dismounted from her position of glory and reduced to the ranks of a non-essential rendezvous for persons to do nothing. It is even an insult to God.

for a man of the world to say, "Ah, you church folks are not doing your duty, you are not doing as much as *we*." It seems like saying to the great I AM, "well you've tried to put light into the world and failed you gave your church to the world and it has come far short of its object, 'tis a grand failure, but *we* have struck it all right. *We* have hit upon the plan of doing something good, just look at the work *we* are doing. You couldn't keep men from getting drunk, (we can) your gospel couldn't save them but our pledge has, look at A. B. and C. all freed by our society, from the evil spirit and are now clothed and in their right mind. Your sons and daughters will not love one another in deed and in truth just look at Mrs. G. and the children of brother W. cared for by our lodge, ah, here is religion." This insult is not to the church only, but to God. Did you ever think what "*we*" (I mean societies) would be if robbed of all the members of the Church? Did you ever think how little "*we*" (I mean societies) are doing in lands where there is no light of Christianity? Roman Catholicism boasts of wonders and is doing much in the United States, but try her in the light of divine truth where she has all the sway, as in Italy, Mexico, Spain and South America. Her very influence here is darkening, blighting, soul-sinking. So "*we*" the societies, lodges, etc, can do wonders and run off with the honors of it, while working in the bright light of Christianity, but oh, turn them loose in a land without a Bible and what could they boast. Verily I believe they think all the church has to do is to

hold the light for them to work by. But if this Jackdaw were plucked, and all the peacock's feathers taken away, it would certainly be an uncomely bird, still nothing but a Jackdaw! I have lost sight of old man Dowling and I will not hunt him up.

(Concluded next week.)

RE-BAPTISM.

Dear Bro. Lipscomb: Doubtless many of the readers of the GOSPEL ADVOCATE are anxious to learn the sequel in the case of M. C. Carruth, inquired of you as to her baptism. For their information and to report the case with a few of my comments on it, I write these lines. On the 12th inst. I buried her with her Savior in baptism. I had baptized her husband, and her daughter before this, but since her first query to you as to the validity of her own baptism.

She received quite a number of letters some on each side of the question and among these is one from our primitive friend, Eld. Wilkinson of Tennessee, which demands some attention to enlighten him as to our teaching on the subject of salvation, baptism and etc. So far, I have confined my labors to sister Carruth. I wished to see her right (as I understood her condition) before I began to try to set others right. Now she can say "I know I have been baptized according to the Scriptures." As I have a word to you, as well as to our friends of the harder sort, I suppose your case had as well come first. I do not know as we differ as to what makes baptism valid for your answer was very well in its place. Your difficulty was in

not suiting the dose to the patient under treatment. You treated her for the wrong form of disease. Had her case been as you *supposed*, your treatment might have removed the cause of trouble. Instead, however, of curing sister C. your treatment of the case (with the counsel of Bro. B.) has made another sick with the disease of jeopardy and she has demanded and received baptism at my hands upon her confession, This sister had been identified with us for a number of years but she could never say she had been "baptized into Christ." So you see you have effected some good if not exactly what you anticipated.

In your first answer you took too much for granted. In the first place she never believed the gospel before she was immersed by our Baptist friends. She was taught that she could not understand a word of the gospel "until quickened by the Holy Ghost." In consequence of such instruction she had no intelligent conviction as to the truth of the proposition that Jesus is the Christ. When one admits a thing because father and mother say it is true, is this admission of faith? If so let us cease to talk of faith by hearing the word of God. Now as she had no faith as to Christ only as she received by tradition she was not brought into him by her baptism. What say you?

As to why she was baptized we may only say, that persons may desire to be baptized without ever knowing who authorized it. Had she been taught that our Savior commanded us to be baptized and that her faith in him had led her to demand baptism, it would have been

valid. When a Pedobaptist has his infant baptized, he does not do it to obey Christ, who never authorized it, but to observe the law of his church. And when a Baptist is baptized under such circumstances as those upon which we are writing, it is simply to comply with the laws of the Baptist Church. In our day many Baptists understand that baptism is a command of our Savior and desire to obey him. Yet we believe that these are exceptions.

R. C. HORN.

McKinney, Texas, Oct. 27. 1874.

We, from the beginning took the position, that only when baptized in order to obey God was it acceptable baptism. We are not prepared to say whether our sister was baptized to obey him or not. That we left for her to decide. She alone could decide that point. The fact that she was taught that she could not believe without first being quickened by the Spirit is not clear evidence she did not believe. The evil of that doctrine is not so much that it prevents individuals from believing, as that it prevents their acting on real true faith that they possess. Instead of acting on a reasonable faith based on the evidences presented in the Bible, it causes them to ignore and neglect that faith and seek some miraculously induced faith, the evidence of which is the feelings supposed to be imparted by the spirit. It hinders faith by preventing persons from looking to the true source of faith; but when they look it does not hinder faith but only causes the individual to ignore it and seek for something else as faith. We have

found a number of persons with whom the work to be done done, was to satisfy them that the faith they had, based on the word of God was the Scriptural faith. We think there are more of the Baptists than our brother gives credit for, that are baptized because God commands it. We think there are cases who have been baptized by our brethren who were baptized without faith. Such on believing should be baptized. We wish just the full truth, and all to obey the truth whether baptized by or a Baptist.

D. L. *

Be ye Steadfast.

"The REVIEW has always gone for co-operation in the preaching and spread of the gospel. It does not, however, go for outside organizations, especially *incorporated* ones, with a long list of offices and officers unknown to the New Testament, who eat up the money the brethren may give for evangelical purposes.

We have supported the Missionary Society in years gone by, and more recently, to some extent, the Louisville Plan; but they have both been tried and found wanting, as the testimony of their best friends has abundantly proved. We feel inclined to wash our hands of all these human schemes, and, until a better is found, stick to the practice of the apostles in preaching the gospel to all nations.

G. W. RICE.

We had hoped the *Review* had finally assumed a steadfast position for the Scriptural provisions for

spreading the truth. But it seems from the foregoing we were mistaken. It has dropped the Louisville Plan only because as an expediency it has failed. It now proposes "to stick to the practice of the apostles in preaching the Gospel to all nations," only until a better scheme is found. Now pray who is to find a better scheme than the apostles found? Why did not the apostles find the best scheme with all their wisdom? Shall we have another company of twenty? or shall we double the number next time, since in the multitude of counsellors there is safety? We propose to stick to the Divine Apostolic plan, no matter what schemes may be found. Come, Bro. Rice, let us lock shields and be steadfast for the truth of God, for the Lord's provisions as superior to all human schemes and in opposition to them. Is there to be no end to this tinkering of the Divine order and institutions?

D. L.

Prayer for Conversion and the Holy Spirit.

Messrs. L. & S.: As I am a reader and subscriber to your paper I will ask you some plain questions and I want plain answers; the first one is: why do you try to teach that Christians have no right to pray for the conversion of sinners?

I ask this because I try to understand what I read, especially the New Testament, and Christ said, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he might sift you as wheat. Behold I have prayed for thee, that thou fail not, and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren." Luke xxii: 31-32. Also

why do you try to teach that they, the Christians, have no right to pray for an outpouring of the Spirit?

Yours respectfully,

HENRY S. JACKSON.

Burnsville, Miss., Oct 25th, 2874.

We never by word or deed taught such a thing in our life. Nor did we ever hear of any one doing so except a few ultra-Calvinists. We have always prayed that they might hear the word of truth, believe the gospel, obey its requirements and be saved. This is conversion. This is a daily prayer with us, a stereotyped one, and we in a very faulty and frail manner strive to work as we pray. We object to a person praying to God to forgive a person's sins, while that person is refusing obedience to God, refusing to do the things God commands as a condition of forgiveness. To pray God to forgive a man while he refuses to obey his laws, is to pray him to dishonor his laws, to pardon a man in rebellion. It is to pray him to offer a premium for rebellion. The difficulty is not to get God forgive sin, when a man quits it, but the trouble is to get man himself to willing to quit his sins that God may pardon. The apostles in Christ's stead prayed the people to be reconciled to God. 2nd Cor. v : 20. We always pray for what we labor, and ought to labor always for what we pray.

Our religious neighbors pray that God will forgive sinners and give them the evidence of his forgiveness while the sinner is failing to obey him. We believe it right to pray that man may be willing to obey God—that God may forgive.

We do not believe God will or can forgive while man is in disobedience. To pray God to forgive him thus, is to pray contrary to his will. We ought to pray according to the will of God. If we ask according to his will he heareth us. 1st Jno. v : 14, "and whatsoever we ask we receive of him, because we keep his commandments and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." 1st John iii : 22. We insist on obedience to God as the necessary condition of God's answering the individual's own prayers, or the prayers of others in his behalf.

We do not believe there is anything like an outpouring of the Holy Spirit at this time. The persons on whom the Holy Spirit was poured out in former days, all could work miracles, could prophesy, could speak in tongues they had never learned. No one is able to do these things at this day. The prayer is usually made for the Holy Spirit to be poured out upon sinners to enable them to believe. The Holy Spirit was never given to unbelievers but to believers in the apostolic days. The wild excitements of this age that is attributed to the outpouring of the Spirit bears no semblance to the results of the outpouring of primitive times. The Spirit does not come to us in this miraculous manner and with this wonder-working manifestations. It comes to us now through fixed and unchangeable laws, it comes gently and insensibly, to bless and comfort when we comply in spirit and in body with the will of God. We pray for the Spirit but not for its miraculous manifestations which ceased when the perfect law was given to man. The

Spirit has since come and worked through the laws the Spirit gave. All other sources of spiritual influence are unreliable and deceptive. Those influences which come through the word of God and of course fully accord with it alone are to be depended upon or can benefit the human family. The pouring out of the Spirit was a miraculous manifestation and was confined to the creative age of the church. We now strive to obey the will of God and to induce others so to do, and while obeying this, pray for the fulness of God's spiritual blessings. Work and prayer are inseparably connected.

D. L.

Ordaining to the Ministry.

Three young men were ordained some time ago at Bethany College, to the ministry. The act is commented upon as follows by David King, of Birmingham, England. He is the leading man among the saints in England. They have maintained in purity the faith and practice as given by the Holy Spirit much more nearly than have we. We take this from the *Apostolic Times* as copied from the Ecclesiastical Observer, Bro. King's paper.

"Here are three young men, who are described as having been in various places 'ministering in the word,' brought up to Bethany that, while kneeling before the president of that college and other elders of the church hands may be laid upon them; thenceforward they may be known as ministers of the word duly authorized and bearing the ordination stamp

as do ministers of the Roman and Anglican churches.

"But why should these brethren be ordained to minister in the word? Is there, in the New Testament, such an office to which persons are required to be set apart, by kneeling before college presidents, elders, professors, etc.? We answer, no! The *Standard* takes care not to tell us what these brethren were really made by their ordination. They are neither termed pastors or elders, nor are they designated evangelists. In certain denominations there is the *one man* who is preacher, teacher, exhorter—the one who speaks in prayer, and administers the ordinances. One such man in each church is called "our minister." This term seems to be the one applied to the three young brethren. Again we deny that there is Divine authority for any such office and ordination. But we may be told that they are intended for pastors, and will be so designated so soon as they are hired by churches to feed the flock. If so, we again deny that apart from the eldership of a church there is any such office; and we affirm that an elder, even if called a pastor, can not be ordained at Bethany in his early days, so as to serve him through a professional career in the various churches to which he may engage himself. Shall we be told that by this ordination the young men were made, and duly stamped evangelists. If so, again we say, no apostolic sanction! Nowhere are we commanded to ordain evangelists. No instance of such ordination is on record. We may be told that hands were laid on Timothy. Yes; and so they were on the babes brought to

Jesus, and also on multitudes who were not ordained to any service whatever. There is no evidence of the ordination of any man to preach the Gospel or to do the work of an evangelist; and until a clear precept or an example from the New Testament be forthcoming, we should keep free from treading in the footprints of priest and parson makers. But another priestly element is introduced into this Bethany ordination business. Three young men kneeling before the ordainers are regarded as taking a "solemn pledge of consecration of head and heart and life-work to the sacred calling to which they ask the church to ordain them." Then they are told that "the vow of devotion thus solemnly signalized can not fail to carry with it a life-long obligation." Certainly, if language is to mean anything, there is here a *solemn pledge or vow* to a life-work in the ministry. Who has required brethren to take this or any other vow? Christianity is free from everything of the sort. A man who believes the gospel, obeys the gospel, preaches the gospel, makes converts, plants churches is an evangelist; he needs no ordination, and to vow or take a life-long pledge to continue that work, or, indeed, to do any other good service in the church of God, is not required of him, and is a presumption to be condemned."

♦♦♦♦♦
 Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Sirup.
 ———

A Correspondent of the California Medical Gazette writes to that journal as follows:

Some weeks since I was called to an infant six months old who was in a

dying condition, apparently from the effects of a narcotic poison. It had taken no medicine except this soothing sirup, of which it had taken within ten hours, two doses of about one teaspoonful each. I had the sirup, from which these doses were given, analyzed by a skillful chemist. There were ten drachms of soothing sirup in the vial, and it yielded of morphine and other opium alkaloids, 1 14-100 grains, very nearly one grain to the ounce of sirup. This result astonished me. The printed directions for administering the medicine are as follows:—"For a child under one month old, 6 to 10 drops; three months old, half a teaspoonful; six months old and upwards, one teaspoonful three or four times a day until free from pain. In dysentery repeat the above dose every two or three hours, until the character of the disease is changed for the better." Here we have a dose of morphine equal to ten drops of laudanum, given to a child of three months old every two hours, and double the quantity to a child of six months old.

I have always discountenanced the use of this preparation as I did not know its composition, and supposed it contained some anodyne, but I had no idea of its deadly strength. It is a familiar fact that children are very susceptible to the influence of opium, and four drops of laudanum has been known to kill an infant of nine months. I think it important that this analysis should be published, that the profession, and through it the public, may be warned of the fearful effects of administering this dangerous and popular nostrum. The quantity used in the community is enormous: doubtless it

has killed hundreds of children, and would kill thousands were it not that by beginning in very small doses and gradually increasing, a tolerance of the immediate poisonous effects is induced although the miserable little victims of domestic drugging are reduced to puny and cachetic creatures, that are carried off by the first disease that takes hold of them.

The specimen of soothing sirup analyzed was made by Curtis & Perkins, of New York, who are the only manufacturers. I have ascertained that there are about 100,000 2 ounce bottles of it sold annually in San Francisco, making 200,000 ounces of Mrs. Winslow's soothing sirup, containing about 180,000 grains or morphine, which are given annually to the babies of this State. No wonder that one-third of them die before they reach the age of two years!—*Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.*

A Talk with the Boys.

For weeks I have been studying men, and have come to the conclusion that their mothers did not do their full duty in "bringing them up," which carries me back to the boys. There are so many awkward, lubberly, vulgar, grown-up boors, and so few real gentlemen, that it is very fair reasoning to infer that they were not properly cared for when they were young; for a straight twig usually makes a straight tree.

I like boys. Girls are very fine and sweet, like flowers and oranges; but boys are like apples—that is, they always remind me of apples, because apples are such solid, wholesome,

good-natured, everyday sort of things, that keep well and possess real character. I do not mean to say that girls have not characters and other noble qualities, but I am talking of boys now.

As everything in this world is sure to have something back of it, so the boys have their mothers—or have had them—and although there is nothing in the world quite so nice as having a real live mother, yet some of the mothers are either so careless, or have so very much to do that they sadly neglect you boys. Of course they teach you to speak the truth, that it is wicked to cheat or steal, to fight like cats and dogs, or to swear. One might be a heathen and know better than to do those things. Then your mothers give you clean clothes for Sunday, wash your face, neck, and ears, and see that your necktie is on straight, and when you start for church or Sunday-school, tell you "to behave." It is this "behaving" business I am after. A man who was once a boy and is now a man, and whose name is Emerson, says this: "Give a boy address and accomplishments, and you give him the mastery of palaces and fortunes wherever he goes. He has not the trouble of earning or owning them; they solicit him to enter and possess."

The importance of good manners is what I would have you first comprehend. The mainspring of all good manners lies in the Golden Rule. The "address" Emerson speaks of, is something more than manners; it comes from self-possession, from courage, and from contact with polite people.

I think one of the very first things

a boy should acquire is self-possession; to speak clearly and frankly when spoken to; to ask in a prompt and straightforward manner when sent to ask; never to suck his thumb when he has an errand to do, nor skulk behind doors when he should be in the street. To enter a room with his hat on, or accept a kindness without a "thank you," are both common faults, and very bad ones, as regards manners. Boys may turn somersaults, climb trees and fences, play ball, wrestle, jump and shout, and have excellent manners, too; but they will not indulge in such things in their mother's parlor, or in the front hall of their next door neighbor's house.—*Exchange.*

Bro. Hundly's Queries.

His first query is, if two persons marry, while unconverted, one of them then joining the church, could such marry in the Lord without sin? God evidently recognizes the marriages of the unconverted as marriages. To be respected and observed by them after the conversion of one or both. (See 1st Cor. 7: 12-13.) Now it was marriage, recognized as such by God. They separate without the one cause. One marries. It is adultery certainly. Continuance in it certainly is continuance in adultery every day they so live. To live with one thus married, after conversion certainly is adultery and sinful in the sight of God. The church is bound to look to rectifying of wrongs of this character as well as of stealing. 2nd. I think Paul gives the privilege of departing in some cases, but not of marrying again. 1st Cor. 7-11 "If she depart, let her remain unmar-

ried, or be reconciled to her husband and let not her husband put her away."

The 3rd query we are not certain we understand. If he means if God will not forgive the first sin of putting away, our answer to the 2nd question obviates the difficulty. If he means the offended one of the couple, will not forgive the offence in the other, caused the separation; I think when the other gives evidence of repentance from the offence, a turning from the course, the offended one as a Christian is bound to forgive. The church should see he or she does. Must use all the means to effect it that God has authorized her to use against violators of Divine law.

4th. The church is bound to enforce the law, if all Scriptural means are first exhausted in inducing the offender to reform, and they fail, the church must withdraw herself from such as are walking disorderly.

5. Immersing into Christ, certainly puts the individual into the body. An individual that worships with a church, says to that church, your watch care and help I ask, and will give to you the same. The hand of fellowship, was given as a token of approval and pledge of fellowship in any work in which a member engages, especially if that work is away from the church. We think it very proper to give the hand of fellowship to every convert in his first setting apart to the Christian work and life, as a pledge of brotherly love and Christian aid. We think it would be good to repeat this hand of fellowship every Lord's day in the worship as a pledge of Christian love. It certainly does not put anybody into the church.

D. L.

ITEMS.

The Church at Pine Knot Springs, Ark. numbers 63. Brethren Hyde and Lemmons preach for them.

Bro. T. M. Sweeney writes us that he has recently had 21 additions to the Church of God in Houston Co. Texas.

The *Christian Monitor* is now under the exclusive management of Mrs. M. M. B. Goodwin.

J. B. Mayfield of Ky. is to labor in future for the congregation of disciples in Little Rock Ark., to which point he has removed.

The Christian meeting-house at Canton Mo. was destroyed by fire Oct 9th. The loss is estimated at \$8,000. The brethren are making arrangements to build a new house.

The Church in Austin, Texas desires a preacher; no one need apply, unless recommended, to be an able and faithful worker.

James H. Wingo of Giles Co., Va. reports in the *Examiner* fifty-two percent additions at his meetings.

Bro. Mansel Kendrick writes that A. R. Kendrick and himself lately held a meeting at Oak Hill, Alcorn Co. Miss. resulting in seven additions.

The first number of Vol. II. American Independent Monthly and Bible Thinker is on our table. This paper is edited and published by Bro. J. T. Walsh, Newberne N. C. The subscription is only \$1.00 per annum.

We understand that there will be a public discussion at Bethlehem Church ten miles north of Lewisburg, Tenn., on the 21st of Nov., between

Eld J. H. Morton of the Christian Church, and Calvin Hardison, Moralistic. The question for debate is:

"Resolved that the moral man, outside of the of the church established on earth, is debarred from future happiness by the teachings of the Bible.

NOTICE.

After the first of January next, the Postal law requires that postage on all papers shall be prepaid at the office of publication. Our subscribers will therefore please remember when sending the subscription to send with it 20 cts for postage. This will cost the subscriber no more than postage instead of the Post Master. He will then never be dunned for his postage. Please remember this.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL.

There are many evils that lurk around the heart, and many temptations prompting us to respond to their calling, but none more readily co-works with all evil than profanity, and is ever ready to lay waste a moral and upright mind; with its deadly sting and poisonous arrow. Profanity, we can truthfully say, is the anchor of many evils arising from an ungoverned disposition.

General News.

An election will be held, Dec. 31st, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of John W. Head, Congressman elect from the 4th district. An unusual large number of aspirants are in the field,—A Democratic jolli-

fication in honor of the late victories is to come off in this city, Nov. 19.—St. Mary's Colored M. E. Church was totally destroyed by fire on Sunday last.—Cotton has advanced $\frac{1}{2}$ @ 3-4c within the last four days. Low Middling is quoted at 13 $\frac{3}{8}$ cts.—Mr. White, the New York *Tribune* correspondent, who has done more than any other man to explode the stories told of outrages in Ala., was assaulted by Congressman Hayes, while stepping from the train at a station in Ala., a few days since.—Wm. Cullen Bryant, the poet editor of the New York *Evening Post*, celebrated his eightieth birth-day Nov. 4th.—Smith, the defeated candidate for Governor of Ark., has attempted to assume the role of Governor and called on the President for military aid.—The grave of Horace Greeley has hitherto been neglected. The International Typographical Union has lately taken charge of it and are making a public appeal for funds to erect a monument.—Rev. M. E. Hysore of the M. E. Mission church Washington City, died in his pulpit on Sunday last.—Obion Co., Tenn., has a wild negro who has lived in a mud hole for five years.—The priest at St. Columba's Church, Edgefield, collared a young man and led him out for talking in a loud voice to a lady during services.—Theo. Tilton's suit against Henry Ward Beecher for \$100,000 damages, was called in the Brooklyn City Court last week.

FOREIGN.—Disraeli has been re-elected Rector of the University of Glasgow, over Ralph Waldo Emerson, who received quite a handsome vote.—Several religious riots have

recently occurred in Poland.—Gibaldi, for whom a charitable appeal was lately made, has been elected deputy to the Italian Assembly from two separate districts.—It is rumored that the Prince Imperial is soon to be married to a daughter of the Grand Duchess Marie, of Russia.—There is said to be great indignation in Germany over the second arrest of Count Von Arnim.—Capital punishment has been totally abolished in Switzerland.

At one of our modern "agricultural" fairs, where the laws strictly prohibited the sale of liquor and all gambling and betting, there were over ten gambling establishments, and the President of the society was reeling around drunk, and offering to bet from \$50 to \$10,000 on a favorite horse.

Snow fell in Northern Ohio Saturday, the 31st ult.

MARRIED.—At Arlington Chapel, six miles from this city, near the residence of the bride's mother, Tuesday evening, Nov. 17, Mr. C. W. McLester to Miss Fanny Cole.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Memoirs of Jesus.....	1079
Our Murfreesboro Meeting.....	1083
Church News	1086
Away up in Tennessee, No. 2.....	1088
Re-Baptism	1093
Be ye Steadfast.....	1065
Prayer for Conversion and the Holy Spirit	1095
Ordaining to the Ministry.....	1097
Mrs. Winslows Soothing Sirup.....	1098
A talk with the Boys.....	1099
Bro. Hundly's Queries.....	1100
Items.....	1101
Notice.....	1101
General News	1101

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 47.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, NOV. 26, 1874.

KINGS OF BUSINESS.

LECTURE BY JAMES PARTON.

PASSAGES IN THE LIVES OF MANY REPRESENTATIVE MEN. — THE RIGHT WAY TO WORK—EVILS OF OVERWORK.

We publish from the *New York Tribune* the following notes on business men from a lecture of James Parton. An earnest, honest life of industry and energy are so intimately connected with a noble Christian life that we feel it is entirely germane to a religious work that we give his suggestions. We do not desire to excite ambition of great wealth. But there is such a seeking of it by some royal road, some quick and easy way, that it is a good work to show that it comes by earnest and faithful industry in small things, just in the same manner that humble competence does. Young men now despise the small beginnings and humble callings, in doing this they miss too the reward of wealth.

There is also such a lack of fidelity in our work, so much sham, so much inferior work done it would be well

for all to understand that success depends on thoroughness and fidelity in whatever is done. Success in business and the Christian religion join in declaring, whatever is worth doing, is worth doing well. Let young men be willing to labor at humble callings, in the productive industries, let them not despise the day of small things, but let them be thorough and faithful in their labor, and larger openings—abundant rewards will be their portion. Do away with all sham and superficialism, all pretence and hypocrisy, be honest and faithful and all will be well.

D. L.

“James Parton gave in this city, on Wednesday evening, his interesting new lecture, “Kings of Business,” extracts from which are printed below :”—*N. Y. Tribune*.

THE LECTURE.

The aristocracy of a country are they who wield its resources; in other words, the strong men who possess and control. In all the tribes and nations of which we have knowledge, we find the strong forming a class by themselves; usually in the older countries, a king and nobility

descended from the ancient strong who banded together to defend the State against foreign foes and internal anarchy. But in our modern world, war having become the occasional instead of constant necessity of nations, the soldier recedes, the man of business comes to the front. Nobilities decay. The great houses of a country are mercantile, not feudal. If we by chance hear the names of York and Lancaster, we do not think of white rose and red or cracked crowns on bloody fields; but ask, perhaps, whether they are in cotton or in sugar, whether they are iron men or pork men. And this is not retrograde, as some would have us think, but advance, signal and glorious advance. In a country governed by law and devoted to the arts of peace men of business are the natural chiefs of the community. I have visited more than once the frontiers of the United States and observed the new settlements and the rising towns where everything arranges itself in the natural way. In the dense, magnificent forests of Wisconsin, where timber is the staple commodity, what is it that the settlers want and must have and can't get? A saw-mill. Who builds it? The strong few; and around the saw-mill, which is the life and opportunity of the place, the town gathers, as in the olden time the retainers nestled in the protecting shadow of the lord's castle. But on the rolling prairies of Minnesota, the need of the people is the steam elevator, which towers aloft, visible for many a mile, the center of the grain growing system. On a fine day in Winter, as far as the eye can reach, you see the sleighs

heaped with sacks, and the farmer in his overcoat and cap of buffalo skin, with wife or daughter by his side, moving at a gentle trot towards this tower of refuge, which sucks up the grain on one side and on the other pours it out into the freight car, while inside is the office where the farmer gets his money, and near by are the stores in which his wife can spend it. These giant structures belong to the strong men of the prairie world, the successors of the ancient nobles. It is not the effeminate idlers who have inherited the names and titles of the old dukes and barons that are their true successors, but men who fill the place in the modern world that dukes and barons did in the ancient. In the corn counties of fertile Iowa something else is required. The farmers there cannot send their corn to us to eat until it is condensed. The leaders of the people there erect those establishments, invented at Cincinnati, where at one end of the building the corn goes in pig, and on the other comes out salt pork. So in the region north of the Adirondack wilderness, where corn will not always ripen, the men of force have lined the frontier with huge factories where the bulky and heavy potato is converted into starch, which is sent to the ends of the earth, and has enriched a line of country which otherwise would be scarcely inhabited. Cross the frontier into Canada; go into the French villages, and you do not find such things. It is because their strong men become priests, and expend the resources of the country in monasteries and other huge ecclesiastical edifices. The land groans under the weight of them, the

country swarms with jovial and fat priests ; and the people, finding little work at home, stroll down every harvest into Vermont and New-Hampshire, in carts drawn by one cow or half a horse.

HOW SOME MEN HAVE BECOME RICH.

Isaac Rich, who left a million and three-quarters a year or two ago to found a college in Boston, began business thus : At 18 he came from Cape Cod to Boston with \$3 or \$4 in his possession, and looked about for something to do, rising early, walking far, observing closely, reflecting much. 'Soon he had an idea : He bought three bushels of oysters, hired a wheelbarrow, found a piece of board, bought six small plates, six iron forks, a three cent pepper-box, and one or two other things. He was at the oyster-boat, buying his oysters, at 3 in the morning, wheeled them three miles, set up his board near a market, and began business. He sold out his oysters as fast as he could open them, at a good profit. He repeated this experiment morning after morning, until he had saved \$130, with which he bought a horse and wagon and had five cents left.

"How are you going to board your horse?" asked a stable-keeper, who witnessed this audacious transaction.

"I am going to board him at your stable."

"But you're a minor," replied this acute Yankee. "And, mind, I can't trust you more than a week." The next morning the lad who had established a good credit with oystermen, bought 13 bushels of remarkably fine oysters, which he sold in the course of the day at a profit of \$17. So he was able to pay for his horse's

board. And right there in the same market he continued to deal in oysters and fish for 40 years, became king of that business and ended by founding a college ; thus affording a new illustration of Prof. Agassiz' theory that the consumption of fish is serviceable to the brain.

So Astor, on reaching New-York with his capital of 7 flutes and a few shillings, goes to work beating furs for two dollars a week, and keeps at furs, until he is able to build Astor Houses and Astor Libraries. So Girard, finding himself at Philadelphia during the Revolutionary war, when the town was held by the British troops, all ordinary business being paralyzed, falls to work bottling claret for the English officers, and followed up that clue till it made him the chief merchant of Pennsylvania. William Chambers, the founder of the great Publishing House of Edinburgh, coming out of his apprenticeship at 19 with five shillings capital, set up a book-stall with £10 worth of books, all bought on credit. The Harpers' began by cautiously printing 500 copies of Locke on the Understanding, and Daniel Appleton by publishing a minute volume, bound in blue paper, 2½ inches square, called "Crumbs of Comfort." George Stephenson, brakeman to a steam engine at the mouth of a mine, began by soling his sweetheart's shoes and demanding a kiss in payment. But this was only a youthful sally. Her name, however, was Ann, and she was a servant girl. But soon he began to tinker at his steam engine, and kept on in that way until he invented the locomotive, and created, with the aid of his son, the railway system.

In those lecturing tours, which are far more instructive to me than I can be instructive to any one else, I frequently see immense establishments, and always visit them when I can. Nine times in ten, if I am told their history, I am informed that the founder was a poor man, who began business on next to nothing. In Chicago, a few years ago, a mechanic invested his whole capital and credit too, in the making of one rough, strong farm wagon, the first ever made west of the lakes. It was all he could do to live while he made it, and if he had not had the good luck to sell it immediately, he would have been in a sorry plight. When I was there 20 years after, he had a factory which turned out an excellent wagon every seven minutes. Last Winter, in Norwich, a beautiful town near the center of New-York, I went over David Maydole's manufactory, where 100 men were employed in making hammers, enough men, you would suppose, to supply the world with hammers. He is one of the most perfect examples of a King of Business I have ever met with in my life. If every King of Business were such as he we should have the millennium the year after next. A plain little man he is, past 60 now, but in the full enjoyment of life and in the full enjoyment of his work. Upon being introduced to him in his office, not knowing what else to say, and not being aware that there was anything to be said or thought about hammers—having, in fact, always taken hammers for granted—I said: "And here you make hammers for mankind, Mr. Maydole."

"Yes," said he, "I've made hammers here for 28 years."

"Well then," said I, still at a loss for a talk-opener, "You ought to be able to make a pretty good hammer by this time."

"No, Sir," said he, "I never made a pretty good hammer; I make the best hammer made in the United States."

And so he does; every hammer made most carefully by hand, and tempered over a slow fire, as delicately as Delmonico's cook broils a steak for his pet gourmand. Then a hickory handle is put to it that has been seasoning for two years; and it is a hammer that dare show itself anywhere in the world. There is thought, and conscience, and good feeling, and high principle, and business sense in it. It speaks its maker's praise wherever it goes and as long as it lasts, and it will last very long indeed. He did me the honor to give me one which has ever since hung conspicuously in my room, admonishing me to work, not fast, nor too much nor with a showy polish nor any vain pretense, but as well as I can every time, never letting one thing go till I have done all that was possible to make it what it should be.

Upon our return to the office after going over the works he told his story. It is a representative story. Twenty-nine years ago, when he was a roadside blacksmith, six carpenters came to the village from the next county to work upon a new church, one of whom, having left his hammer behind, came to the blacksmith's to get one made, there being none in the village store.

"Make me a good one," said the carpenter, "as good a one as you know how."

"But," said the young blacksmith, who had already considered hammers, and had arrived at some notion of what a hammer ought to be, and had a proper contempt for cheapness in all its forms, "perhaps you don't want to pay for as good a one as I can make."

"Yes, I do; I want a good hammer."

And so David Maydole made a good hammer, the best one probably that had ever been made since Tubal Cain, and one that perfectly satisfied the carpenter. The next day the man's five companions came, each of them wanting just such a hammer, and when they were done the employer came and ordered two more. Next the storekeeper of the village ordered two dozen, which were bought by a New-York tool merchant, who left a standing order for as many such hammers as David Maydole could make. And from that day to this he has gone on making hammers until now he has 115 men at work. He has never advertised, he has never pushed, he has never borrowed. He has never tried to compete with others in price. He has never reduced a price because other men had done so. His only care has been to make a perfect hammer, to make as many such as people wanted and no more, and to sell them at a fair price.

SECRET OF SUCCESS.

It is essentially the same story with all these Kings of Business. They learn how to do some one thing superlatively well, and then they keep on doing it better. Near Pittsburgh there is the great Cambria Iron Works, which employs 7,000 persons in making steel rails and iron—a

great town of people, all in the service of one Company. "What is the secret of such a development of business as this?" a visitor asked of the President and ruling spirit, Daniel J. Morrell. His answer was: "We have no secret. We always try and beat our last batch of rails. That's all the secret we've got, and we don't care who knows it."

In Philadelphia, Henry Desston & Sons sell five tons of saws every day—an immense quantity, for a saw is very thin and light. Forty years ago he landed on these shores, aged 14, with his father and sister, and two days after landing, the father died, leaving those two orphans alone in a strange land. He got work in a saw shop, and by and by began business for himself in a small cellar. The simple secret of his marvelous prosperity is that he studied saws to the very uttermost, both theory and practice, and learned how to make better saws than had ever been made before.

Why are the Rothschilds the first bankers of the world? Because in a business career of 102 years, they have never failed to keep an engagement. Why is the Chemical Bank in New York the most solid and profitable bank in America? Because in the panic of 1837 when all other banks ceased to pay gold for their notes, that bank did not and never has. When gold was at 286, if you presented one of its \$50 notes at the counter, and asked for its equivalent in gold, you got \$50 in gold. Why is the Aetna Insurance Company of Hartford the first of its kind in America? Simply because after the great fires of New York,

Portland, Chicago, Boston, it did what it had undertaken and engaged to do—paid its losses. When Cornelius Vanderbilt at 18 learned that to him had been awarded the contract for conveying supplies to the different forts in New York Harbor, he stared with astonishment. He had disdained to compete with the other boatmen in price, but had offered to do the work on just terms. The commissary observing his surprise said to him, "Don't you know why we have given this contract to you?" "No," replied the youth. "Why it is because we want this business done and we know you'll do it."

In the whole world I do not believe there can be found a business 50 years old which is not founded on the principle of rendering an equivalent for all that it receives. Honesty is the rock upon which all enduring success rests.

I was very much struck during the late panic with three rules which Vanderbilt gave to men in Wall-st.:

1. Never use what is not your own.
2. Never buy what you cannot pay for.
3. Never sell what you haven't got."

From what agonies of apprehension and remorse and shame men would be saved by the observance of those rules.

Next to honesty, I think we must place, as a condition of kingship in business, knowledge. I have observed that the men who take the lead in affairs, whatever else they lack, are sure to possess a most minute and entire knowledge of their branch of business—such a knowledge as can be got only by taking hold and doing every part of it.

Girard, as sailor, mate and captain, had visited every port with which as a merchant he traded. He knew the men, the people, the markets. Astor with a pack on his back, had trampled over the whole fur producing region of New York and the lake country. No man ever knew furs as he knew them. He loved a fine fur as a connoisseur loves a fine picture. Stewart has the best touch for silk or velvet and the best judgment of colors of any man in his establishment. All the Harpers, young and old, began by setting type and working the press. The late John Walter, proprietor of *The London Times*, called at the office of the paper one day before going to the House of Commons, of which he was a member. While there a courier brought in a package labelled "Immediate and Important" which he found to contain news of the greatest interest. It happened that all the compositors were gone to dinner. He took the dispatch to the composing-room, set the type himself, and by the time the men came back, he had it already to go into a second edition, which was immediately issued. He knew the business from top to bottom—knew it in his brain and knew it in his fingers.

So Horace Greeley, on returning from his first visit to Europe, made up the steamer's news for *The Tribune* before she entered the harbor. The steamer arrived at 6 in the morning, after all the papers had been printed. Going straight to the office, he, too found the compositors all gone home and the pressman just preparing to go. He began forthwith to set the news in type, and he never left the

case till it was all ready for an extra. Then he started up town to see his family. Old Jonas Chickering, old Mr. Steinway, could make a piano from the legs to the key, every part, outside and inside. The original Delmonico was himself, an admirable cook. A thousand examples could be given, showing that the capital of a house of business is not money, but brains.

Again: Before a man can be a King of Business or a king of men he must be monarch of himself. A great part of the secret of being able to control. I remember Robert Bonner pointing out a person going by the office of *The Ledger* and saying: "I worked by the side of that man for years setting type, and a very good workman he was. Do you want to know why he is still a journeyman printer and I am not?" I did want to know the reason. "Well," said he, "the reason is this: He used to buy five-dollar pantaloons, and as soon as they began to look shabby he cast them aside; but I bought coarse, strong three-dollar ones and wore them out. That's the reason."

There is a great deal in merely being able to feel money in your pocket, and not spend it. I must own that it is a very rare gift with the literary class. I have known a young writer in receiving \$30 for an article, invite a friend to dine with him at Delmonico's and ordered two bottles of \$6 wine. Such men, whatever their talent, usually remain drudges and slaves all their lives. The simple reason, in fact, why property, always and everywhere, gets into such enormous masses, is that it is the nature of the

strong to husband their resources and themselves, and it is the nature of the weak to squander both. If you want to test a young man and ascertain whether nature made him for a king or a subject, give him a thousand dollars and see what he will do with it. If he is born to conquer and command, he will put it quietly away till he is ready to use it as opportunity offers. If he is born to serve, he will immediately begin to spend it in gratifying his ruling propensity. That propensity may be, usually is perfectly innocent. In my youth, for example, books were my temptation, and many a fierce tussle I have had with it while standing before the window of a bookseller. The first time in my life that I ever had two dollars all at once, I intantly bought a Shakespeare with it. Knowing my weakness, I used to leave my money at home, when I had any, in order not to be surprised into buying a book; but feeling that this was base cowardice, a contemptible avoidance of the enemy, I afterwards made it a point always to have money in my pocket. Often I have courted temptation, standing, long before a window gazing upon some particular book that I had been longing to possess for many months, and then stalking away with a proud consciousness that I might have bought it and didn't. But, in my case this was not strength but mere vulgar necessity. The strong men are they who really might lawfully and properly indulge in expensive taste, and yet can wait till they can indulge in it with absolute safety.

Correspondence.

Bro's. L. & S: I have concluded to contribute an article for publication in the *ADVOCATE*, upon what is known as the doctrine of final perseverance as taught by our Baptist and Presbyterian friends.

One of the strongest affirmations that I ever have heard them make, was that regeneration is the work of God: that he by his Holy Spirit converts the world, and consequently it would be an outrage to say the Lord converted a sinner by a direct influence of the Holy Spirit, and then for that individual to fall from grace. That would be branding the Lord with an incompetency to do his work, and consequently he would be nothing more than one of us. They say that God did the work and it can't fail. Well we intend to give the case a fair trial, and call in the witnesses on both sides.

We first take up generation or creation. God created man and there was a failure, and what was that? So far as that work of creation is concerned, that is just like the creator, it is just as perfect as perfection itself. This they are bound to admit. As to man's anatomical structure, that is perfect. There never was such a demonstration of wisdom and power, as in the making of man. And yet there was a failure; and what is it? Has God failed? No; man failed. Man sinned and consequently he fell from that pure state, and so the failure was not God's, but man's. And it is God also that regenerates or recreates, according to their teaching. And the work of regeneration or re-making man, that is, of bringing him

back to a pure state, is God's own work, and if he does it, there is no mistake but that it is done to perfection. But poor man just like he was after his creation oft-times fails.

We will consider the law of naturalization in a national sense. Suppose a man in England has been informed that our country is much better than his; the testimony begets faith, and he makes his way to our happy land. Then he has to comply with the laws of adoption, which require him to reside here one year, and after he has done this he is not yet a citizen until he takes the oath of allegiance; and after that he is a citizen in spite of any thing. And the only way to get him out is to kill him out. But he can easily take himself out. Just so under the Law of adoption as given to the Apostles. It is, "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Now this is the law by which man gets into Christ, and if he does this he is in Christ, and the combined world could not get him out, as is often asserted by the believers in this doctrine. Paul says: "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present nor things to come. Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the Love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." This I consider one very strong passage of Scripture and if there is any passage in the Bible that we should be thankful for I think this is the one. It is a passage that should give us great consolation to think that nothing has

the power to separate us from the love of God. Because if that could be done no man would be safe. He would be in danger of being torn from the arms of the Savior at any time by an enemy.

Peter admonishes Christians to add all the Christian graces, and says "he that lacketh these things is blind." He says, "give diligence to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things you shall never fall." But suppose they don't do them, then of course they will fall. But says the objector, if they are born of the Spirit they will not want to sin. We suppose the Apostle knew what he was talking about, and if he had thought there was no danger he would not have acted so simple as to take up his time in writing this letter and warning them of imminent danger. Now I will take up one other passage found in 6th of John, which says, "all the father giveth me shall come to me, and he that cometh I will not cast out, and I am come to do the Father's will. And this is his will that every one that believeth on him may have everlasting life and I will raise him up at the last day. And of all that was given him he should lose nothing. And that none come only those that the father draws. I suppose no man will doubt that the way God draws men is by gospel teaching. Now listen at the Apostle Peter 2nd letter second chapter. "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. "For says

he, "it would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness than after they have known it to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, the dog has turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire. This, I think, is as strong language as the apostle could have used, to show that a man once cleansed can return to his sinful course again and be lost. We read in John, 6: 65, "And he said, no man can come unto me except it were given unto him of the Father. From that time many of his disciples went back and walked with him no more. Then Jesus said unto the twelve, "will ye go away." Then Peter said, to whom shall we go? Which I think is very conclusive that they could go away, but that they did not go back. And another strong proof is about the sheep that no man could pluck out of his hands. That we admit, for no man ever had that power and I feel thankful that the Lord ever made that declaration, for if a man could do that it would ruin the Christian world. Go to the 8th chapter of Romans, and you find the following; there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Now suppose they did not walk after the Spirit, but after the flesh, there would be condemnation for all such. And if this would not admit of this conclusion, there would have been no use of using the above language. We will call your attention to Galatians 5th. The apostle advises them to stand fas

and not to become entangled again with the yoke of bondage. The apostle here has reference to those who have been translated out of Satan's kingdom into the kingdom of God's dear son. Also we are informed that if we claim justification under the law, that is the Jewish law, we are fallen from grace. How in the name of common sense could a man fall from that which he had not got in possession. A man must first get in the favor of God before he can fall from that grace.

Then in Revelation it is said, "I have somewhat against you because you left your first love," and he makes it stronger still and says; "remember from whence thou hast fallen, and repent, and he said if they did not repent he would remove their candlestick out of its place." Paul to 1st Corinthians is even more explicit than elsewhere. He admonishes the Corinthians to take heed lest they fall. Now if there is no danger the Apostle would not have spent the time to write this letter to the church if they were in a safe condition. But Paul knew they were not fallible beings and were in very great danger of falling. And if they were in danger in the days of the Apostles, we are equally so to-day, for we are no better than they were and are saved or lost on the same plan that they were. And Paul in his 2nd letter to Timothy informed him that in speaking of the resurrection being passed already, they overthrew the faith of some. And if the faith of some could be overthrown then, why not now? We have the same sort of folks, and the same faith.

And when we consider the conver-

sion of Simon, the sorcerer, we are bound to come to no other conclusion than that he was a converted man, for the Bible tells us that he believed, and was therefore saved, and yet he became a bad man again. And you will find in Paul to the Hebrews that if we sin wilfully after we have received a knowledge of the truth of Christ, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin, but a certain looking for of judgment. Now the just shall live by faith but if any man draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him. I am astonished at any man contending for this doctrine with such strong proof before him.

W. N. McCAIN.

Coldwater Depot, Miss.

Away up in Tennessee. No. 2.

CONTINUED.

I got off at Falkville station. Young Brother Eddy Lee was there, having hauled some women to the station. I mounted his ox wagon and was soon at Dr. Henry's house but he and sister H. were off two or three miles at a meeting, and baptizing. Bro. Lee came along, invited me to go up and eat some watermelons, which I did and was not sorry for it: they were fine and we had a pleasant talk until the arrival of the Doctor, when we had a joyful meeting. Dr. David Adams sent for me, several years ago to go with him to Mimm's store. I did so. I asked the audience after preaching, if any one knew a Dr. A. C. Henry in that County. A brother said he did and would let him know that I wished to see him. The next morning in good time he was there. He attended the meeting. His wife who had gone

to school to me years before, was baptized. The husband followed in obedience some time after. About a year after brother Adams sent again for me to go with him, stating he thought brother H. would begin preaching if I would go down to see him. I shall never forget the day this important subject was discussed. The Dr. is a good fisherman and a splendid hunter. He had killed a fine fat gobler for the occasion, and Amanda had put an extra touch on it with a good deal of stuffing. After my long trip down there and notwithstanding he is pleased to call me his father in the gospel and notwithstanding all the good Bro. Adams did, which was much, I am willing to ascribe his being a preacher to God and his wife. She was anxious for it and argued strong on that side that day. I have heard chicken-hearted wives and mothers talk sentimentally, and lovesick ones object to their men preaching. All such form the unenviable contrast with such an one as we have before us now. I know some of the things preacher's wives have to suffer, and I love the meek and longsuffering and forbearing ones for it. God loves them too. I have seen sister Amanda tried. I have seen her when meat and bread were gone and clothes almost gone, but never have I heard her say Dr. quit, or utter one word of harsh complaint. She has told me her troubles in such humility that I could weep with her. The Dr. is a good preacher and sound. We would not have let him leave here but for succession of bad, worm-eaten crops, and the continued financial troubles. He now speaks of going West. The church

or churches that put him to work in Ala. or Texas or rather keep him at it will do a good work. His address is Falkville Station, Ala., South & North R. R. I went to his meeting on Friday, found a large audience at Piney Grove, with many zealous brethren, preached twice, three confessed. These swelled the number of confessions to eighteen if I remember correctly.

From the church I went to the Station to take the train for "away up in Tennessee" again. On the train and away we go. Now what must I do? I must learn something or teach something. It will not do to go along and not say something. To whom must I speak. There was a drummer for a Decatur hotel on board, who entertained me for a while. I looked over the passengers and made up a judgment about each one of them. I asked Mr. Drummer if he knew the queer looking man just across the way. He did not. Well I gave my opinion, and at my suggestion my friend asked him his name. Sure enough it was that wonderful man John Harding, once of Gallatin, then of Selma, Alabama, and now of Lebanon. 'Tis said a better worker than he is hard to find. His zeal is not circumscribed by the ordinary metes and bounds, but he works not to be like others but to do good. He had many things to say about a new church he was interested in building in Lebanon. He was one whose business it was to solicit help. He asked for money, if there was none of this, then for something else. He would take a yearling, a pig, turkey, chicken, wool, a mutton, duck, in fact he said he took everything except guin-

eas, geese and tan bark. All these are turned into church money. The church will be built. I object to the ways churches are generally erected. I think the people of God should furnish their houses and send the Gospel out to the world. The begging ordinarily resorted to seems to lower the dignity of the people of God. A small or humble house built by the church without such urgent and persistent solicitations, would do the cause of Christ more good and give the church a better character than a finer house with its own opinion of itself lowered and that of other people. It is just as reasonable for me to go out begging the world to build me a dwelling as it is for the members of a congregation to look to disinterested persons to furnish them a house for worship. There should be some shame among Christians and some self existence so far as this world is concerned. The only difference between the two, is, it is more common or fashionable to beg for those houses called the houses of God. A popular "pastor" arises at a dedication, when the crowd is large and says "Friends this house was built for the Lord, but it cannot be set apart for his use while there is a debt hanging over it. We want to raise one thousand dollars here to-day, now who will give? pass the hat. Six hundred has been raised by this bit of financial tactics, but it cannot be turned over yet. Try again. Three hundred more come in by the next manœuvre, and still she can't be the Lord's. One hundred more paid and she can pass into his service. Another heave, strain and a grunt and from pure (*poor*) love (love of show) after bleeding the pockets of men of the world this house is borne into the family of the Lord a *free will offering* (who says this) of his *children*. Oh shame! It was built with a view to this day. Men of the world feel their importance when they are leaned upon thus and think that they have a part and lot in this matter. I do believe if sinners were allowed to have nothing to do in such things, they would seek a more active position and relation to God. The goats have been milked until they have learned to come up with the sheep. Well enough, says one, since every church built in a town enhances the value of property there. That is so and every private house built in a place does the same thing, must the people of the place be charged with its erection? Shall the world be charged up with all the advantages of Christianity. This and the whole procedure of money-God is far from the teaching "without money and without price." There is some pride and some policy in this public giving. Men in business expect to tickle in order to be tickled. Competitors for public favor often rival each other in this way. Bring out a great array of people and the ostentatious ones buy a name by a large or liberal giving. They do so and church people use pride, show, envy, unlawful levers to prize money out of the pockets of weak-minded men or those popularity or money hunting. Under the old dispensation some money could not find a way into the treasury of the Lord, but a house built with means raised by addressing the flesh in many ways is called the Lord's house. David could

not build a house for God because his hands were stained with blood. Can men whose hearts and lives, are polluted by envy, ambition, a love of popularity and money build the Lord a house? Which is worse, stained hands or stained hearts? The house that Solomon built I mention here is not a type of any house made with hands but the temple of God, "which temple ye are" said the apostle to Christians. This ought to be pure and holy. I did not introduce the name of our brother for the purpose of fault-finding, a thing that is very easy, but for commendation. I do not know to whom he went asking, but if to the brethren it makes little difference how much they give. They will not likely give too much. But they should do of a willing mind and to glorify God. While on this subject I will add this much more. The plain boundaries between the world and the church are not sufficiently kept up. If Christians would depend upon sinners for nothing, then sinners would look to Christians for something. But as it is there is not a great difference between the church and the world, and the world has the advantage to hear some sinners report. The body of Christ should be a live body and able to live by herself. But I mentioned the name of the brother to call attention to his character as a servant of God. He does not claim to be eloquent, wise or learned. His pretensions are humble, yet in a church everything must work if he can move them. He is not so afraid of doing wrong that he will do wrong all the time by not telling the brethren their duty. Not so afraid of offending the brethren that he offends God all the time. The members must pray in their families, at church, he soon gets the majority of the males to exhorting publicly and conducting the worship, the women interested in home work; he has frequent prayer-meetings. If preachers are holding a protracted meeting he does not let them set about and spin long yarns but work. This is a great work. It makes the church a tender mother for babes, the safe fold for little lambs. Things are working well at Lebanon. I think I have this from brother Sewell, and soon there will be a house there. Here is a man with a small capital, to receive his own estimate of himself, say one talent, who is doing a tremendous business for the Lord, bringing in compound interest while hundreds of five talent men are whining or pining out their days about one thing or another and the most of them about what they shall eat, what they shall drink, and wherewithal they shall be clothed. You need not say ah, he does not have my trials. Oh no, but he has his own, for he was doing a fine business and broke, but the beauty of it is he did not break down serving God. Many men are met who were once good workers, zealous, ran well, but being bewitched by some fascination have lost all and are no more than drones or standing aloof from the church altogether. No one need think zeal is an aptitude belonging to a few and that God has strongly or strangely endowed some men with it. 'Tis a willingness to use the talent given. There are many who would be willing to be something if they could be great ones, men of influence

of great name, big *I*. But notwithstanding, there is a great desire among churches for such, they are not the kind needed. If every congregation had one little one, converted and made like a little child, who would be willing and always ready to do the little work of the church, the hard work of the church, the demand for that currency known as pastors would cease, and he would no longer be a legal tender. Christianity would be heard from then. Its weight would be felt by the world. The members would not always be feeling in their hearts their religion whilst no one else is "feeling" it. A world felt the religion of Peter, John, James and Paul and if the practical lessons of Christ were observed by his followers and he honored by the obedience to his commands, and sects had more love for Christ than for party, then there would be a power not *felt* now. I tell you I would not give one of these unpretending, but ever working little ones in the church for a regiment of showy, stiff, look at me, fine-dressed, well salaried pastors. The great cry now is for brains and a tongue, but let us have a little more heart for this warfare. Captain Bragg, a little more heart. "Is he a first class pastor?" Can he command the popular ear?" "Is he deep?" are the engaging qualities of the day. This sort are bought and sold like dumb cattle. Preachers are going like any other commodity. If it is calico small price. If bombazine ordinary. If silk, big price, bigger the better. If homespun, no go. These last must make tents and preach as best they can. Men can dispense the best places here but God will give

out "the joys of the Lord," "the kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world." Those who humble themselves God will exalt. Those who by *patient continuance* in well doing will have ETERNAL LIFE.

J. M. BARNES.

New Revelations.

If the claims of the religious denunciations of our times be true, new and direct revelations constantly going on. The claim is, that in every case of conversion, there is a direct work of the Holy Spirit of God upon the heart of him who is converted, and that the evidence of such conversion is found in certain feelings or emotions in the breast of the converted one, which feelings are supposed have been wrought or produced by the Spirit of God, working directly upon the heart. We sometime since heard a preacher say that direct miraculous power from God is wrought in every case of conversion. And if the claim of direct or abstract Spiritual influence be true, then miracles and direct revelations have not yet ended. And if this be true, we have but little use for the Bible for these new revelations, if from God at all, are just as good as the Bible, and in every way as authoritative to man. But where is the evidence that God is making these new and direct revelations to men? In ancient times when God brought new revelations to men, he always demonstrated them to be true by miraculous powers connected with those revelations. When Moses went to the children of Israel in Egypt with a message of salvation, he performed three distinct and powerful

miracles in the presence of those people through Moses and Aaron, as an evidence that the message they brought was from God. And this Miraculous power connected with God's revelations, always enabled the people to distinguish between the true messengers of God, and false prophets. False prophets, and false teachers never could perform miracles, and in this way they were often exposed. In the days of Elijah the prophet, there was a very large number of false prophets, and the masses of the people went after these false prophets, and forsook the living and true God. And when Elijah was about to make an effort to turn the people from these false prophets, and from the idolatry into which they had gone by following these false prophets he proposed the test of miracles. This, was agreed upon, and the false prophets were all together, and they were to put a sacrifice in order upon their altar, and Elijah was also to prepare one, then if Baal would answer by fire, he was to be the god they would worship. But if Baal should fail, and the God of Elijah should answer by fire, then he should be worshiped. The proposition had so much fairness in it they could not reject it, and were therefore forced into a fair trial of the matter. The false prophets were set to work first, and they prepared their wood, and their burnt sacrifice, in the morning, and called upon their God, Baal, till the middle of the day, and no answer came. Then Elijah began to mock them, and to say cry aloud, for he is a God; he is talking, or on a journey, or peradventure he is asleep and must be waked. These

false prophets then cried louder, and leaped upon the altar, and cut themselves with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them; but no fire came. Then Elijah prepared the altar of God, that had been neglected, and dug a trench around it, and had twelve barrels of water poured upon the offering, and upon the altar till it ran down and filled up the trench. He then called quietly upon the name of God. He made no ostentation, no parade. But God heard, and sent down the fire, and consumed the sacrifice, and even the water that stood in the trench, and thus left no doubt as to who was the true God and who was his servant. Then the false prophets were all taken and slain, and Elijah was recognized as the true prophet of God. The people had been blindly following these false prophets, and disregarding Elijah the true prophet, who was really following the word of the Lord. Never was there a more striking demonstration of truth, nor a stronger exposure of falsehood. These false prophets had made the people believe them, and they had thereby gone off from God, and rebellion against God had become the popular side, and the prophets of Baal were four hundred and fifty, and the prophets of the groves four hundred, and against all these stood Elijah alone; and yet not alone, for God was with him. If men who claim direct revelations from God in the way of secret Spiritual influences now, could demonstrate the truth of their claim, they might then have some claim upon our credibility. But as it is they have none. They are claiming something entirely unknown to the Bible,

and yet no miraculous power to demonstrate the truth of their new revelations. How then shall we believe them? We have many sad examples of believing men who said they were from God, and had messages from him, when not a word of it was true. We have a very striking instance of this in the thirteenth chapter of first Kings. We there have an account of a prophet, a man of God, that went from Judea down to Bethel, where Jeroboam, son of Nebat, king of the ten tribes which revolted from Solomon's son, was burning incense to an idol which he had made. This man of God knew that God had spoken to him, and that he therefore had the word of God; for he was enabled to perform miracles, which he did, in demonstration of the truth of the message he brought. But at the same time that God sent him to Bethel, he told him that he must eat no bread nor drink water in that place, nor return by the same way he went. All this he knew was from God for it was plainly given to him when he was sent to Bethel. So he went there, as God directed and performed his mission, and was ready to return, when he, king Jeroboam, asked him to come into his house, and eat, and he would give him a reward. But money could not buy him off from his duty to God. Hence he told the king he could not go in with him even if he would give him half his house; for said he, I was charged by the word of the Lord, not to do so. And he easily overcame this temptation and turned and started away. But the sons of an old prophet who lived at Bethel, were present when the man of God came to Bethel, and heard what he said, and saw what he did, and they came and told their father, the old prophet what the man of God had done, and all that he said. Now this old prophet was a false prophet, and was no doubt favoring the wicked course of Jeroboam. So he concluded to try his hand on the man of God. And having learned that this true prophet was relying firmly upon the word of God, he determined to try to take that word out of his heart; knowing well that if he could succeed in that, he had him safe. And Satan well knew the disposition and inclination in man to look and listen to something new. Indeed this has always been one of man's weak points. He is ever anxious to lift the veil, and look into the future, to see what is to come hereafter—to try to get news from the unseen world. Men are not satisfied with the slow process of learning everything from the Bible. They want direct dispatches from heaven. So this false prophet came to the man of God, and said to him, come home with me, and eat bread. But the man of God still remembered the word of the Lord which he had received, and repeated it again, and told the old prophet he could not go in with him. Then said the prophet I am a prophet of God as thou art, and an angel spoke to me, for you to go home with me, and eat bread and drink water with me. At this temptation the man of God fell. And yet he had no evidence of the truth of what the false prophet said, only his word. The idea that the old prophet had something direct from God was too strong a temptation for him—he yielded, he fell. A lion met him by the way as he started out, and

slew him. In trusting in what this old prophet said, the man of God trusted in man, instead of God. He well knew that God had spoken to him; for it came direct to him, and the Lord confirmed the truth of his message by miracles. But he turns aside from what he knew to be the word of God, to the word of a man and a wicked one at that. If he had put this false prophet to the test of miraculous demonstration before he would receive what he said, he would have proved him to be false, and would thus have saved himself. This example ought to furnish us a practical lesson at the present time. There are men all over our country claiming that they were converted to God, and their sins all forgiven by a direct work of the Spirit of God upon their hearts, working forgiveness and giving the evidence of it at the same time. These men always claim that they were pardoned before baptism, and independent of it. And these men are teaching sinners everywhere, that they can obtain pardon the same way. That the Lord in his own good time will send his Holy Spirit into their hearts to do the work for them. And to these believing sinners thus taught, it is worse than useless to quote the language of the Holy Spirit which requires such believers to repent and be baptized for remission of sin. They repudiate it with disgust, calling it Campbellism, and such like names. And yet they know at the same time that this is just what the word of God says. But they put their trust in what uninspired men say, and risk their eternal interest in what men say, when there is not one word of authority in the Bible for it. Preachers go about claiming that they have received and enjoyed this direct spiritual communication from God, and

that their souls were converted thereby and telling sinners they may expect conversion in the same way. Now there is not one word about any such conversion in the New Testament. So sinners who put their trust in what these preachers say, are trusting something for salvation in which there is just as little authority from God, as in what the false prophet said to the man of God. And when the man of God yielded to that, he died. Those who yield to this claim of direct Spiritual influence, are yielding to something that they suppose has come direct from heaven. And they would rather by far trust in that for their salvation, than in the positive declaration of God's word. And precisely upon this same principle is it that men go into common Spiritualism. It is claimed that Spirits from the unseen world bring direct communication back to the living, and that they can thus carry on communication with those in the unseen world, independently of the Bible. And no man can give a single reason for the truth of abstract Spiritual influence from God, that could not with the same propriety be given in behalf of Spiritualism, in any, or all of its forms. Any one may just as easily prove that the Spirit of the dead come back to this earth to communicate with mortals, as these abstract influence men can prove that the influences they claim, came from God. And why not just as well believe the one as the other? I had just as soon believe that God sends human Spirits back to communicate with the living, as to believe that he sends his own Spirit now, in a direct manner, to convert. God never has, in any age,

made communications to men in any such way. He says through Isaiah, "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning," 58: 18. So there is not only no evidence in the Bible that God communicates with men secretly as is claimed at the present time; but the whole claim is an utter contradiction of what God himself says. What a delusion then, to trust in these direct or new revelations from God, for conversion. We think there has never been a more successful delusion offered to men, to lead them away from the word of God. But in the Bible, the word of God, there is perfect safety. Let none conclude therefore that it is too slow a process, or too old a revelation, to take just what the word of God says, and go by it in all things. There can be no danger here. These claims of new revelations are the dangerous ones; there can be no safety in them. If this claim of getting religion through the direct work of the Spirit of God be true, then the Bible will have to be laid aside, for this new plan proposes to save man contrary to it. But if the Bible be true, then the new plan is false, for it is contrary to the Bible. Having all confidence in the word of God as given us in the Bible, we can have none in the claims of new revelations through the direct work of the Holy Spirit.

E. G. S.

The Murfreesboro Meeting.

Bros. L. & S.: I cannot forbear a word of criticism on the proceedings of the Murfreesboro meeting. I am made to exclaim with Burns, "Oh, wad some power the gift as gie us To see oursels as others see us."

In the first place, that "Spirituous Liquors" and "Dancing" should take rank among a series of topics for consideration in a Preachers' Consultation Meeting, seems to me, to say the least, a very sickly concession. Would not decided Scriptural condemnation of such evils have a better effect than this respectfully dogmatic *consideration*? Do these good brethren suppose their judgment will have more weight than the word of God? If not, why give it the preference?

Why should these brethren recommend what the Scriptures teach? Is it that they think the Scriptures are not of sufficient authority with the people, and need *their* commendation, or is it that they thus unwittingly assume a little conventional importance and so affect correlative authority? Or if they recommend what the Scriptures do not teach, with what degree of authority does it come? Suppose another similar convention of preachers recommend a different procedure, what then? Whose recommendation shall we follow? Do these recommendations tend to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, or to promote dissensions—division?

I humbly suggest that brethren come together to investigate the plan of salvation as revealed in the Bible, and to enjoy communion with saints; to promote Scripture knowledge and unity of faith by mutual communication of the truths learned, and to incite to hope and zeal by recounting to each other their trials and triumphs; but let their resolves be sacredly registered only in their own hearts and in heaven, and let their recommendations take only the ever-

welcome and effective form of deeds conformable to the divine statute. Then will not their resolves detract from the truth of God, nor their recommendations deny that he is Lord.

J. R. W.

Beacon Grove, Tex.

QUERIES.

Brethren L. & S.: As I have had quite an argument with some of my near Baptist neighbors on the time in which Christ ministered or preached unto the spirits in prison, and as the question is yet undecided, it will give me great satisfaction if you will give me your views on the subject through the *Advocate*.

Your brother in the one hope,

WM. P. DONNELL.

*West Mountain, Wise Co., Tex.,
Oct. 25, 1874.*

The time the preaching was done was evidently during the 120 years just preceding the flood. The Lord said, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." Gen 6. We think the Spirit did strive with man during that hundred and twenty years. Not secretly or abstractly, but through Noah, who is said by Peter, to have been a preacher of righteousness. The passage itself shows the preaching was done "when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing," &c. The Spirit of Christ was in the ancient prophets, as we learn from first chapter of first Peter. So upon the same principle

we conclude the Spirit of Christ was in Noah, and preached to the antediluvians.

E. G. S.

Bros. L. & S.: The numbers of this year's *Advocate* came lately through the kindness of Bro. E. Lindsay into our hands and by examining them I find in No. 16 an article on the Lord's Supper over the signature D. L., with which I can as yet, in my own way of reasoning on God's word, (i. e. let the word of God interpret for itself) not fully agree. You say there is no express command in regard to the unleavened bread. Yet the bread we break in the Lord's Supper is an emblem of the body of our Lord and Savior. The bread of the passover, the unleavened bread, which the Savior broke, was a fit emblem of his body, that saw no corruption; but leavened bread partakes of corruption, and cannot be a fit emblem of the uncorrupted body of Christ. If I am in error please explain through the *Advocate*, that others who may be of the same way of thinking can be set right too.

Yours in the one hope,

JOSEPH BURCHARTZ.

*High Hill, P. O., Fayette Co.,
Tex., Sept. 11, 1874.*

I think our brother agrees with us precisely. There is no express covenant in reference to the character of the bread and in the supper. From several considerations we think as does our brother that the unleavened is preferable. We infer it. That is acceptable certainly. All can have

it with very little care. We think all should use it.

D. L.

Brethren L. & S.: I trust you will give the following a most critical investigation :

A GREATER THAN JOHN.

"Among those that are born of woman, there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist : but he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Luke 7 : 28. In Matth. 11 : 11, the expression is somewhat varied. There the *synphemic chronidex* is used, (commonly called the perfect tense taking in a block of time as far back as Enoch's day, reaching down to the very time of speaking. "Among all the prophets there has not arisen a greater than John : but he that is least in the kingdom of God (the reign of God) is greater than he." Here the *phemic chronidex* is expressed, the speaking time, not the present tense, as it is vulgarly called. This greater one was at that very speaking time in the kingdom "He is in the kingdom," surely does not express, "he shall be in it," but that he is in it. Surely he will remain in it as long as time shall last.

This greater one is Christ the Messiah, the Son of God. "He took upon him the form of a servant," descended to the least estate of man, to save man. John bear witness of him saying, "He that cometh from heaven is above all ; and what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth, and no man receiveth his testimony." John 3 : 31-32. This is then that Greater One.

Please scrutinize and show if you

can, that this is not the true idea.

Fraternally,

WARNER LAMBETH.

McKinney, Tex. Sept 30th. 1874.

We do not know much about the *phemic chronidex*, but we do not see how Christ at any time could be said to be the least in the kingdom of Heaven. Recognizing that he was in the kingdom before his descent to earth, before his resurrection and coronation, we cannot see how he was the least in it. He was for a time made lower than the angels, and took on himself the infirmities of humanity, was made the seed of Adam, yet was he not the least in the kingdom of God. But the same idea is expressed when Christ says, "Blessed are the eyes that see the things that ye see. For I tell you that many prophets and kings have desired to see the things which you see and have not seen them, and to hear the things which you hear and have not heard them." We have heard and known and enjoyed blessings and privileges that no king or prophet ever enjoyed.

D. L.

Explanation.

Bros. L. & S.: In the report of the Murfreesboro Meeting, Oct, 10th, Morning session, after the names of the brethren that were enrolled, should read, The subject of ordination was then taken up, and discussed very ably for some time, the following brethren taking part in the discussion : C. M. Day, David Lipscomb, T. J. Shaw, W. E. Hall, G. W. Abell, J. E. Scobey, M. Ransom.

In justice to myself and others, the following explanation is necessary :

I suggested that the names of those that were in favor of the resolutions as set forth by the meeting, as also those opposed, should be recorded. but a majority was opposed to it, hence the report as you received it.

In much love and friendship to all.

J. M. WITHERSPOON.

Murfreesboro, Tenn., Nov. 5, 1874

Church News.

Bros. L. & S. : Since my last to you, I have held meetings at three points with but very indifferent success. Commenced 2nd Lord's day in Sept. at Bethlehem, Monroe County, preached seven discourses ; seven were added. The 3rd Lord's day in Sept. at Antioch, Monroe County, four discourses, no additions. The 4th Lord's day in Sept. at Mimms' Store, Wilcox county, eight discourses, three added. Besides this I have preached at two new points where there is no organization. I feel confident that much good has been done in arousing the brethren and removing prejudice from the minds of the people, and if some one could only live in this section and hold forth the word of life, there would soon be a great ingathering of souls. But I am compelled to seek a home elsewhere, I cannot support my family here. I expect to start for Texas in about two weeks.

Truly and fraternally yours,

N. B. SHAW.

*Bell's Landing, Monroe Co., Ala.,
Nov. 10, 1874.*

Bros. L. & S. : Knowing that it

rejoices the hearts of the true disciples to hear of the success of the Gospel, I will give you a report of a meeting held at a grove on Lolli's Branch in the southern part of this County, embracing the 3rd Lord's day in this month. It continued 3 days, resulting in 15 accessions, 10 from the world and 5 from the Baptists. The meeting was conducted by Bros. Huffman, Chew and Calloway. From there Bro. Calloway went 8 miles to Aurora, preached 2 discourses, and 2 obeyed the gospel. Most of those who obeyed the truth were young people. To our heavenly Father be all the praise.

Your brother in the gospel,

H. L. WILSON.

*Oliver Creek, Wise Co., Tex., Oct.
28, 1874.*

Bros. L. & S. : I notice through the Advocate the reports of the labors of some of our brethren, showing that the good cause is gaining ground. Bro. J. R. Hoover has just closed a meeting at this place with twenty-eight additions, a few of whom were reclaimed. A few weeks since he held a meeting of several days at this place, resulting in thirty four additions, a few of whom were reclaimed, in all sixty-two additions. We have had much opposition to contend with at this place, but hope it will not be so in the future.

Our Elders and Deacons were selected by the congregation, after which they were appointed to office by fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands. We endeavored to organize, just like they did in the days of the apostles, who were guided by the Holy Spirit. Not that we expected

to receive any spiritual endowment by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, but if the apostles have not left us an example, where will we find one? If we are left to choose our own way, how many ways would we have? Brethren as you are devoting your time to the teachings of the Bible, I would like to see, through the Advocate, the scriptural teaching on "the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," in organizing congregations of Disciples.

Yours respectfully,

THOS. H. HAILE.

Butler's Landing, Oct 31, 1874.

Brethren L. & S.: After leaving Bro. Roulhac at Union City, as I stated in my last, I joined Bro. J. H. Morton in a meeting at Decherd. From thence to Smyrna, in Maury Co., which meetings have hitherto been reported in the Advocate. Embracing the fourth Lord's day in September we engaged in a meeting with the brethren at Philadelphia, on Duck River. This is a new congregation. The brethren have a new and comfortable house. The congregation is indebted, chiefly, to Bro. H. O. Gilliam for its existence. He has fallen asleep since our meeting there. We hope his sons will enter into the work of the Master with the zeal and interest that their father used to possess. The immediate success of our meeting was twelve accessions. I left the brethren and sisters, amidst many tears, for Columbia, at which place we delivered nineteen discourses with eleven accessions. The brethren at Columbia have been much persecuted, still they grow gradually.

Embracing the fourth Lord's day in October we engaged in a meeting at Riggs' X Roads, Williamson Co., with four accessions. We have a few faithful brethren and sisters at this point. Our preaching brethren passing through the country will not forget to give them a call.

I have just read Bro. L.'s second reply to Bro. Jones, which I regard as being overwhelmingly "overwhelming." I love to read Bro. Jones' articles, and hope he will guard his syllogisms—rise, and come again. I will just say to my brethren everywhere, we want some means of knowing a Christian from a man of the world without going to church to see whether he communes or not. We want the mark of distinction to stand out prominently at home and abroad—on election days, about court-houses, fair-grounds, ball rooms and pic-nics. We want to know that men are Christians by their refusing to go to such places. The church will never be what the Lord designed it should until we, as men and women, make ourselves a peculiar people.

I am now at Union City, will write you again. Yours in the one faith,

J. M. F. SMITHSON.

Nov. 9th, 1874.

ITEMS.

At a recent meeting conducted by brethren C. W. Sewell and C. E. Gillespie at Antioch, Lincoln Co., Tenn., there were 14 additions. A church of about 30 members has been organized at that place.

Bro. C. E. Gillespie of Franklin Co., Tenn., gave us a call last week as he passed through the city on his

way from Union City, where he had been assisting Bro. Smithson in holding a meeting. He reports good interest and a number of additions up to the time of his departure.

Bro. J. S. Lamar in a letter to the *Standard*, says a report is out that he has joined the Episcopalians. He characterizes it as utterly, ridiculously and absurdly false.

The address of L. R. Sewell is Readyville, Tenn.

On Sunday last, Bro. P. S. Fall withdrew his resignation and consented to remain with the Church St. congregation for another twelve months, at least.

Bros. Scott and Lee recently added 17 to the church at Ladonia, Texas.

The Woman's Mission Home in this city has been organized and is now in working order. Five persons have recently applied for admission.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

Christ shall come again, but oh! how different will be His appearance from that of His first visit to Earth.

Then, he was a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief. Now, He comes in the glory of His Father, and with the Holy Angels. Then, he had not where to lay his head. Now, all things are his, even the Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of Our Lord, and his Christ. Then, a crown of thorns encircled his brow, while sorrow and distress drew from him in agonizing perspiration, great drops of blood. Now, he is clothed with glory as with a garment. His face shines like the sun, his eyes are as a flame of fire, and his voice,

as the sound of many waters. Then, he was the condemned criminal. Now, the mighty judge. Then, he died in shame and ignominy. Now, he comes to be glorified in his saints, and behold he is alive forever more.

And now, shall the righteous rejoice. A place in the line of Christ's children,—His servants—will be worth more than millions of worlds on an occasion like this. It avails much now, to have given up the vain baubles of earth for Christ. No true believer will now, longer be obscure. No holy soul, but shall now be full of everlasting joy. Every pious wish will now receive its full reward. Justice, who seemed to sleep so long, now awakes to vengeance, terrible vengeance. While mercy slighted so long, now hides her face. Her work is done. And justice, stern, severe justice, begins the everlasting settlement. A settlement of affairs from which there can be no appeal. Nor is it needed. In this court at least, impartial justice will be meted out to all. And now the righteous, so long oppressed by earth, as God had promised them, are saved. The wicked, walking so long in the sight of their own eyes, and in the ways of their own heart, as God had threatened, now are damned, and God's eternal, unchangeable and immutable word made good.

J. T. P.

Huntsville, Tex.

General News.

Nashville at the present time is infested with a gang of thieves. Numerous depredations have been committed during the last week.—Three

young men from this city went hunting on Sunday last. While approaching a pond in which a flock of ducks had alighted, one of them slipped and fell, discharging his gun and instantly killing one of his companions.—Mrs. Abraham Lincoln passed through the city Friday on her way to Florida, where she goes to spend the winter.—James B. Crockett, an old citizen of Williamson Co., died last Wednesday. He was a soldier of the war of 1812, and was in his eighty-fifth year.—Golladay's lottery was to have taken place in this city Nov. 23. A large crowd gathered at the Opera house to witness it, but about the time the wheel of fortune began to turn a posse of policemen marched in and arrested Golladay and all his clerks.—Tuscumbia, Ala., was visited by a terrible wind Sunday night, which demolished half the town and killed twelve persons. Numbers of the inhabitants are in want and a public appeal has been made for their relief. Hon. F. D. Hodgkins, editor of the *Chronicle*, with his wife and four children were killed. The storm also visited several other places in the same State, killing two persons in Mobile.—The steamer *Empire* sunk at the wharf in New Orleans last week. Fourteen persons were drowned.—Hon. R. M. T. Hunter is writing a history of the late war between the States.—Mr. Gray of Jones Co., Ga., has bequeathed \$20,000 to Mercer University at Macon, for the education of young men from Jones Co. unable to pay their tuition.—Mrs. Wilson formerly Augusta J. Evans, author of "St. Elmo" and other novels is living a retired life in Mobile Ala.—A salary

of \$40,000 per annum is paid to the President of the Erie Railway.

FOREIGN.

In view of the Arctic Expedition to be fitted out by the British Government, Lady Franklin renews her offer of £10,000 for the recovery of the official records of Sir John Franklin's expedition.—The section of country around London has lately been enveloped in so dense a fog as to render travel on land or water dangerous.—Mrs. Emperor William sets the Berlin ladies a good example by dusting and *fixing up* her own room every morning.—China is speaking of having an international Exposition.—The Republicans carried the municipal elections which were held in France on Sunday last.

A movement has been commenced in Philadelphia which will do much to counteract the influence of drinking saloons. It is the establishment of cheap coffee-houses, in which refreshments can be had at an almost nominal rate.

Marshall Bazaine and wife are on their way to America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Kings of Business.....	1103
Correspondence.....	1110
Away up in Tennessee.....	1112
New Revelations.....	1116
The Murfreesboro Meeting.....	1120
Queries.....	1121
Explanation.....	1122
Church News.....	1128
Items.....	1124
Christ's Second Coming.....	1115
General News.....	1125

THE

GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 48.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, DEC. 3, 1874.

CHRISTIAN EMPLOYERS.

We give this week a continuation of notes from Parton's lecture on successful men of the world. In this installment is found some wise thoughts on the treatment of employees by their employers. We call attention to it because there is need of an understanding of a wise as well as just policy in these matters. So many men act in the foolish, niggardly and mean policy of oppressing their employees and of cheating them out of every dollar possible, that the honest and wise policy should be presented. If a man would successfully employ and use men, he must strive to promote their welfare—must be just, generous, and magnanimous to them. A good employer makes good employees. A man of honor and uprightness, a Christian, desires to see every employee do well, improve himself and prosper in every possible manner. Do all professed Christians do this?

How many Christian employers are liable to the denunciation of James, "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that are

come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasures together for the last days. Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which of you is kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." Jas. 5: 1-4. This is as applicable now as when James wrote it and is as true of many who are not rich as of many who are.

Then again the folly of men gaining money by dishonest means and by evil callings, thinking to condone their sins by giving large sums to impractical charities and useless universities needs scathing rebuke. Gain your means honestly, in good callings, by upright dealings, especially by fair and honest treatment of dependents and employees, and disburse your surplus earnings in doing good to humanity as occasion offers through life, is the Christian rule. It may not leave as great a name behind us,

with men, it will leave a more fragrant memorial with God our Heavenly Father and with Christ our Savior.

D. L.

KINGS OF BUSINESS KINGS OF MEN.

But all these qualities that I have mentioned—honesty, knowledge, self-control, resolution, perseverance—will not make a man a king of business. An individual, let him be the greatest man that ever lived, cannot accomplish much unless he knows how to avail himself of the services of others. I remember hearing Mr. Prang, the great chromo-maker, say that the hardest thing he ever had to learn was to keep his own hands off the work, it was so much easier and quicker to take hold and do a difficult thing than to get another person to do it. But he soon found that the master of a large establishment must use all his skill and energy in doing just that, for it is only by doing nothing that he can do everything. A king of business is a king of men. He knows how men feel and think; what are their ruling motives and their disturbing foibles; where human nature is weak, where strong, and what makes men contented and discontented. He is a judge of men, and knows how to pick out the men he wants, and keeps them by treating them as he would like to be treated in their place.

Almost every day I pass the stage door of Wallack's Theater in New York, and I notice there the same door-keeper whom I saw on duty in the same situation when the father of the present Mr. Wallack opened

the establishment 20 years ago. When I enter the theater in the evening I hand my ticket to the person who took my ticket from me on the opening night. I see there the same money-taker, ushers, and actors year after year, men grown gray in the service. In this fact we have a part of the reason why this theater holds its own against all competition and in spite of all changes in the public taste. Generally speaking, no business is more precarious than the theatrical, but this theater's business is as steady as that of an old bank. I have been there hundreds of times and never saw a non-paying house. The manager knows how to select the right men, and also how to make it their interest and their pleasure to remain.

It is precisely the same with the great publishing house of the Harpers. There are many men now in their service who have been with them all their lives—came as boys, and are now grayheaded sires. They have several men who have been in their establishment over 40 years. The simple secret is, they are good judges of men, and treat them with steady justice and consideration. If you visit the Cambria Iron Works, before mentioned, where 7,000 men under one chief convert iron ore into steel rails, you will find a grand illustration of the same truth. "We find," said the President (Mr. Morrell), lately, "that the more we do for our men, the better they do for us." The men are encouraged to own their houses, to maintain a reading room and library, and to get the best attainable teachers for the schools. "This is my home," added Mr. Mor-

tell on the same occasion, "and I want my family to live in a civilized, intelligent, Christian community, not in the midst of ignorant and turbulent savages." Honest David Maydole, hammer-artist, practices the same system—strict in maintaining the discipline of the shop, but ever willing to make it easy for a good workman to buy a lot and build a house, and paying wages in full, to any tried and faithful man during sickness, long or short—once, for two years.

In going over the letters and dispatches of Napoleon Bonaparte, I detest him, but he had his good-points. Nothing struck me more than the pains he took to distinguish and gratify the men who served him. Unlike the late perjurer, usurper of his name and throne, he usually appealed to the generous and heroic nature; punished seldom and little; rewarded often and bountifully; censured seldom, often praised; never degraded, but was always eager to confer honor. He showed a curious ingenuity in inventing new ways of gratifying his soldiers. Two hundred men rushed across the Bridge at Lodi, swept by 30 cannon, and thus began the victory. He caused the names of those 200 men to be printed, and the list stuck up on the church door of every parish where any one of them lived. What reward could have been so thrilling to the troops, or brought more conscripts to the standard of the young general? I think I could pick out from the 22,063 documents of this collection, as many as 100 similar modes of rewarding soldiers. Nelson, too, was most solicitous for the health, comfort, and honor of his men.

Traverse the world over, search the history of our race in all times, and wherever you find a man truly superior to his fellows, a natural King of men, born to command, you will find him attentive to the interests and to the feelings and to the dignity of those who execute his will. If he is not man enough to be so from good feeling, he is man of business enough to do it from policy. If there is any one here who snubs persons dependent upon him, begrudges them their just compensation, cares nothing for their interests or their honor, that man is not naturally a master; he is one by accident only; he belongs by birth or breeding, or both, to the class of the defeated and the servile. He is merely a beggar on horseback, and perhaps stole the horse.

HOBBIES OF WEALTHY MEN.

By their hobbies shall ye know them. The favorite hobby at present of the wealthiest slaves of business is to give away or bequeath stunning sums of money for unnecessary or impossible objects—imposing upon posterity tasks that will not be performed. The thoughtless praise lavished upon such people as Girard ought not to mislead us as to the real merits of the men and the true character of their acts.

The wisest and greatest man that ever lived could scarcely, even if he were perfectly unshackled, execute such a will as Girard's without doing more harm than good. But that huge legacy, now worth, I suppose, \$30,000,000, has been administered by the gang of pot-house politicians who for the past thirty years have constituted the Government of Philadelphia. If Girard, during the last year

of his life, had loaded one of his ships with all that gold scraped together by fifty years of miserly solicitude, and poured it out into the unfathomable sea, he would have rendered a better service to Philadelphia than he did by leaving it to found an orphan asylum on a scale far beyond the wit of mortals to conduct successfully—a huge boarding-school of a thousand pupils. There was a printer in New-York who took it into his head to raise chickens on Staten Island for the New-York market. He bought a farm, fenced it in, and began with a small family of 2,000 chickens. There never was known such a time among the farmers' wives of Staten Island for selling off their old hens.

He had beautiful contrivances for feeding, watering, and sheltering his numerous flock; patent nests, convenient egg receptacles, and every device of the chicken farmer. But, for some reason unknown, scarcely any eggs appeared, few chickens were hatched, the birds pined and drooped, and soon so many dead ones strewed the ground of a morning that they had to be collected in a wheel-barrow—the dead-cart of this chicken city. In short, he discovered that chickens cannot be raised thousands in a family. They will not thrive in masses. Nor will children. You could only have a beneficial orphan asylum on that scale by making an artificial village with its schools, and the boys divided into groups as closely as possible resembling families. How can the Girards of the world, men who live without love, upon whose knees children never sit, who repel and drive far from their hearts and homes

their own kindred, who know nothing of any kind of power except that which is connected with the signing of checks; hard men, ignorant of every phase of human existence except banking and stocks—how can such people be rationally expected to create institutions the most complicated, difficult and delicate known to civilization? I once heard from the lips of Girard's lawyer, the late William J. Duane of Philadelphia, a description of the scene that occurred in Girard's house after his death; Mr. Duane was executor, being in charge of the property. As soon as the breath was certainly known to be out of the old man's body, and Mr. Duane had closed his eyes, it seemed as if the spell had been suddenly dissolved, and the numerous nephews and neices and their descendants, who never before had stood in Girard's presence but with fear and trembling, burst into exultation. A fierce joy shone in every face. The younger men rushed down into the cellar, and brought up bottles of their uncle's choicest wine, hoarded there for years, of which they had never been invited to taste. Some of them were far gone in intoxication before the body was cold. Older men rummaged the rooms; women searched the closets and drawers. The whole house was a scene of wild riot. They behaved, in fact, like a select party of vultures, which, from a safe distance, have followed and watched a sick buffalo, and when at last the monarch of the prairie droops, lies down and falls over upon his side, a dead creature, then they swoop down from the sky, and pick out his eyes, tear out his vitals, and shriek

exultant as they do it, each foul bird glaring hate upon the rest, and devouring with his vulture eyes the whole carcass. When they had raged all over the house, they came in a body to Mr. Duane, and demanded to know if there was a will. There was. He had drawn it himself, two years before. It was in the iron safe in the room where the dead man lay. Upon hearing this, a frenzy of desire seized them to know its contents; and they insisted on hearing it read then with such infuriate clamor that Mr. Duane, knowing how the will would avenge his client and rebuke this inhuman indecency, consented at length to read it, and it was read.

"When I had opened the will," said Mr. Duane to me, "and was about to begin to read, I chanced to look over the top of the document to the company seated before me. It was a sight never to be forgotten. There was a ghastly pallor on every face, and a certain look of mingled curiosity, greediness, and jealousy, which I am sure the greatest artist that ever lived could not do justice to. Years have gone by, and I can see it still."

He began to read. When it became evident that the bulk of the estate was left for public objects the affectionate relations, who had been left only a few thousands each, made not the least pretense of concealing their rage; and, as you know, they spent their legacies in vain attempts to break the will. Unloved in his life, unblest in death, are such slaves of business as Stephen Girard. They are foolish to make so much money; they are foolish to leave it for objects of which they know less than noth-

ing, and the public is not wise in accepting their gifts.

Once already within the historic period Christendom has been cursed with institutions founded by mistaken benevolence—convents and monasteries—which cost nations a convulsion to suppress. Let us beware of repeating the error.

Strange Things.

Bro. Lipscomb: I had hoped that our war of words would cease when I accepted the discussion of your own proposition, but I find myself misrepresented in such a wholesale manner, that I am constrained to give a passing notice to a few items in your response. Though you are doubtless surprised "in several particulars" this surprise cannot justify this language: "Yet he had concluded to write no more until Bro. Smithson said he was overwhelmed," when my words were: "I had concluded to pass over his sophistries *and proceed at once to [demand, should have been inserted] the proof of your proposition.*" If this sounds like *writing no more*, it must be to him only who desires a cessation of hostilities.

Bro. L next makes a flourish over the equal space question and triumphantly asks "have we refused him space? Have we limited him?" No. That is just the trouble, he will neither limit me nor himself, when all know that something like equal space is the rule. "We cannot see how a man seeking to present or elicit truth can occupy such a position." Well, the reader can see that I intend to *elicit* what truth Bro. L. has before I commit myself to the task of finding truth.

When the scintillations cease to flow from him then we may look to other sources.

Bro. L. thinks I undertook to defend the proposition, that "formerly government punished good men, now it punishes bad." If Bro. L. cannot see that pointing out the fallacies of his argument against it, is not voluntarily to defend it, is not necessarily an endorsement of it, then he is welcome to use the elegant phrase, "child's twaddle" as much as he pleases.

Bro. L. reads us a long lecture upon the prefixes *in* and *un* and labors hard to escape the force of Webster's definition. But the reader sees that Webster understood these, and lest the reader might misunderstand him, he appropriated his appropriate meaning of the word by referring to Nero's persecuting the Christians. Hence I did not speak at random when I said if Bro. L. prefers an *inappropriate* meaning, it is no fault of mine. But says Bro. L. it mortifies us to have to spend time over such verbal—shall we by courtesy call them criticisms?" No sir. Let us have no false modesty here. He who can stoop to compare an opponent with Ditzler need not often fear mortification nor ask for the laws of courtesy, "We said the Savior violated the law of the land, both civil and religious. Bro. Jones challenges us for the proof, does he deny it." *He does most emphatically.* Bro. Lipscomb here indulges in accusing me of unfairness and unmanliness which he repeats with additions before he gets through his article. Our readers will be glad that I have my own course marked out and that Bro. L.'s bluster

cannot divert me. It is time enough for me to take ground when I see that Bro. L. cannot maintain his. The reader will note this issue, and as we have already two questions this may be marked No. 3.

Unfortunately for me, while quoting substantially and from memory, I wrote Paul as the author of John's saying, "sin is the transgression of the law" and Bro. L. thinks I was exceedingly unfortunate in reversing the proposition, "the transgression of the law is sin." He seems to think there is much difference between the two propositions, that, "The first is true, the latter may or may not be." He says he has "never seen a more flagrant wresting and perversion of the Scriptures" &c. Let us see. 1st. John iii, 4: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law." Romans iv, 15; "Because the law worketh wrath; for where no law is there is no transgression." Here we have Paul saying there must be a law before there can be a transgression and John saying for sin is *the transgression of the law*. Now if Bro. L. thinks he knows better than John let him think so. Bro. L. thinks I use the terms indefinitely and apply to human law what the apostles applied to God's law. Bro. L. cannot see that I have been trying to get him to see that any transgression of any law is sin against that law and that the character of the sin depends upon the law violated. If it be God's law then it is sin against God, if it be human law, then a sin against man &c. The reader will see that I have nowhere intimated that human law was equal to or for the same purpose as

the law of God. But Paul says they are for the disobedient and advises us to be obedient lest we feel the sword which the ruler beareth not in vain.

Bro. L. says my thinking it right to vote is one thing and its being right is another; just so, and Bro. Ramsey's thinking it wrong is one thing and its being wrong is another. It matters not what light may be put on "the esteeming a thing to be unclean" it is a perfect license to me if I think it is right. Bro. L. must therefore abandon his proof-text or surrender the argument.

But to show that Bro. L. can make some clear and correct propositions I quote and endorse this one; "The first commandment is to serve God; to love and obey him first—then so far as consistent with this to obey the powers that be. This we contend for. The harmony with the divine law is the test of right or wrong, not obedience to the human." Here is a clear truth about which there can be no controversy and upon which I make no issue. But the question is, is serving as juror inharmonious? "Is service on a jury by a Christian disobedience to God?" But here Bro. L. comes in with some if's: "If Bro. Jones intends to take a position" &c. "If he simply intends to play" &c. * * * * "without directly taking position, we decline to discuss with him." Then follow remarks about a "bushwhacking style"—his dislike of this mode of war, when he is the party to be shot at &c. &c. Of his dislike to be shot at we have no doubt, nor do we suppose he likes the idea of getting out of the bushes into an open field but to escape under the pretext that we are not in ear-

nest or are afraid to take position, he cannot. However illogical and ignorant of words we may be, there are some words that cannot be misunderstood. After stating the question of our own wording, "Is service on the Jury by a Christian disobedience to God?" I say, "You affirm, I deny. Now my dear brother let us have no beating of the bush. Come square up to the question. Show us God's law forbidding such service, and I will walk hand in hand with you and Bro. Ramsey, even if it be to the stake, in obeying God rather than man. If there be such a law you surely can show it." Then in my remarks to the reader I say: "We have now a clear and simple question that demands no extraneous matter, and so far as I am concerned shall not be encumbered with it. As I said before so say I now; truth must be somewhere, let us try to find it." Now the reader can understand that I have taken as positive ground as Bro. L. has, and that other reasons must be assigned if Bro. L. declines to discuss his own proposition after all his bluster about "child's twaddle" "bushwhacking," "seeking an unfair advantage" &c. Now my brother, throw all these things away. You know that I am as honest in my views as yourself—that I have the same right to be heard and that I have a right to choose my own time and manner of taking positions—that as you had boldly assumed positions I had a right, as boldly, to attack without setting up for myself. But now we have three questions to which you answer affirmatively while I deny. They are plain and simple and you have only to prove them. If you do

this I am vanquished. If you fail, then we must look elsewhere for the proof on the propositions. Then take them up in their order and I promise to be as brief as possible, even at the risk of being called a quibbler. The brethren are becoming tired of this everlasting talk about voting and holding office &c. and nothing but sweeping assertions without the proof. To the law and to the testimony. One single verse saying thou shalt not vote, serve as juror or hold office or showing that Christ did violate the law of the land both civil and religious will settle the whole question.

Hoping that, when you have replied to this, (as lengthily as you please,) you will be ready for the issues, I subscribe myself your brother in the search for truth.

I. N. JONES.

We are in the habit of letting a correspondent who wishes to retreat from a position do so, under any cover he chooses. Yet Bro. Jones came upon the arena with such a flourish of trumpets to demolish us with his logic, that we are disposed to hold him to a stricter accountability. There has been either a merely verbal criticism—a quibbling where no difference existed or Bro. Jones has surrendered quite a number of his positions, and speaks quite at random. This does not properly accord with his critical style. In the first place he stated that we “followed in the footsteps of our illustrious editorial predecessor, thrust, pressed and urged this yet unsettled question, in most glowing and dogmatical terms upon the readers of the *ADVOCATE*.” We suppose he refers to Bro. Fanning of

course.—Well Bro. Fanning never published one article on this subject in his life—until we had published a score. Nor did he at any time more than reply to some difficulties presented to our position, by Bro. Kendrick and others in our absence. In the next place we have not indulged in sweeping assertions without proofs. In one volume of the *ADVOCATE* there were over two hundred pages of close argument of this subject. So much space and so thorough was the investigation that we have been reluctant to occupy space with it since. Though proofs have been made on the subject since. They were arguments too, that satisfied such minds my brother, as your own Father, Dr. T. W. Brents, Wade Barrett, J. M. Barnes, P. F. Lamar of Ga. H. T. Anderson and the great mass of the most earnest and thoughtful brethren who read them. Besides being satisfactory to Bros. Fanning and P. S. Fall, who had long held the position. Repeated calls have been made for their publication in book form. Then those two statements were made without any foundation in truth.

He now says he did not volunteer to defend the proposition made by Bro. Walling, that formerly government punished good men, now bad men. He occupies $6\frac{1}{2}$ pages of foolscap in criticism of my objection to it. If he did not intend to defend it there were six and one half pages of mere verbal criticism, or criticism of my style of reasoning where he intended no issue. That is quibbling according to Webster. Every reader understood him as defending the position of Bro. Walling. A logician ought to make his meaning clear.

It would have been so easy to say, "while bro. Lipscomb's position is correct, his reasoning is fallacious." Especially as he denies so earnestly that he has made any attempt at verbal criticism or to prove that I am not a correct reasoner. Then we would have all understood him clearly instead of being misled by six pages of foolscap in his first essay and three or four of explanation in his second. We repeat, he is the first to discover that a general meaning of the word is the inappropriate meaning. Webster did refer to Nero's persecution as an example of his meaning of persecute when appropriated to religion.

He complains we compare him to Ditzler. We did not do it. We compared his reasoning to Ditzler's. If it is a crime to compare it to Ditzler, what must be the offense of reasoning like Ditzler. We repeat his reasoning is D.'s precisely, carried to an extreme that D. did not dare go. *We* did not make it so.

Bro. Jones now denies the Savior violated the laws of the land most emphatically. We presented plain proof that he did. Why not meet this proof instead of deny. The law of the land was, "no one should make himself the Son of God" under pain of death. That was the Jewish law referred to by the lawyers and priests in their appeal to Pilate when Pilate was seeking to release him.

Tertullian says the Romish law was that no one should be deified (that is worshipped or held up as worthy of worship) by any man, no not by a Consul or Emperor, without the approbation of the Senate." Lardner Vol. 6, p. 615. The living God never was approved as a deity by

the Senate, hence it was not lawful for any to worship him or teach others so to do. It was tolerated among the Jews but not by others. It was doubly a crime for an individual to make himself a God. Tacitus the most reliable of Latin writers says, "Christ was put to death in the reign of Tiberius as a criminal, by the procurator Pontius Pilate." A criminal is a violator of the law. He does not tell us what the crime was, but tells us his followers suffered for the crime of refusing to sacrifice to the gods. The law required all to sacrifice to the gods. Did Christ do it? Did he let his disciples? He dare not deny that the kings and rulers were gathered together against the Lord's anointed and they punished him unto death itself. Why punish a man, Bro. Jones, if he obeyed every law of the government? What play on the meaning of words to escape this? When Jesus told the Apostles they "must be brought before governors and Kings for my sake" what does he mean by "for my sake?" Is it not that obedience to my law will require disobedience to them. Then Christ tells them they shall be persecuted. "When they persecute you in one city flee to another." Mat. 10. Read the whole tenth chapter of Matthew and tell your readers, if you will, that Christ did not teach disobedience to human law as necessary in many instances, in order to obey him.

Read the account of the rulers and Elders and Scribes gathered together and commanding the Apostles to preach no more in his name. Hear the response of Peter and John: "Whether it be right in the sight of

God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge you, we cannot but speak the things we have heard and seen (in defiance of your law) Read of their imprisonment and miraculous deliverance. Listen to the apostles quoting the passage, "The Kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy Holy Child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together." Now why this combination against him if he violated none of their laws? And then Peter proceeds "and now Lord behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness we may speak thy word (in defiance of the law.) Let him read of the martyrdom of Stephen the beheading of James, the imprisonment of Peter, the imprisonment of Paul and Silas and the perpetual persecution of Apostles and Christians not only through Apostolic but through succeeding times. Let him read the declaration of James that "whosoever will be a friend of this world is an enemy of God." The world means not the earth elements but the affairs and institutions, the spirit of the world, they are embodied in the governments of the world. Let him read the prophetic declarations and see that the beast, the human government, always persecuted the good woman, but helped the bad woman and know well that there is not a single reader of his with a particle of Biblical intelligence that does not see his emphatic denial is in opposition to a truth stamped on every

page of Scripture both old and new. Yet this is the only issue Bro. Jones now makes with us, in matters pertaining to this discussion.

He next takes up as quotation—"The transgression of law is sin—while acknowledging his mistake in quoting, he intimates that I contradict John and Paul, when I quoted them both. Does he insist that the expressions, "sin is the transgression of law and transgression of law is sin, are equivalent?" He knows they are not. A horse is an animal—an animal is a horse, are they equally true? Just as much so as the other. In such expressions the words without qualification are taken in an unlimited or universal sense and mean all horses are animals—all animals are horses. Every one sees the fallacy of the position. Yet it is just as true that all animals are horses as that all transgression of law is sin. John then said "sin is the transgression of law." Bro. Jones says "If Bro. L. thinks he knows better than John, let him think so." What does Bro. Jones mean by that expression? Had we objected to John's language? Had we changed it or modified it in the least? Had we criticised any application of it? Be careful my brother that you are not guilty of something worse than bad logic here. We say sin is the transgression of law—we so said before. We say with Paul that where no law is there is and can be no sin. We or John, or Paul, did not say with Bro. Jones that the transgression of law (meaning any and all law, and human law in particular, of which he and I were speaking is sin." Then we ask again why does he say: "If Bro. L. thinks he knows better

than John, let him think so." He changed John's language, not we. Now my brother we intend you shall come out of this contest with "a badly bunged eye and a bloody nose," but we do not intend to misrepresent you nor do we intend to be misrepresented by you. We intend to strike you hard blows, we intend to strike them square in your front.

He now says. Bro. L. cannot see that I have been trying to get him to see that any transgression against any law is sin against that law." No Bro. Jones we cannot yet see that you have been attempting any such silly thing—as to get us to see that a transgression of any law is a transgression of that law. Why should Bro. J. attempt such a useless thing? Why should he attempt to make us see a thing that any child two years old, not a born idiot, cannot help seeing? We did not see it nor do we yet see where he has attempted anything of the kind. We from the beginning cut off the possibility of such a quibble by stating that it was good or bad Scripturally that we sought. But violation of human law is never properly called sin, unless so qualified. Webster defines sin to be violation of divine law. He says "the reader will see I have nowhere intimated that human law is equal to the law of God." The reader will see very plainly that if he did not assume it to be so—there was no meaning in his language. When we spoke of Christ's violating human law, he quoted the language—"sin is transgression of law" which he dare not deny applies to Divine law, and said according to Bro. L. Christ was a sinner. He cannot even say he meant

a sinner against human law, for if such a use of the term *sinner* was legitimate, which it is not, we had plainly stated we were speaking of goodness or badness in a Scriptural sense, and Bro. Jones so used it. If he did not make law apply equally to human and divine law, there was no meaning in his language. We have always maintained it the duty of Christians to obey human law, over them unless the human law contravenes the Divine. We have taught this much more fully than Bro. Jones ever did, or than he now believes, as we will show him before we are done with this question. Bro. Jones still persists in misrepresenting our reference to Bro. Ramsey's thinking it wrong to serve on the Jury. We never intimated that Bro. Ramsey's thinking it right made it right before God for him to refuse. We stated plainly and repeated it. When he refused Jury service because his religion forbid it, and was punished for it, this punishment to him must be punishment for religion's sake; was a wrong to him—hence according to Bro. Jones' definition, "persecution" whether the religion be true or false, does not alter this truth. A repetition of the misrepresentation must be regarded by all as willful.

Bro. Jones then quotes our language and endorses it, "The first commandment is to serve God—to love and obey him first, then so far as consistent with this to obey the powers that be. The harmony with the Divine law is the test of right or wrong not obedience to the human." He then adds "here is a clear truth about which there can be no controversy and upon which I make no

issue." Now let us see back again. On page 1008 No. 43, he quotes my language. Neither morality nor immorality, neither goodness nor badness attaches necessarily to obedience to human law." He adds: "Here for once we have a clear issue. Now for the proof." After what he calls his proof, he says on next page: "Then my second point is established beyond cavil, that goodness or badness attaches necessarily to every act obedience to human governments." That is if his reasoning has meant anything, it is necessarily sinful in the sight of God to violate human law under any circumstances, making human law the test, which he now disavows. If this not his meaning we are not able to extract an idea from his articles. Now on this identical proposition of mine "obedience to human law is no test of right or wrong," he fully endorses, makes no issue. What becomes of the clear issue then, made. Frittered away to nothing, deserted. Now brethren, not a single point made in his first article, not an issue made that has not been explained away, deserted. He did not intend to differ from me, nor to defend the opposite, he only intended to point out my fallacies of argument in opposing an error that he and I both oppose. That is the substance of his explanations and concessions in the foregoing, if we understand him.

Now reader, we do not think the mere form of reasoning in reaching a truth worth so much of time and space. And we are afraid after this exhibition that he really thinks it is wrong to vote, to serve on the Jury &c. He only objects to our fallacious mode

of reasoning. If we are practically right we are satisfied even though we reach the truth by a circuitous and illogical route. Now Bro. Jones do you intend to assume the full results of the denial, to wit, It is right and proper for Christians to vote, serve on the Jury and otherwise participate in the affairs of human government? You are properly the affirmant but we are willing to lead. They are all one and the same question. Say you do and at a proper time we will proceed with the question. We cannot until we know you do intend this. Our readers I am sure will justify fully our demand in this respect, since every original issue has been deserted with the claim that you took no position.

We cannot spend the time or occupy the space of the *ADVOCATE* in merely verbal quibbles or criticisms as to processes of reasoning which do not affect the great practical truth. That is very good exercise for your school boys, perhaps, but our school boy days are over, and with them have passed, school-boy amusements and exercises. We are now after practical truth.

We recognize fully your right to be heard. We have not limited that right. We do not intend to. But we have some rights also. One of our rights is to have a voice in deciding the character of a discussion to which we become a party. And we now tell now tell Bro. Jones very emphatically we do not intend to engage in a discusssion with a man that takes no position. If he intends to take position in his denial, that it is right for Christians to vote and serve on the Jury, say so distinctly, and we will proceed at a proper time to

the investigation of the question. We cannot until we know you do for fear after we have spent time in the investigation you will say you took no position, you were only examining my fallacious manner of reaching the point. This does not interfere with Bro. Jones' right. He properly on the affirmative, although we are willing to lead, he can proceed to give his position and we or others will demur and criticise as we see fit. But we predict he will never exercise that right.

D. L.

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY.

Parents! a word in your ears—may another Voice speak to your hearts! concerning your responsibility in the matter of temperance.

This word has two meanings. The first, which is Scriptural, includes every branch of that self-control which our headstrong nature requires, involving caution in things lawful, and abstinence from all unlawful and mischievous indulgence. The other use of the word refers to the one form of self-restraint made necessary by the seductiveness of intoxicating drinks.

To the latter this brief appeal must be confined. True, every part and every appetite of those bodies, fearfully and wonderfully made, which you have taken the responsibility under God, of calling into being, is included in that responsibility, and should be studied and guided by you, the only law-givers, as the only creators, whom your child at first can know.

But the one branch of "temper-

ance" and "intemperance," which in common use has monopolized those terms, is so important and so interwoven with the web of human life in this age and country as to demand an earnest utterance and your candid hearing.

If we should say that, parents, as such, are more responsible in this matter than any and all others, it might not be far from the truth. If we should add that this responsibility begins with the birth of the child, it would be but part of the truth. In many cases it might be asked, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born," if not "blind," yet with bodily, mental, or moral infirmities, hereditary inclinations, undeveloped appetites, that make him an idiot or a drunkard? It is not necessary that the parent should be either, or anything else of a very low grade, in order to curse the offspring and the world with terrible hereditary evils. Even slight carelessness in the indulgence of animal appetites, and especially of artificial craving for stimulants and narcotics, may work infinite harm.

And then, after birth, it is not enough that no bad example is set, no hurtful influence is exerted. There are positive as well as negative duties pressing upon parents concerning the young lives, both animal and spiritual, committed to their care. Standing in the place of Deity for instruction, counsel and command to your child, you should not omit that guidance which he cannot at first find elsewhere. Besides informing him, as soon as possible, respecting the divine Creator and Ruler, you should teach him respecting himself and the

laws of his nature, which are laws of God. You should seasonably caution him as to his appetites and their due restraint, his inclinations, and their needful control; and this before those appetites and inclinations are fully developed, or the appropriate temptations presented in full force. Do not wait till your children are invited to drink, still less till they have acquired the taste before teaching them from Scripture and facts, that wine is a mocker, and strong drink is raging, at last biting like a serpent and stinging like an adder.

It is not enough that they find not the foe on our own table or lurking in the sweet dregs at the bottom of cordial or so-called "medicine" cup, often more terribly fatal than would be a residuum of arsenic or strychnine to the indulged darling who sips and smiles, and learns to make his parents weep bitter tears. It is not enough that when they go from home to a college or to a ladies' seminary, they are not furnished as some have been, by fond, foolish parents, with cordials and health restoratives often more fatal than the diseases they would avert.

Many a parent who has never heard the stinging report from a ruined son, "Father, where did I learn to drink?" has been startled by the whispers of conscience quickened too late into sharp reproof for neglect to instruct or warn. Every child should be taught, as he can know nothing beyond the reach of his own senses, something of the nature and effects of intoxicating drinks. Unhappily, he is liable to meet them in some form whenever he goes from home. Even children's parties and

summer picnics are too often polluted by their presence. Forewarned is forearmed. Happily there is now no lack of instructive and interesting publications on this subject, adapted to every age and degree of intelligence. The "Children's series" of the National Society, numbering more than fifty illustrated tracts will be read with great avidity by even the youngest readers; while elaborate treatises and earnest appeals, from the same and other sources, may be readily obtained and placed with the best results in the hands of the young.

Happy our young children, if, like one little girl, they could say to an offer of sweet wine, "It's drunkards' drink; I don't want it." We might be reasonably sure that such offers later in life would not prove temptations, whether coming through the vile traffic or no less dangerous hospitality.

Among parental precautions, you should not lose sight of the inclinations, we may say necessities, of young people in the direction of society and amusement. Do not fail to make home so attractive as to remove one of the most frequent and fatal temptations toward bad company and bad habits.

God save you from the shame and sorrow of having drunken sons and daughters! God save your children from the drunkard's sin and doom.

But neither these prayers, nor your anxious amens will avail, if you neglect the means which God and nature have put in your power as the appointed guardians of those so dear to you. The price of safety is perpetual vigilance, both for ourselves and others. Be watchful, faithful.

and wise, and, with the Divine blessing, implored and granted, you may save your households and help to save your country from this direst of calamities, this most cruel of foes,—
Watchman and Reflector.

Away up in Tennessee. No. 3.

“There are more things in heaven and earth,
Horatio,
Than are dreamed of in your philosophy.”

But the things on earth are startling enough, surely, to gratify the curiosity of wonder hunters, or seekers of something new. Really something new turns up ever and anon, or things with new coats on, sometimes in new places. In this fast age many strange people are met, while traveling. You only have to keep your ears open to hear something, and your eyes open to see the wonderful. While on a trip not long since the cars stopped at a station. A nice looking old gentleman with some ladies came in. These were seated right behind me while the venerable escort stood in the aisle looking after their comfort. I expressed a desire to know what place that was, though my question was not addressed to any one in particular, a polite answer was given by the gentleman. In a conversation, to which this bit of talk lead, I found out he was a member of the church of Christ. We were then quite well acquainted and talked freely. They have just had a good meeting here, said, he, as we passed another station. Who preached I asked, and the question was answered. A big preacher—very popular. How did you like him? I did not like him at first, I did not like “that gown” but after I had seen him awhile I was more favorably impressed with him. What

gown?” Why he wore a long gown while preaching.” Something new, oh no an old thing in a new place!!! “*That gown!*” What meaneth this? Oh there is nothing in a gown, you old foggy, you. “Hush a by baby daddy’s gone a hunting to catch a little rabbit skin to wrap the baby bunting in.” This lullaby may quiet some consciences but some babies will not go to sleep by it. Am I permitted to ask what is meant by this notorious gown? Would there be a great cry of “too particular,” “too straight,” “too nice” if I file my objection to this untidy piece of dress. Is it busying one’s self in other men’s matters to watch over the brethren for good and point out what is understood to be wrong. He is my friend who with candor, tries to keep me right and in the straight path, and the straight faith too. There must be an appearance of evil for this clear headed old brother did not like it and this bitter exotic coffee had to be sweetened by much sound sugar preaching before he could forget the unnaatural taste. It was only a few years ago that the doctrine of Christ was buried out of sight of the learned and unlearned, under the mysticisms, formularies, ceremonies, theories, dogmas, doctrines, traditions, bombastic display and pompous show of men. Our brethren digged deep and labored hard hunting up the old land marks, and the good old way so plain that wayfaring men though fools need not err therein. They exhumed the lost city and found the people thereof to be very simple in their manners and plain. They insisted that the teachings of Christ and his apostles thoroughly furnish all for the work of

the Lord, that the man of God might be perfect. Their love for God's authority and the simplicity of the religion of Christ as exhibited in the acts of this people drew thousands of honest, sincere and devout characters away from the man made system, and these rejoiced in breathing the pure religion, freed from miasmatic breath of human forms and clerical pretensions. The grass has barely covered the graves of those who first sounded the alarm, digged deep to find the foundations of the walls, rallied Israel, led them back to the old Jerusalem and began the building of her walls, when lo! a move Babylon-ward and Rome-ward is clearly seen. This is denied. But as the old Gallileo said, "The world moves for all that," From what I can learn there is much trouble in our ranks about being like other folks. "Out of the fashion, out of the world" is as true in religion as in affairs of this life. We want a king, said Israel to Samuel, to be like all the nations, and the unsatisfied masses who want something God has not furnished, only follow in the footsteps of this rebellious people. Straws show which way the wind blows, 'tis said, and there are some small things which mark out the tendency of things backward, fleshward, selfward. It has not been long since I heard it said if we do not have a fine church like other people, we cannot get a crowd to hear us. 'Tis a common excuse offered,—“we must have music up to the times else our benches will be empty.” So in comes the organ. 'Tis better not to have a hearer, than to have a house full of creatures, whose minds are carnal, which are at enmity against God, are not subject to the

law of God and indeed cannot be. If that speech and that preaching, free from the enticing words of man's wisdom demand the good old songs of Zion, mixed very copiously with humility, love, meekness, long suffering, will not draw the crowd, then God does not offer any bait for them addressed to their flesh. I believe I will say God never addresses the flesh and his children should not do so. 'Tis Satan who aims his weapons at the carnal man but those of our warfare are not carnal but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. Be not conformed to this world, but transformed by the renewing of your minds that you may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God, is the teaching of heaven. Why have the organ and not the fiddle? To be like other folks, for anybody with any music in their souls, knows full well that there is more music and better music in horse hair and cat gut than in any other instrument. "Oh but the organ has the religious tone to it." Who said so? Other folks. There it is. That makes a difference. 'Tis borrowed, got it from the nations around you. If the frolicsome fiddle cost a little more and it was a fashionable instrument its tones would be just as well suited to church service as any other. The truth is Madame Fashion could give the command and her servile devotees would accept anything from a Jew's harp to an eight thousand dollar organ. Why do you have societies to do the work of the church? Was the idea suggested or taught by the word of God? Was it not borrowed? Certainly, and the desire to have them is only an effort

to be like other people. Oh what a craving to be like those around us! Is this not the only age since the time of Christ that has resorted to societies? Are we not, in proportion to advantages doing less for the world than any other age?

I have now come to the conclusion that there is, in religion and dress, nothing so monstrous or absurd that people will not adopt and follow. The first time I heard the use of the organ threatened, I was satisfied our brethren would not so soon depart from the living God in the use of it. But "*other denominations*" (oh what a misnomer for the church) are winning laurels with it and by it and we must use it or perish. When I first heard of the knot on the head, the hump on the back and those long-toed, Yankee-made, "Dutcheified" boots I thought no taste was so vitiated by fashion's disgusting ways as to receive and practice them, but I give it up. Man is a man. I am prepared to hear anything. What next? Well out comes a brother—a great preacher—a city preacher—in a gown. Well what of that? One Lord's day evening I was sitting at brother Walton's in the city of Waco. He has a beautiful and comfortable little brick house situated right in the rear of a church with a cross on it. It was quite warm and the reverend functionary officiating in the sanctum sanctorum, hearing confessions, must of necessity have all the air he could get. So I saw him shifting his gowns or choosing out of the number the one for the occasion. In fact I committed the unholy act of looking right at his "*riverence*" while performing the uncomely piece of tactics

necessary to get into one of them. It looks too much like this old fellow for our brethren to wear them. I do not like them because he wears them. Again, the Rubric (do you know what that is? not the Bible, but the Rubric) says ministers while attending the sacrament must have on the surplice (that is white gown) and graduates (bigger fish) must have on also the hood. Still farther I have another book in which are these words: "During the reading of prayer the minister wears a white muslin surplice and during the reading of the sermon a black silk robe—the former signifying his calling as a priest to make intercession for the sins of the people and the latter being significant of his prophetic character as a teacher of divine truth." Now you have it. Do you not see why I do not want my brethren to be wearing these gowns while waiting upon the Lord. They are borrowed, and borrowed from a bad source—from Rome. They mean something, and that no good. 'Tis true these are arbitrary meanings, but men have given them, and these robes have them and will carry the ideas with them, and having the thing is giving importance to the thing signified by it. We should shun the very appearance of the evil in them. Did that preacher wear that gown for comfort, or why? Was not the idea borrowed? Was his comfort in a gown paramount in importance to the interests of Christianity which require us "to be not conformed to this world?" Why could he not be pleasant in the common clothes such as are worn by other people? Is he of a very hot nature? It is a very easy

thing to dress so your clothes will not attract attention. It always annoys me to have on something that all are constantly looking at. I would be pleased if my piety, devotion, zeal, or knowledge in Christ, were so noticeable that God would be glorified by my conduct, but to think that my garb is winning or extorting notice that my personal worth could never get, would be mortifying. I liked all very well except "*that gown.*" Well what was the matter with that? It looks like the man sitting upon the confessional. It looks like one trying to make his garb separate him from the people. It looks like the wearer wants a badge of distinction. It looks like somebody wants to be like somebody else. It looks like being conformed to the world or at least a part of it, Rome and her daughters. It looks like laying claims to a more consecrated sphere, in which the common clothes are not good or sacred enough for him and do not say enough for him. It looks like aping the man who dares claim to be the intercessor for the people. It looks like seeking the distinction of those who claim to have high spiritual endowments. Under the law every priest had a peculiar dress, and so they do under grace, but this dress is for the spiritual man.

The servants of the Most High are a peculiar people, differing from the world not so much in the dress of the outward man as of that one created in the image of God who made him. The gorgeous dress of so-called priests and other ministers of this time is a grand humbug upon the beautiful idea set forth in that typified by Aaron's dress. God wills that all

the priests of the new dispensation (and all his children are kings and priests) shall wait upon him, offering spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. He is as particular in defining and describing every article of their outfit as he was when the Aaronic priesthood officiated. When Aaron stood before the altar with the priestly garb on he was dressed just to the Lord's liking. It was a heaven-devised garment, and to change, alter, amend, leave off or add to this would have been rebellion. No priest was prepared to come before the Lord and wait upon him without his dress on. "Now put on," says the word of God, "Bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another and forgiving one another if any have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness." When priests have put on all these they are ready to make an offering to the Lord, and are they prepared before? Has the man without mercy any claims at a throne of mercy? None at all. The proud man, the bitter, unkind persons spot their offering so as to make it unfit for the Lord's use. He that would from the golden altar of his heart offer the sweet incense of prayer must not have on such defiled garments as envy, hatred, slander, peevishness, fretfulness, but come adorned in the garb of love. The man who has not on the wedding garment will be cast out where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. There is beauty in the typical signification of the things of the Old Testament;

But did Aaron's dress point to the gowns of our day? Oh, what an assumed distinction! There is a way to be peculiar. A man who will follow strictly the word of God is a perfect curiosity. If you do not swear or take an oath the world declares that is strange, and many will suggest that you are a little too particular, like the Indian's tree, "little too straight—lean over." But just refuse to vote, if you want the patriotic indignation of those around you stirred, and you have a desire for bad names. They are just like the sects however, when arguments grow short they try what virtue there is in hard and ugly names. Again men must think for you about sitting on the jury. If perchance you cannot conscientiously do this, and you understand the word of God to forbid it, again you are a strange man. The nearer the children of God draw to the Father, the farther removed are they from the world and the more peculiar are they. To be a *Christian* is to be peculiar. I heard a few days ago of a man wishing a whole family of non-voters were hanged. "They that will live godly shall suffer persecution," said God's word, and this is truth yet. Why are not all the children of God striving to become noted in the service of the Lord? Do not put on your bodies something that will attract attention. What we wear should be for use and not to set us off. But adorn the spiritual man and then sensible men will admire you and God will love and exalt you. But "*that gown!*" The old brother did not like it and not even the wearer at first. I do not like it first or last, and who does? Why the wear-

er of it, and there will be others who will follow the fashion. 'Tis said the fox was greatly excited at first meeting with the lion, terribly shocked. The next time, she feared truly, but not so much by far as at first, the third time she drew near and even dared speak to his majesty. Catholicism with all its intolerable forms and doctrines loses all its hideousness by being oft seen. The brother did not like "*that gown*" at first but could bear it by and by. I will venture the assertion that every departure from the simplicity of the gospel and Christian life, also every innovation from the world and sectarianism have been wedged in thus. These things ride behind for awhile, soon they are in the saddle, then the consciences of the conscientious are trodden down ruthlessly. There must be pastors in our times to come up with the world, to be like other folks and keep pace with a fast progressive age, and these men of orders must be distinguished for something and by something. They do not belong to the ignoble rabble. The dignity of their office requires that they should have a badge of distinction—"*that gown*" will do. Have not I, I the pastor of the First Christian Church on — Street in — City the right to wear just what I please, a gown, a hood or anything else? Oh yes, "only use not liberty for an occasion to *the flesh*, (that is, to gratify pride, ambition or a desire to follow men) but by love serve one another." Gal. 5: 13. "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak." 1 Cor. 8: 9. Being free do not use your liberty

for a *cloak* of maliciousness, (wickedness) but as servants of God. Oh, but you have a coat made just like other men's, are you not conformed to the world? Is not this the way the gown brother would argue if approached on this subject? But Paul would reason thus, meat is meat and I have a right granted by God, to eat of it, provided in so doing I am not injured, my brother not tempted and God not dishonored. There is no selfishness in Christianity. A man in following Christ, must look at himself, around himself and above himself. When I propose to put on a gown and come before the brotherhood I should ask myself a few questions. Will not my influence be impaired by so doing? Will not I cause weak brethren to stumble and fall? Am I not doing this to gratify the flesh? Will not human institutions be promoted and the clergy honored? These gowns are seen in the idol's temple, they belong to it, are a part of the worship of it and the wearing of them makes one involuntarily think of their associations. Thus are this world's institutions honored. The gown may be no part of one man's religion, but having gained a sacred importance it is to be dispensed with by others, just as meat offered to idols, on account of the reputation it has. If we were all as ready and as earnest in looking up things commanded by God and intended to glorify, and honor him, as well as those which build us up and make us strong in the Lord, as we are in following the things that look to the honor of men and these of no importance only such as they gain from the injury it does, then we

would be better and the cause of Christ would move on more prosperously. We have not got back to the trip Away up in Tennessee Again, and another letter is full long. We leave you to think, and read the word of God.

Obituaries.

Bros. L. & S: You will please announce through the Advocate the death of our much esteemed sister Susan Toon, of Fayetteville, Lincoln Co. Tenn. She was born March 15, 1824, and was baptized into Christ early in life and died Nov. 14th 1874. She lived a devoted life for nearly 35 years in the cause of our Master. She leaves her husband and One child, a poor blind young lady, and many friends and brethren to mourn her loss. But we sorrow not as those who have no hope believing that our loss is her gain.

'At home she was cheerful and ever ready to do deeds of kindness, affectionate to all. While others loved and honored her, she felt her weakness, and was always ready to confess her faults. She expressed her willingness to meet death. She whispered in my ear, "My way is clear: I fear no evil; my hope is worth ten thousand worlds like this, I have spent most of my time in prepar'ng for this hour;" Oh what sweet words of comfort from a departing friend, a tried, true, and brave soldier. She was always cheerful, pressing onward, comforting the disconsolate, strengthening the weak, confirming the strong, persuading the sinner, and encouraging the Christian. So much was she engaged in the work of love that those who differed from her religiously were often heard to say that she was certainly among the faithful of this age and among the best of Fayetteville. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."

W. H. DIXON.

PETERSBURG, LINCOLN CO. TENN.

Again we record the death of a good, true and devoted Sister who departed this life Sept. 8th 1874 in the 55th year of her age, for many years she was an earnest, devoted member of our congregation here—Sister Mary M. Thweat. She was not sick very long, died of flux, at her residence near Franklin. She was loved and respected by all who knew her. Surely,

"Life is a span—a fleeting hour;

How soon the vapor flies:

We are like the tender transient flower,

That blooms and fades and dies."

"Dearest sister, thou hast left us

Here thy loss we deeply feel ;

But 'tis God that hath bereft us
 He can all our sorrows heal.
 Yours in the Christians hope,
 E. B. CAYCE.

FRANKLIN TENN. Nov. 7, 1874.

Co-Education.

In the 38th Advocate of this year Bro. Lipscomb, in his usual dogmatic style, gives his views on mixed schools. I have waited for some one more experienced than myself to reply, but no rejoinder has yet appeared. It is true that the article is a page of assertions with scarcely an effort at proof, still I think some notice of it is necessary.

Dogmatism is well in its place, but questions of expediency do not belong to its province. When Bro. L. has a "thus saith the Lord" at his back, I do so much admire that fearlessness with which he sometimes shakes his fist in the face of the whole world, but on such subjects as the above, I think more modesty would be becoming. A man who had tried each system of teaching for 25 years, could not speak more confidently.

For every assertion that Bro. L. makes with regard to the evil influences of the system he condemns, one hundred can be presented in its favor from men who speak from the test of experience in the school room. Bro. L. says it does not refine the boys. Men who have tried it for 15 and 20 years, say it does. I refer him to the statements of such men as A. Holbrook of Lebanon, O., and Bro. Giltner, of Eminence: the president of the State University of Michigan, with its more than 1000 students, and that of the N. W. C. University. These men with hundreds of others, endorse, adopt and recommend the

system, after years of severe trial.

The Brooklyn evidence is just no evidence at all. Of course boys and girls whose minds are filled with "free love" notions cannot be safely allowed to associate together. They have been taught that lewdness is a virtue and they will most certainly practice it if opportunity permits. Those commissioners or some other commissioners might as well publish their conviction, that for preacher and female members of the church to sit together in the same room tends strongly to produce looseness of manners and lewdness in morals, because it did not "work well" in the case of Beecher and Mrs. Tilton.

Bro. L. has heard of lewdness in such schools. I wonder whether he has heard of any in other schools? Dr. King has; and tells his readers that he has known every species of vice to prevail in "Boys' Academies" and "Girls' Schools." He gives a philosophical reason for it.

Bro. L. speaks in the face of facts when he says that mixed schools do not afford as thorough training as others. Are the teachers of mixed schools all humbugs, and their published course of study a sham? From hundreds of similar statements, I select the following made by the Cincinnati *Daily Gazette* with reference to the Lebanon Normal School: "The thoroughness of the training is evidenced by the exceptional success of its graduates in all the professions, law, preaching, teaching, engineering," &c. In the above-named school "grown youths of both sexes" not only study together in the same room, but mingle unreservedly together in their recreations.

If success is any evidence of merit, the Lebanon School furnishes all that reason can require. Nineteen years ago it began with one dozen pupils; its annual enrollment is now more than sixteen hundred.

If the system of co-education is so fruitful of evil as Bro. L. thinks, it ought to be exposed; and you, Bro. L., are the man to handle it without gloves, but let us have facts and figures, not naked dogmatic assertions.

Fraternally,
A. CLARK.

ITEMS.

There are three members of the Christian Church in Brownsville Tenn.

T. W. Caskey has located at Sherman, Texas, and is preaching for the church at that place.

G. W. Stallings writing from Wittsburg Ark. says that the few churches scattered throughout his portion of that state are like sheep among wolves. He says, however, that they are not cast down, but are still contending for the faith once delivered to the saints.

The brethren at Union Congregation Hickman Co. Tenn. are to have a new and more convenient Post Office called Brushy. Bro. D. R. Rivers is Postmaster.

Words of encouragement will come occasionally, as witness this from Bro. T. M. Sweeney. "Best wishes for success with your paper. If I should not renew in time, don't stop my paper. I can't do without it."

An effort is being made to induce

Henry Ward Beecher to lecture in Nashville. He has been offered \$1000 to deliver two lectures.

Dr. T. W. Brents was in our office last week. His book is selling rapidly and is doing a vast amount of good preaching. We hope that Bro. B.'s ready pen will contribute something for the *ADVOCATE* ere long.

Lawrence W. Scott, Texas editor of the *Christian Weekly*, is in favor of getting up a preachers' aid society among single preachers. When one marries each member is to give him so much to start him.

Gladstone, Disraeli and other men of note are predicting a religious conflict in Europe. The international Catholic Congress which is to meet in London is regarded as an effort to combine the Catholic forces of all countries, for the purpose of making an attempt to restore general temporal power to the Pope.

QUERY.

Bros. L. & S.: Will you give us some explanation on the 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians beginning with the 8th verse to the end of chapter.

Should a man and his wife engage in the commemoration of the death of our Savior where there is no church nor disciples to meet with.

S. T. B.

Nevada Co. Ark.

The eighth verse teaches that charity, or love, is never to cease. As long as there is a child of God on earth, that child will love God supremely, and will love the Lord's people, and all the world, both friend and foe. But it teaches that all mirac-

ulous Spiritual gifts were to cease. The power of prophecy, the power to speak with tongues; all direct miraculous knowledge was to cease in the church. The age of miracles was to cease, and men were no longer to be endowed as they were in the first age of the church. The ninth verse teaches that the Revelations pertaining to the New dispensations, were made in parts, a little at a time; even to the apostles, the things pertaining to the new institution were given in parts; so much as at a time as was needed for the occasion, and no more. Hence Peter had been preaching for years, before he understood that he was to carry the gospel to the Gentiles, and not till he saw the vision upon the housetop at Joppa, did he understand this matter. The same was true we doubt not with all inspired men. It was true of the old prophets. They sang beautifully of the sufferings of Christ, and of the glory that should follow; but none of them understood the grandeur and beauty of the things of which they spoke. The Spirit inspired and impelled them to utter certain things, but they themselves did not comprehend their meaning. Just so it was in the days of the apostles. No one of them at the start had a full knowledge of the whole scheme of man's redemption. These things were given in parts and as they were needed, and then written down, so that after a while, when these parts were all brought together they gave us the complete will of God to man. But the apostles themselves knew in part, and prophesied in part. But a more perfect day was to come, as is shown from the 9 to 12. That perfection of God's revelations came

when the New Testament was completed. We now have in the whole Bible, a full development of the entire will of God to man in all ages and dispensations, spanning the grand arch of time, from creation down till time shall be no more. Those therefore that live since the full canon of God's revelations to man was made, have the advantage of any inspired prophet or apostle in that respect. Those prophets and apostles only received parts of the Lord's will at a time. We now have it all written down together, and if we will read and study, we may soon get all that pertains to life here, or hereafter. The world is wonderfully blessed in this respect, since the New Testament was completed. The last verse teaches that faith hope, and love, are principles that will never cease. They belong to every Christian on earth, and in all time. No one can remain a Christian long on earth, and not cultivate these. They belong to Christians now, as much as they did when the apostles were living, and must be cultivated by Christians individually. To the second inquiry, we say, yes. Where there are but two disciples in a community, they constitute the church of God at that place, and they certainly ought to keep the ordinances.

E. G. S.

Erratum.

G. W. Abell's article, No. 46, page 1085 in sentence—"We have just as little use for Prelates or Popes, to set another vatican to work," &c. read Vulcan for Vatican.

General News.

The pork trade of Nashville has heretofore amounted to 20,000 hogs annually. It is estimated that the number killed this season will not reach so high a figure. Prices have ranged from \$6.30 to \$7.35 per hundred.—Maj. H. C. Lucas of this county was found dead near Donelson Station Monday.—Wm. L. Barry, the oldest type setter in the Union, recently died in St. Louis. He formerly resided in Nashville—C. C. Giers, recently elected representative from Davidson Co. to the lower house of the legislature, resigned a short time since, but has withdrawn his resignation.—Major Havemeyer, of New York, died suddenly of apoplexy Nov. 30.—Prominent citizens of New York have signed a petition requesting the authorities to enforce more rigidly the Sunday laws in regard to Theatrical amusements. Under the name of "Sacred Concerts" several of the low play houses have lately been thrown open on Sunday. Among the signers of the above petition are the names of Lester Wallack, Dion Boucicault and other prominent Theatre managers—Another subject which has lately agitated the New York mind, is the fear that the grain trade will be diverted from their city. The high rates of wharfage, loading, unloading &c. is taking the grain to other ports. Baltimore is the rival most to be feared as some years since, she took away the coffee trade from New York.—Last week upwards of 9000 'Longshoremen struck for higher wages, or least the majority of them did. For it may be

mentioned as one of the evils of trades Unions. that some of these men who have been receiving 80 cts. per hour are actually striking for 60 cts.—A party of Sioux Indians stole a patent ice-cream freezer last week thinking it was a hand organ, and all the big medicine men turned the crank a week before they concluded there was no music in it.—Sandy Station a colored North Carolinian goes to the Penitentiary 5 years, one year for each chicken stolen on that fatal night.

FOREIGN.

The Duke of Connaught, son of Queen Victoria was thrown from his horse and severely injured Nov. 30.—Although the Russian Empress has been in England several weeks, the Queen has never seen her.—They are having Anti-Masovie riots in South America, instigated by the Catholics.—James Russel Lowell has declined to accept the Russian Mission.—It is reported that China and Japan are preparing for war.

Every man has in his own life follies enough; in his own mind troubles enough; in the performance of his duties deficiencies enough; in his own fortune evils enough, without being curious after the affairs of others.—*Edgefield News.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Christian Employees.....	1127
Strange Things.....	1131
Parental Responsibility.....	1139
Away up in Tennessee No. 3.....	1141
Obituaries	1146
Co-Education... ..	1147
Items.....	1148
Query.. ..	1148
Erratum	1149
General News.....	1150

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 49.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, DEC. 10, 1874.

Popular Gambling.

It is not my purpose, in this article to speak particularly of the basest forms of Gambling. It would be almost a waste of time to give a lecture through a religious paper, for the benefit of that class of men who traverse the country with their tricks and games, duping every poor, ignorant wretch, who has a sufficiency of credulity, and a sufficient want of honesty to "bite at their tricks;" or those who engage in the more legal, and more "respectable" style of gambling, by horse-racing. We cannot expect to reach the eyes or ears of these professional "blacklegs," &c., for they are a reckless kind of men who never read religious papers; and if they did, would not likely be influenced by anything we might write. Those who read are all ready to admit that these low, vile, base, degrading habits are all wrong: and any refined Christian would revolt at the idea of committing such deeds. But there are other forms of gambling in which Christians engage. It is of these I wish to speak. The reader may be surprised at this, but I think he will agree with me when I have done.

These forms of gambling have attained to a high degree of respectability; the papers, the clergy, and the public generally, not only fail to raise their voices against them, but give them a liberal patronage.

"What! the preachers gambling?"

Yes, gentle readers, the preachers not only gamble themselves, but do all in their power, (i. e. some of them) to spread the patronage of these gambling institutions all over the land.

I would first speak of lotteries. Now some seem to have the idea that a man cannot gamble without saying, saying, "I'll bet so and so," but this is a wrong idea. For instance, suppose two men meet at a place where there is to be a horse race. They begin to express opinions as to which is the fastest animal of the two. Mr. A. says, "I believe the grey will beat." Mr. B. thinks not, and says, "If he does, I will agree to give you fifty dollars, with the understanding that if he does not, you are to give me the same amount." They make the agreement, the race is run, and Mr. A. receives the fifty dollars. Now will any one say there was no gamb-

ling in the transaction? Of course not. Yet it was done without proposing to bet.

Now let's make a comparison, and see how much difference there is between this and lotteries.

The manager of the lottery sends out his propositions. A man sends him ten dollars with the understanding that if he happens to get the right ticket, he is to receive one thousand dollars. In the event he wins, he makes nine hundred and ninety dollars. Is there any difference between this transaction and the one at the horse-race? If there is I cannot see it.

The principle would be the same if the man said, "I'll bet you ten dollars against nine hundred and ninety dollars that I draw a certain ticket."

This is admitted to be gambling by a great many, but there are others of which I will speak, that are a little more popular. One of these popular forms of gambling is in fairs. I was stopping with a brother who was a stranger. He told me they had organized a club, of fifty in number, each of whom paid into the treasury five dollars. At the close of the year, the man who produced the most wheat on one acre of land, was to receive fifty dollars. Corn, oats, &c., likewise. Then, said I, you propose to bet five dollars against forty-five dollars that you will raise the best wheat that is raised by any of the club? You had as well bet five dollars that your horse can beat some other horse running, or that you can beat some other man playing cards! He began to look at it in a new light, and being convinced that it was wrong, he

promised me that he would withdraw from the club.

There is another form of gambling that is more popular, I believe than fairs, the one in which more preachers and prominent church members engage. This is the Insurance business generally. I regard this as only a respectable form of gambling. Bro. A. pays the insurance company one hundred dollars, with the understanding that if his house is destroyed by fire, the company are to pay it back to him with nine hundred dollars more. What is this but betting one hundred dollars against nine hundred dollars that his house will be destroyed by fire?

Bro. B. intends starting on a journey; he goes to the insurance company, and pays them twenty-five dollars with the understanding that if his life is destroyed by accident before he returns, they are to pay his family ten thousand dollars, or one thousand, as the case may be. Now, does he not virtually bet twenty-five dollars that his life will be destroyed before he returns? I might go on to mention other popular forms of gambling, but will desist, asking the brethren to think upon this subject, and decide whether or not they can consistently engage in these things. If I am wrong in my conclusions, I am ready to be set right.

What think *you* of the matter, Bro. Lipscomb?

Very Fraternally,

ANDREW W. PRYCE.

Baldwyn, Miss. Nov. 15, 1874.

True honor dwells in the soul! The real dignity of wealth arises from its judicious use.

QUERY.

Bros. L. & S.: You will please explain the 39th and 40th verses of 11th chapter of Hebrews, (also 33rd verse) and you will oblige your Bro., and others in Christ.

Respectfully,

J. H. CAMPBELL.

Gordonsville, Ky., Nov. 17, 1874.

The promises spoken of in the 33rd verse evidently refer to promises that were given to those who would obey God under the Mosaic dispensation. In 32nd verse of the same chapter we have several persons named, all of whom lived under the Jewish dispensation, God promised to protect, and feed, and watch over and bless all who would obey him under the Jewish dispensation in many ways, as in 28th of Deuteronomy. The persons named in the 32nd verse were obedient servants of God, and they received the promises annexed to such obedience. And the promise spoken of in the 39th verse, we think is the promise of eternal inheritance. The two verses run thus: "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better things for us, that they without us, should not be made perfect." The apostle throughout the entire eleventh chapter is speaking of righteous people who lived and died before Christ came. The promise of eternal life was given to none, until Jesus arose from the dead. In 9th chap. and 15th verse, we have the following: "And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death,

for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." In this verse he speaks of both Testaments, the New Testament and the first Testament, and says, "that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." This promise of eternal inheritance is to the called ones under the first or Jewish covenant. These called ones are, we doubt not, those who lived and died in the service of God under the old dispensation. Just such as are spoken of in the eleventh of Hebrews. Some have even thought that all the Jews who lived and died before Christ came, will be eternally saved, both good and bad: that the blessings and punishments under that dispensation were all temporal, and that when those temporal punishments were inflicted, that ended the matter of punishment with them, and that they will all live eternally in heaven. But in the above passage, the apostle singles out certain ones from the old dispensation, and denominates them the *called ones*, and shows that *they* were to receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Now if all the ancient Jews were to receive eternal life, why should the apostle make this division of those ancient Jews, and give the promise to the *called ones*? Why not extend that promise indiscriminately to all, if all were to enjoy it? But in speaking of some of those people as *called*, and applying the promise to them, he certainly shows that the

others, those *not* called, do not receive the promise. The called ones in the Old dispensation, certainly means those who did the Lord's will pertaining to that dispensation, just as the called ones in the New dispensation means those who do the will of God in it. While those not called, are those that did not do the Lord's will, and such have not the promise of eternal life under the Old Testament, any more than under the New. The same principle applies to both. Jesus said the time was coming when all in the graves should come forth, "they that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." John 5. Here all the dead, under all dispensations are included, and only those who have *done good*, have the promise of eternal life, while those who have done evil, will receive eternal condemnation. It can well be said of such as are mentioned in the eleventh of Hebrews, that they have *done good*. But of those under the Jewish economy that disobeyed God, and died in rebellion against him, it will have to be said, they *did evil*; hence condemnation, and not eternal life, will be theirs. While it is true that the ancient Jews had some idea of some sort of a future state of existence after death, from some things that God revealed, it is at the same time true that in the Jewish age God never promised eternal life. But through Jesus Christ, that promise is now extended to all the obedient, the faithful ones. And this promise of eternal life we think is the promise spoken of in the thirty-ninth verse above. The Jewish dispensation was a sort of preparatory

one, and in it, the Lord promised immediate, temporal blessings as the reward of the obedient ones, and threatened immediate, temporal punishments upon the wicked. But at the same time, their doom in the eternal world will be fixed according to the actions of this life, just as will be the case with those who live under Christianity. All will be judged according to their works. This puts the people of all generations and dispensations upon one common level, and fixes their eternal destiny upon the same principle.

E. G. S.

The Christian Convention of Florida.

In accordance with a call which was circulated in the State, among all the churches of Christ, a meeting was held on Friday and Saturday the 23rd and 24th days of October, 1874, with the Church of Christ at Gadsden, in Gadsden Co., Fla.

PROCEEDINGS.

Met Friday morning; adjourned until Saturday, 10 o'clock, A. M. At which time the Convention met, and organized by calling Bro. Duncan McDearmid, of the Gadsden Church, to the chair, and Eld. T. J. Gregory of Bethel Church, Liberty Co., Fla., to act as secretary.

The chairman stated the object of the convention to be for the co-operation of all the churches of Christ within the State, and to find out the best plan for the spread of the Gospel.

A call being made for representatives,* twelve churches were represented in Middle Fla., showing a membership of 270. Also a letter

from Eld. S. R. Bonham of East Fla., showing a membership of over 500 in the eastern part of the State, making a total membership of about 800 in the State.

The following resolutions were offered and adopted, namely: That we keep one evangelist in the field. That we secure the services of Eld. J. C. Gibson for the ensuing year, to labor as evangelist in Middle Fla., and other points near his field of labor. That Elders be ordained in all the churches where persons can be found with Scriptural qualifications. Adjourned till 4 o'clock P. M. Met pursuant to adjournment. The following resolutions being offered and adopted, viz: That the several churches represented in this convention pledge themselves to raise funds for the support of the evangelist, and that we pay him quarterly.

That each church appoint some person to receive and disburse the funds raised by said church.

That all the churches organize Sunday-Schools where they have not already been established.

That all the congregations meet on each Lord's day for worship, where it is practicable.

That we meet each 5th Lord's day during the year, to hold a co-operation or investigation meeting. Each church to be represented either by delegates or letter.

That the next annual convention be held with the Church of Christ at Concord, in Gadsden Co., Fla., commencing Friday before the 4th Lord's day in October 1875.

The Minutes being called for, were read and unanimously adopted.

On motion, the Convention adjourned until the next annual Convention in 1875.

T. J. GREGORY, Secretary.

DUNCAN McDEARMID, Chairman.

Repentance is not good when it consists of thanking God that we are no worse than our neighbors.

Laying Hands on Paul.

The *Times* quotes these two sentences from our article on Inspiration and comments as follows:

"We also mentioned the fact that Paul was advanced from an inferior position to a prominent one, by the laying on of hands.

"When Paul had hands laid upon him, he received a higher degree of spiritual power, the apostolic measure of the Spirit, with apostolic gifts."

If Bro. L. will re examine the history of Paul's labors in Cyprus, where he first arose to a position of greater prominence than that occupied by Barnabas, we think he will find that his promotion grew out of the intrepidity and decisiveness with which he acted under trying circumstances, rather than from the fact of his having recently received the imposition of hands. Moreover, Barnabas received the same imposition of hands at the same time, therefore this could not have produced the subsequent difference between them.

The proposition that Paul received, through imposition of hands, "a higher degree of spiritual power, the apostolic measure of the Spirit, with apostolic gifts," and that "he had it none before," is unsupported, we think, by evidence, and it is inconsistent

with the tenor of Paul's argument in the first chapter of Galatians. He was certainly a qualified apostle before the laying on of hands occurred (Gal. i: 4; xi: 12;) and therefore he must have had "the apostolic measure of the Spirit."

If our brother had examined closely our article he would have seen that we recognized not only that Barnabas had hands laid on him but that he was advanced from the position of a prophet to the apostolic position, and in the advancement received the apostolic gifts as did Paul. But Paul was taken from a lower position than Barnabas and advanced to a higher one. We find no evidence that Paul arose to the position in Cyprus. This is simply the first record of their actions after the imposition of hands. Besides, did not Paul have the same intrepid courage before this that he did now? If so had he not manifested it previous to this time in all the fourteen years of his labors, trials, persecution among the heathen? Or was it quickened, guided, strengthened by the Holy Spirit bestowed through the imposition of hands and the gift of the Spirit like Peter's?

While Paul was "an apostle in" the sense of one sent—still it is strange, if he had the full apostolic measure of the Spirit, why have we no indication of it previous to this? Why do we find him classed among the prophets and teachers? No regularly constituted and fully inspired apostle is ever so classed in the Scriptures. Again it is strange that just at this time too, his labors became the representative labors of the church as regarded by inspiration. The coin-

cidences here are most remarkable if he was not more fully endowed at this time. It is true the language in Galatians would seem to indicate he was an apostle, but we cannot reconcile the recognition of him simply as a teacher with the idea of full apostolic powers. Had he been a worker of miracles it seems to me when the apostles and disciples at Jerusalem were afraid of him, and Barnabas had to vouch for him he would have mentioned this. This was three years after his conversion, too. He was chosen to be an apostle from the beginning—he acted somewhat in the spirit of the call from the beginning, but was fully endowed only at the imposition of hands. Just as the twelve were chosen and were intrusted with a measure of spiritual power, but were only fully endowed and endowed for the complete apostolic work at the day of Pentecost. This seems to us true.

D. L.

Away up in Tennessee. No. 4.

I do not know when we left Alabama and crossed into Tennessee but had a very feeling sense of it when we entered the tunnel. I knew that whereas it was light with me, it was now dark. The story of the young couple, I heard years ago, came to mind quite fresh. 'Tis said the young man had on his lip a piece of black sticking plaster just before entering the tunnel, but strange to say, it was on the young lady's lip when the train came out. There is, in mathematics an operation called transposition of terms. If this transfer had been a daylight caper, it would have

been a demonstration of this principle, but as it was not, the change must be ascribed to magic. 'Tis an old trick however, Adam and Eve played it no doubt in the garden and after they got out, and these young ones were only keeping up an old family custom.

Athens, Pulaski and Columbia were passed on the rout. About nine o'clock the train stopped at Carter's Creek Station, I stepped off, and by the moonlight recognized brothers John Alexander and Tom Jamison. A horse was waiting, and after a three miles ride, sat down to rest in the comfortable home of brother Alexander with his pleasant family. A night of sweet repose prepared me for the next day. Between ten and eleven o'clock we met at Beech Grove, shook hands, thanked God who had preserved us through the varied scenes since we parted. The meeting began,

There should be some preparation for a meeting and generally is, but of the wrong kind. A pig, beef, lamb numberless chickens an occasional duck and turkey are the meat offerings for the occasion. Then comes in the offering of pies of all kinds, from the pumpkin, up to the grand old pot peach pie, and family slice potato pie. Nic-nacs have a part and a lot in the matter, and taking all things into consideration there is sometimes a wonderful setting of things in order. The cobwebs must be brushed down, there must be a working up of all things that the decks may be perfectly clear for a week's action. More than ordinary starching, ironing, fluting, puffing, pinking, flouncing, engages the attention. Not only the flock, the herd, the

fowl house, the granary the laundry, but the dry good's store must be taxed for the occasion. The fruits of the tailor, bootmaker, hatter, and dress-maker are pressed into use for the momentous events just at hand. All things are ready and the battle begins. There are more important things than the ones mentioned. The church should be set in order if the parlor, the kitchen, the dining room, the table, the toilet must be neglected. It is not the business of the church to serve tables wholly. But it is thought that her chief duty is to do the feeding the loaves and fishes whilst others do the work. If there are brethren who are not at peace, these should be visited, they should be reconciled, for such are hindrances to the good of a meeting. Are there any members off duty, look after them and stir them up that they may fall in and close up the ranks. For these are also barriers in the way, too. There should be a general examination of hearts and lives. It should be seen to, that all are following the instructions of the Bible. Are all praying without ceasing, praying in the family, are the brethren praying in the church, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting? This is not all. Let all the members prove themselves to be the leaven of righteousness, working among sinners reading the Bible to them, warning them of their danger, persuading them to go to preaching and working the minds of their neighbors up to the reception of God and his Son.' Tis highly necessary for all to keep company much of the time with such characters as Matthew, Mark, Luke, John Paul, Peter, James, Jude, and through

them with Christ, for I have feuded out the best way to be like them is to keep their company. Oh but Christians ought to do these things all the time, you say, not simply just before a big meeting. That is so. Their armor ought to be as bright at one time as at another only they should get better every day. They ought to watch all the time for 'tis said eternal vigilance is the price of their liberty; this is true of eternal liberty. If the church would grow in grace all the time and the knowledge of the Lord then they would be ever ready for a meeting. The truth is they would have a big meeting every time they met, and sinners would be continually drawn to the church. But the prevalent idea is, we will get a big gun here, he will do it all—perfect wonders, and the church forgets her own duty, in the contemplation of what "parson Big-gun" can do and will do. They want to make one big fight that will count for a time to come, besides it will make up for any remissness in the past. The devil is not so easily or so thoroughly frightened that big noise will drive him away for a great while. Resist the devil and he will flee from you, but the resistance must not cease or he will rally and come again. Besides 'tis the little guns that do most execution. The larger ones stun some, frighten others, overshoot the many, but the small shot hit and kill. There is an army where there is a general. There are regiments with small arms, where one big gunner operates. There are whole churches for one big preacher. Then there is a great loss when all sit still and wait for some one better skilled or more powerful to do

the work. The churches should work away, every member should work. There is plenty for every one to do and though little, the sword of the Spirit, wielded faithfully by you will wound just as if a Goliath used it. A church should be a live institution getting stronger and better, every day, doing more good and it should have the elements of life in it, and not have to send off and call some one to come, and breathe the breath of life into it, that it may become a living body. Few churches are ready for a meeting when the time comes for it. The first thing the preacher has to do on arriving upon the ground frequently is to convert the church. They are a lukewarm set, they read but little except the county paper and the Magazines. If there was as much zeal and "wideawakeativeness" at the beginning of a meeting, as there is at the close there would be more good done. But when "Big Gun" relies upon death-bed stories and the mechanical tears that are pumped from his lachrymal fountain to move men and get up what is called an interest, all this combined movement upon sinners is not so necessary, but when every day piety and the plain word of God are to influence them the co-operation of the church is a thing very much desired and needed. So much so that I had rather have no brethren to assist than those who keep a cloud hanging about all the time. If the church knew her importance, her work, her influence and her rich reward, surely she would stand upon her dignity, claim her part in the work and would not be shorn of all honor by the preacher. The word of God should sound out from the church, but the

preacher must be on hand to do the blowing. Preachers and preaching are very good in their places but churches should live so that preachers will be more dependent upon them than they are upon these proclaimers of the gospel. 'Tis mortifying to hear old churches whining for the preacher as if he carried the spiritual milk bottle or the sugar-teat and they could not get it without him. It should not be necessary for a preacher to spend much of his time stirring up a body thoroughly furnished unto all good work, having the Spirit of life in them, being a city set upon a hill. The keeping itself alive is the work of the church and it is in poor plight to offer life and light to others if it cannot keep awake itself. 'Tis the duty of the preacher to do this work when not done by the church, but it is far better for him to give himself up to the ministry of the word. The family work of the house of God is a pretty one and is of a kind to interest all. This involves the building one's self up, strengthening the brethren, and at the same time so letting a light shine that the world will glorify our father in heaven. Why is it that men and women are so remiss in this work? Why do they let churches go down, their light dim, their influence wane, and the cause of God suffer in every particular, then cry out to some preacher, you did it, you are to blame for this? In order to succeed the church should work all her members, fight all her forces without a single reserve or exempt. Yesterday was the day of the election. A church with members as zealous as the brethren were that day would be a peculiar people.

One brother, living in three hundred yards of the church, who has not been to the house of God for weeks, but has been confined to his house by sickness, and was waited on with the bread and wine by the brethren at his house, was for all that hauled to the polls, (five miles) and on the next Lord's day went visiting, still not going to the house of the Lord. Another, a preacher, went to the political dinner on Friday and walked (about six miles) was absent from his post (only a mile distant) of duty on Lord's day, but punctual at the place for voting on Tuesday. "I will walk to the election (about five miles) and let any man have my horse to ride rather than for him not to go" are the words of another. I notice the brother who cannot attend night meetings could set up all night counting votes, and some who cannot leave Saturday, lost several days' work with the election. Now this is the way to make things move along. Paul planted Christianity with such zeal as this. Yes I have just heard of a brother who said he would walk on "his all fours" or go to the polls. This is the kind of zeal to have. Oh for such soldiers of the cross as these. If brethren would just be as intent upon going to the regular meetings on Lord's days and be as anxious to get others to go, oh what a church we would have. It would be a glorious church if in addition to this they would be as anxious about all the duties of the Christian. "Oh but there is a great issue upon us, we ought to be alive to its importance." As if the issue between heaven and hell is not great enough to call out all man's

energies, and the decision whether he shall be consigned to the chains of darkness, weeping, and gnashing of teeth, gnawing worms and unquenchable fire of the damned, or reign in immortal glory, in peace, happiness, without a tear, a sigh or a sorrow or a death; when this is decided to be unimportant, then it will be time to go wild over politics. There is more to be gained from the kingdom of God than from any government in the world. Besides the loss of heaven is greater than of all things earthly. Shall it be thought for a moment that we can openly show more zeal for other things than toward God, and yet be the special objects of his favor? It does look like men would move in proportion to the motive power before them. Let us look at things as they are before us. God proposes to draw intelligent creatures to him. To do this he places before them inducements to come, or reasons for action. Then God condescends to address man with reference to his own interest. "Be not weary in well doing, for in due time you shall reap, if you faint not," saith the Lord. Then he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life-everlasting. This is on the one hand, Satan on the other offers the kingdoms of *this world* (nothing in the next) and the glory of them. What else? Christ promises that you shall be with him and like him. And the devil shall take you with him, lifting up your eyes in torments being in hell. The one side of this is a very dark picture, let us look at its best phase and make the best of it. A good government offers you protection, in this world, peace and the opportunity to labor and enjoy the fruits thereof, but nothing beyond death and the grave. Now does it not seem that the greater motive power is in the gospel of salvation, by which we are planted firmly upon the rock of ages from which we look with a lively hope for an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. Remember all this vast heritage is a reservation for a certain class. Who are they? Those who are "kept" by the power of God (not the power of popularity, a big name or things of that kind) through faith (not the Spirit acting upon the heart personally, immediately, but by faith.) But how few of us will suffer ourselves to be kept. Satan can keep men serving him by the use of money, pleasure, fame, plenty to eat, drink and wear, but most of the world refuse to be held bound to the Lord's service by the pardon of sins, the promise of crowns of righteousness, "mansions above," "the tree of life," an entrance into the city" with pearly gates and foundations of precious stones, "immortality "incorruption," "everlasting life," of being "heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ." I was just thinking if God imposed such burdens upon men as Satan oh what a horrid religion it would be, what a cruel God that commands it. But it is nothing for a man to walk five or six miles to a political dinner or to vote, but to hear the same man give in his testimony God does not require that, and if he did he would not do it. Oh what a mistake. It is true the great heavenly Father does not

make men get drunk, drag themselves down into misery, go mad in a passion, act a fool in many respects, as the devil does, but he makes men truly wise, elevates their characters, directs their minds upward; yet a man will walk farther and go faster hellward than heavenward, do more to gain damnation than salvation. Is it not really astonishing in the highest degree that men hasten so zealously after the things of this life and are not moved to the highest pitch of ardor

When such transporting rapturous scenes,
Are rising to their sight—
Sweet fields arrayed in living green
And rivers of delight.'

And these are the very things they need, too. But man acts in the same line of inconsistency in other matters. I met a negro last Spring, with a sack of corn on his head, I surmised where he was going, but to elicit some information on the subject I asked some questions. He told me he was carrying a little corn out to the store to get a little "bacca." I tried to turn him from his purpose by reminding him of the scarcity of corn and suggested he might need it before the year was out (which thing he did not doubt) but he made one argument that weighed heavier in the balances of his appetite than all I said. He was out of "bacca" and must have some. While I was sitting at breakfast this morning, two men hailed at the gate. I went out to them one was a six footer and was smoking a cloudy pipe with a stem of two and a half inches long. They wanted homes with bread and meat in them. Piper did the talking, and after telling his business, apologized for coming on the Sabbath as he called it, he would

not have done so, but "rations" were out at his house. *But for all that he could smoke.*

I know a family who sold all their chickens last Spring and bought tobacco and snuff with the money. This is a fair swap of the necessaries of life for things to gratify the lusts of the flesh. 'Tis a similar trade to bartering eternal life for the joys of this life and it appears to me little joy, too, that which comes from the dear "bacca." Such persons as these present a sad picture, having wasted their substance in slavish service of the flesh, then by going for something to eat or for work in order to get something to subsist upon. Imagine ourselves, after having wasted all the God given time, talent and strength in the riotous living of sin, calling from the torments of hell upon Abraham to send Lazarus to cool our tongues, or think of ourselves having failed in death, and no friends to receive us into everlasting habitations wandering away from the presence of God and the glory of his power. And why, because we knew not God, obeyed not the gospel and would not have this Christ to rule over us. The church, I repeat, should be prepared for a meeting. Yes she should be prepared to be a church. That is not all, the preacher should be in proper tune for the occasion. It is a common thing or getting to be a common thing: for this valiant soldier to be armed and equipped with a full supply of borrowed yarns, anecdotes, "feeling" stories or cry tales. Then if his bottle is well filled with tears, when the time comes to storm the fortresses of sinners' hearts, he can shell them with

yarns, and the fountains of the great deep of his eyes being broken up he can deluge them with tears, then they must have religion sure. Make men sorry so they weep and mourn with such means as these and call that "Godly sorrow?" Not a bit of it. 'Tis the sorrow of the world. God has no hand in it. 'Tis dishonoring to Him. Leave the death of the cross and turn to the death of some little girl, or some wretched old sinner, crying and wailing as he leaves the shores of time "Lost, lost, lost forever lost," as a means to move men heavenward! How ridiculous! Tell this with a pious sniff, a saintly whine, the oozing out of a few tears and call it God's power of salvation. Why you know better. When the story of the cross and the promise of heaven will not move them, they will have to pursue the even tenor of their way downward, so far as I am concerned. God wants man's good senses addressed. He proposes to reason with him. The devil works upon his feelings. That which is born of Spirit is Spirit. But if the flesh, with its carnal tales and inventions begets anything 'tis nothing but flesh. Not a Spiritual emotion is stirred by telling of the man who got his back broken by a fall and of leaving his friends and relatives and goes to the grave howling over his fate. Calmly should sinners be led to contemplate their God and themselves. No man is prepared to preach to sinners until he is in love with them and in sympathy with their wretched condition. Then he can place himself in their position and look at the joys of heaven offered through the promises, and the horrors of hell made vivid by the threatenings of the Almighty.

I think it was old brother John Smith's advice to young preachers, (and it will do for older ones) to get right full of the word of God, then let it find its own way out soothing as it comes with the love of Jehovah and fired by the fear of the day of judgment. Style saves no body. It is truth that pierces the heart of sin and in turn proves a healing balm to its wounds and bruises. The Doctor may give medicine, in powder, pill or drops, it makes no difference. 'Tis the medicine that heals, not the way it is given. It is right, further, for the preacher to be humble, put his trust in God, be faithful, pray earnestly, fervently and continuously, be instant in season and out of season and leave the result with God, without resorting to tricks or human devices. If the good seed do not germinate in the hearts of men, if the sword does not pierce their hearts, then he is not to blame. I just as soon use the mourner's bench as the tale of horror that goes with it.

The church at Beech Grove is a noble band. The brethren come short of duty they say, but they are a teachable people and seem to be thankful to you for pointing out their wrongs. They expressed themselves as benefitted by the many lessons of wisdom read them from God's word, and pointed out to their special attention. They seemed really determined to be more zealous in time to come. Heavenly Father help us all to be deeply in earnest and to love thee forever.

Virtue never dwells long with filth. A consummate villain may be a clean man, but a scrupulously clean man is seldom a consummate villain.

Notes from Correspondence.

Bro. J. B. Smith, of McMinville, in a note a little more complimentary than we like to publish, says he would like to say a word relative to the Murfreesboro Co-operation meeting. "Such meetings in my judgment have a tendency to sap the vitals of Christianity. To say, "It is the sense of this meeting," is to say in substance what the Pope strives to impress, that the common people cannot read and understand for themselves; and to say we recommend so and so is a shame to men professing to be preachers of the gospel of Christ. Why not recommend the Bible? It, if it be true, is the only safe and infallible rule of faith and practice; if false we have no need of co-operation meetings or any other sort. Popery was born little by little, and had its origin in meetings similar to this co-operation meeting. For a committee to say, "It is our judgment" is to ignore the Bible. If it is the teaching of the Bible, why not say so—and give the chapter and verse? If it is only their judgment I would not give one fig for it. I'm no man's disciple, I propose to be Christ's.

There were some things recommended in this meeting contrary to the Bible. For instance the formation of colored people into churches distinct from the white. Let those brethren read Col. 3: 10-11 and say they have not done wrong."

But our brother especially chides us for attending such meetings and giving the example of what influence we may have for attending them. Well, it is our nature always to meet

a difficulty, not go around it. We do not think any one at the meeting or away from it will be misled by our attendance. We are not apt to let ourselves be misunderstood on such points. It is frequently best to meet such evils and expose them. This is a question on which each must act very much according to his temperament. Men of different temperaments always must meet difficulties in different ways, to meet them effectually.

The meeting was not called for a co-operation meeting, but a consultation meeting. One word more, There has been developed in these matters a wide difference between brethren. Yet we are all commanded to be of one accord, of one mind, and to walk by the same rule. We have always maintained that men who were desirous of obeying God, need never differ in their faith or walk. Why then this disagreement? Why the disagreement about baptism? The disagreement is not in reference to what is taught in the Bible on the subject of baptism. All admit immersion of the penitent believer is baptism. But the difference is about what is not taught in the Bible—about sprinkling, pouring, etc. It is the introduction of something not taught in the Bible that causes difference, division, strife. There is no difference among Christians as to any meeting enjoined in the Bible. But when men introduce meetings and practices not taught in the Bible, then come discussion, controversy, division.

D. L.

A strong man's enemies are generally the weak men about him,

Correspondence.

Bro. Hall, of Jackson Tenn., recently inquired of me in regard to matters and things "Spiritual" in this part of the moral vineyard, members of Congregations, etc. etc. And as I have been thinking for some time of asking the brethren east of the great Mississippi for help, I therefore take this mode of answering Bro. Hall's queries.

1. The Brethren are only sparsely settled in this section. There are some four or five small congregations in this County, (Izard.) They are all poor in this world's goods, and a little stingy, I being judge, probably 200 in the whole County. About the same number in Sharpe County, two Congregations in Stone County. I know of only one in Fulton County I know of only one in Independence Co. There are three or four in Lawrence Co. I know but very little further on east, not having traveled in those Counties lying on Black River. The preachers are brethren A. J. Tool, Lacross, Izard Co. J. Rowlet, Ash Flat, S. Brown, Mountain View, Stone Co. W. Wilkerson, Opposition, Lawrence Co., J. Garner, Big Bottom, Independence Co. John Lemmons, Pocahontas, Randolph Co. John Lemmons, (father to the former Lemmons.) Bro. Hodge, Conventence, Independence Co.

Brethren Hodge and old Bro. L. preach nearly all the time, the others depend upon their own individual resources for a support, and preach when they can. They are all poor and nearly all have families, which must be supported.

Now if Bro. Hall, or any other Bro. can afford to come over here without any special inducements, the brethren would like to see them, and greet them. Here is a large field uncultivated, reaching from Yellville to Mississippi River, and from White River into Mo. I know not how far. If a brother has a large heart, and a sacrificing Spirit, then he may come, if he is satisfied to be jolted over the mountains and hills, and through the creeks and Rivers on a punch of a horse, or mule, he may come. What few preachers there are here, are sacrificing and poor.

We need true men here to build up the good cause of the Master, men who will not stall at small matters, nor hard places.

We need a few strong men, who will bear the banner of the Cross aloft, and plant it in some of the strongholds of our Spiritual enemies. There are a few strongholds, which ought to be stormed, and taken. There are no pastorates to be settled in here, men must make their own marks here, hew out living stones from the rough quarry, build them on the one foundation.

Could not some of the strong congregations east of the Big River, send us a brother preacher to spend a few months in planting the cause at some of our important centres, such as I could mention? None of our brethren have ever preached at Batesville so far as known to me. There is no congregation at Jacksonport, and several other important places.

Should any brother conclude to visit Batesville, he can address Bro. Dr. James Barnes, who would take delight in affording any facility nec-

essary. Then I would like to bring the Bro. out into this section, thirty-five miles, and afford any comfort I could. It seems to me if the preacher would sacrifice some, not all, as some of us have to do, and the brethren some, much good might be accomplished.

We would like for a strong man to come if any, one able to withstand all classes of error, one who has made progress in the knowledge of the truth, not a modern progressionist. The brethren over here are satisfied with plain, strong teaching of the gospel. Many of them love the "law" of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, because they believe it makes men and women free from the law of sin and death. We are not willing to compromise away any part of the truth, because the truth make free.

Now brethren, you may lay this, or so much of it as you think proper, before the readers of the *ADVOCATE*.

Yours for the truth and hope of the gospel,

G. W. CONE.

Newburgh Izard Co. Ark. Oct. 1st. 1874.

Dear Advocate: The enticing arms of sleep have wooed Fannie and the babies to its kind embrace, and sweet rest is renewing them for the busy to-morrow: the fire has burned low while I sit musing all alone; the soft sound of the fitful blaze and the sharp ticking of the clock are the only sounds that disturbs the silence. The one reminding us that time is swiftly passing by, the other saying in language that speaks louder than words, thus must the fire of life in thee burn out.

I took my seat at the table intending to study my Bible lesson for next Lord's day, which I read over and then fell into an idle reverie partly fanciful and partly real, for the scroll of memory unrolled and scenes known to memory came back to view; and fancy ever ready to wander in the dark future brings hopes and fears as her bright pictures come and go.

It is pleasant for me to spend an hour in meditations on the past; and not far does the mind go in that direction until it falls in company with you, kind *ADVOCATE*, for many profitable hours have been spent in perusing your instructive pages; and this must account for me taking pen and paper to-night to communicate with your readers; through your voice I would say to them, many weighty responsibilities rest upon us, how have we thus far fulfilled them? How much time has been given to vain things? How many moments have gone into eternity bearing thence some treasure the God of heaven will accept and place to our credit? How many days has the balmy air of morning and the receding light of evening wafted heavenward from us the breath of prayer? Surely not so many as our necessities have demanded. And how many utterances of thanksgiving have escaped our lips for blessings received? Not as many as the times we have proved unworthy of these blessings. Let us renew our resolves and begin with renewed energy the battle for the right, determined to boldly meet every responsibility the word of the Lord places before us, if it be in a sphere ever so humble. Then

let us arm for the conflict using only the weapons of truth; many a shot we think falls short of our aim may mortally wound the adversary. Many a thrust of the two edged sword that we think is labor lost, may open a way for the light. The seed dropped by the wayside may gain strength enough to resist before the fowls of the air come to devour them. Some of the stony places may be broken through by the hammer of truth to give to the seed depth of root. The thorns and briars may be thinned out until the plant shall find room for growth. If it fall in good ground how great the return? Then let us scatter the seed of the kingdom along our pathway of life, and try to bring its fruit to greater perfection in our own hearts and in those where we find it growing. "He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Accept **hi**, kind readers, as an offering of love.

Sincerely your Bro.,

RUFUS HOOVER.

Bell Buckle, Tenn. Nov. 20, 1874.

NOTES.

In the South West Va. Co-operation, last year, Bro. Stone preached four months, one hundred and eleven sermons, taking seventy one confessions, received thirty-two dollars and forty cents remuneration. He has a large family of girls. We think it an outrageous shame that churches should ask teachers to do their work for them and fail to sustain them. We do not think it honest. But Plans do not cure the evil. The Kentucky State Meeting made special pledges

to Bro. Pangburn, to secure his salary as corresponding Secretary of the Ky. Missionary Society.

The last meeting of the General Board was its 25th anniversary. They did not raise money sufficient through the working of the Plan to pay their corresponding Secretary. Pres't. Pendleton delivered the Quarter centennial address. He gave an extended history of the Society, notices largely Bro. Franklin's course. He speaks of him as the hard to be caught and harder to be held editor of the *Review*. It throws some light on Bro. F.'s course, that is creditable to him. He reluctantly yielded assent to these schemes at first, but soon saw, they worked evil afterward.

President Pendleton enumerates Bro. P. S. Fall as one of the supporters of Plans, devised by men for spreading the truth. If he is, he has been greatly misunderstood in this latitude,

We have always understood him as being a most rigid adherent to the truth, that the Christian cannot transcend the clear limits of Scripture provisions.

Bro. McGarvey commenting on Bro. Franklin's objections to the Louisville Plan asks him for a better plan for the churches to co-operate. W. T. Moore says, "All that has been accomplished has been done by individual and church operation. They have not been failures. Why not accept these? W. T. Moore advises a giving up of all tried plans as failures. Twenty-five years of experiment all wasted in failures.

About a year ago we stated that some of the Ky. Brethren, recommended that no Christian should

support a man for the legislature unless the candidate was known to favor granting the wishes of the brethren in reference to Ky. University. In this way to make the church a political party in the election. This was indignantly denied as a misrepresentation by the *Times*, as we then published. In the number of Nov. 5, one of the editors says, "We most freely admit that many of them (the brethren) as individuals did work earnestly for the election of such men as favored their rightful claim to control their own institutions, and for the defeat of those who resisted this claim." What becomes of that denial then?

The *Times* and *Standard* both enter a denial of a failure to publish additions reported in the *ADVOCATE*. In the four numbers of the *ADVOCATE* including 40 to 43 are four hundred additions reported that have not been published in the *Times*, either from the *ADVOCATE* or from other sources. These are exclusive of over one hundred that we think possibly have been published in the *Times*, received from other sources.

We have not examined other numbers. But this is a fair sample of what has been for several years. We heard Bro. F. H. Davis of Hillsboro, a year or so ago, who was reading both papers, and who saw the neglect in these matters and the frequent charges of our doing nothing speak of it. He spoke then of collecting the numbers reported in the *ADVOCATE* and sending them to the *Times*. Whether he did we know not. We speak of these things not because we are sensitive that due credit is not being given to

the *ADVOCATE*. For this we do not care. The point with us is this: These papers profess to collect and publish all the news reported from all sources. They fail to publish these then say we are doing nothing, and attribute our failure to the lack of a human plan. The churches in their individual capacity are depreciated. We wish justice done them. We do not ask it for ourself or the *ADVOCATE*, but for the truth of God.

We know that our increase and work in Tennessee has been greater in proportion to our numbers than in any of the States having their "plans." We know too that our statements in reference to these matters are in all essential particulars correct. The *Standard* has of late done better in the reports than the *Times*. We have made no examination as to particulars. Its style of reporting renders it more difficult.

D. L.

New Translation.

A new translation of various portions of the New Testament. Translated to suit those who have but little confidence in the present version; and made to conform more closely to modern teaching and practice.

Mark 16: 15, 16: "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth shall be saved, and then he ought to be baptized."

Luke 15th chap. commencing at 20th verse: "And he arose and came to his father: But when he was not very far off, his father saw him coming, and straightway closed the door and retired to an inner apartment: And his son came and knocked for

admittance but got no response. Nevertheless he continued to knock, and call and cry and plead for entrance, but got no answer from his father.

And so he got his friends to intercede for him, which they did, day after day and night after night and with such vociferations as had not been heard since the prophets of Baal tried to arouse him—their god. 1st Kings 18: 26-28. And they continued thus for a long time, and at length they succeeded in arousing the old man's sympathies, so he opened the door to his son. And then such jumping and falling down in the dirt, and rolling over and kicking is seldom seen by any except among the heathen.

Luke 16: 27: 30: "I pray thee father, that thou wouldst send him (Lazarus) to my father's house, for I have five brethren, that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. And he said, Nay father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead they will repent, and moreover I have learned from good authority that Moses and the prophets are a dead letter, and you know, too, that communications from dead men are far better, so send him to warn them. But said Abraham, they are dead and cannot repent, nor believe or do anything unless the Holy Ghost first makes them alive, for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.

But father Abraham, Why would you direct them to Moses and the prophets? For dead men cannot hear or read, or feel, and as you say, cannot do anything, and moreover, how

is it, that the dead letter can kill a dead man?

Well son, Great is the mystery of Godliness, our master must punish those who have eyes and cannot see, and ears and cannot hear and hearts and cannot understand."

Acts 2: 37, 28: "Now when they heard this they were pricked in their heart and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do?"

Then Peter said unto them: Every one of you come up near to the altar of prayer, to the mourning bench, and we will pray for you, and you too must pray mightily to give you faith, and peradventure some of you or maybe all of you may yet religion, and be filled with the Holy Ghost, and then you ought to be baptized because your sins are remitted."

Acts 16: 29-32. "Then he called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas and brought them out, and said "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And they said believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house. And they prayed to God to give him faith, and all his house.

And they rejoiced believing in God, and then he was baptized and all his, straightway."

Acts 22: 16. "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and wash away thy sins, which are already remitted, calling on the name of the Lord."

W. D. B.

Obituary.

Please announce through the Advocate the death of my youngest brother, Mansil W. Matthews. He had been in bad health for years and confined to his bed for eight or nine weeks.

His disease was enlargement and ulceration of the spleen and his sufferings were great, but he bore them with that patience becoming a Christian till Sept. 24, when, worn out with suffering he calmly fell asleep in Jesus. He leaves a wife and two small children, two brothers and numerous relatives and friends to mourn his loss. But we sorrow not as those who have no hope. From a child he was familiar with the Scriptures, early in life he obeyed the Gospel, lived a faithful and consistent life, and quietly passed away.

Your Bro. in Christ,

J. C. MATTHEWS,

DONALTON, TENN. Oct. 22, 1874.

Addenda.

In our article on Inspiration and Imposition of hands we referred to Conybeare and Howson speaking of Barnabas in the order of their names taking precedence of Paul on two occasions, and then gave the explanation of but one time. To wit, at Jerusalem. Where the old association with Barnabas, his seniority in the gospel and doubtless in years too, naturally in the minds of his old associates, gave him the pre-eminence and caused him to be mentioned before Paul. The other occasion was at Lystra when Paul healed a cripple and the people took them for gods. They concluded they were Jupiter and Mercury. Jupiter was the father and superior of all the gods. In his ministrations he was supposed to be accompanied by Mercury. Mercury was the god of eloquence. Paul then as the chief speaker came to impersonate Mercury. Barnabas, as the more taciturn and no doubt, too, the more commanding in appearance and the elder, they called Jupiter. But Jupiter was the greatest of the gods and the father of Mercury.

Barnabas as Jupiter naturally took precedence in their minds and was so mentioned. The order of their names

corresponds to this precedence. The rule is positive that in all simple enumerations in Greek, the most important personage is first named, the least, last. Sometimes, an accidental relation to others in the list may throw a name out of this order. For instance Peter always stands first. Andrew the brother of Peter comes next because he is Peter's brother, and the brothers are mentioned together. So also James and John. This is a different application of the rule, but not a violation of it.

D. L.

Honorary Church Members.

Every congregation perhaps, is troubled with a class of members, that are hard to deal with. They seem to be exceedingly worthless, and useless. The elders find it hard work to manage them. I refer to that class of members, who are mere hangers-on. They are supremely indifferent, about everything connected with the success of the gospel. They occasionally go to church—arrive when the preacher is about half through—take a back seat, proceed leisurely to take an inventory of the audience, members, dress, &c. As soon as the congregation is dismissed, they are off again, for perhaps three months. If a collection is taken up for the poor, or for the church, they invariably have nothing to give. Call upon one of these to pray in public, and you almost take away his breath. He can only shake his head and his hands at you, to say by that proceeding—"Excuse me, dear me! no, I—I beg—Bro. A., you pray yourself."

Prayer at home? No, Sir. Not one of this class ever prays at home. In fact, they do not believe in prayer. This is the class, that believe in "fixed laws," "general providence," &c. "Where's the use" say they "of asking our Heavenly Father for anything? Is he not more kind than an earthly parent? Does he not know our wants?" Such church members as these, may raise up whole families of children, to scoff at religion—bring sorrow and disgrace upon parents, and finally to die, impenitent sceptics. I have never been able to see what use such members were to the congregation, which is the Body of Christ. If we take our own body as an illustration of the Body of Christ, we find that every member of the body does something. There is not a useless member in the whole body. Nor is there one live member, but *works*. So I understand the Scriptures to teach, that every member of the body of Christ, must find, and *do something*, in the body. Every member must work. There must be no honorary members—no drones in the hive—but all must work. If these lazy, idle, indifferent members, will not work, they ought to be put away. If any will not work, he ought not to be allowed to eat. If the church does not withdraw from such, they themselves ought to have self-respect enough to ask that their names be stricken from the roll of members. For any one living thus, who is at all acquainted with the New Testament Scriptures, must certainly know, that he has no more chance for heaven, than if his name had never been entered upon the books of the church. He ought to

see also, that he is only a stumbling-block, to those who are out, and to many who are in the church. There are many in the church, who *would* work, but for some one of the *honorary board*. There are many in the world, who no doubt would be pleased with the church, its doctrine, and its work, if it were not for the killing influence of the hangers-on. Every church should exhaust all its influence to save such, by putting them to work, and if all efforts failed, they should be cut off as dead members. They are worse than useless, and the church should *show them their sin*, that they may be led to repentance. Turn them over to Satan, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of Christ. So long as the church will retain them, they may perhaps imagine themselves saved, and will wake at last to judgment, where all are to be judged and rewarded according to what they have *done*, and having *done no good*, and of course *much harm*, they are lost, and the church in a great measure responsible, because she did not show these their sins, and lead them to repentance.

J. T. P.

M. Guizot's Confession of Faith.

The first page of Guizot's will contains the following remarkable declaration:

"I die in the bosom of the Reformed Christian Church of France, in which I was born and in which I congratulate myself on having been born. In remaining always connected with her I exercised the liberty of conscience which she allows her members in their relations with God,

and which she herself invoked, in establishing herself. I examined, I doubted, I believed that the strength of the human mind was sufficient to solve the problems presented by the universe and man, and that the strength of the human will was sufficient to regulate man's life according to its law and its moral end. After having long lived, acted, and reflected, I remained and still remain convinced that the universe and man are neither of them sufficient to explain and regulate themselves naturally by the mere force of fixed laws which preside over them and of the human wills which are brought into play. It is my profound belief that God, who created the universe and man, governs and preserves or modifies them, whether by those general laws which we call natural laws, whether by special acts which we call supernatural, emanating, like the general laws, from his perfect and free wisdom and from his infinite power, which he has enabled us to recognize in their effect, and forbids us from being acquainted with in their essence and design. I thus returned to the convictions in which I was cradled, always firmly attached to the person and liberty which I have received from God, and which are my honor as well as my right on the earth, but again feeling myself a child in God's hands, and sincerely resigned to so large a share of ignorance and weakness. I believe in God and adore Him, without attempting to comprehend Him. I see Him present and acting not only in the innermost life of men's souls, but in the history of human societies, especially in the Old and New Testaments—monuments of the divine revelation and action by the mediation and sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the salvation of the human race. I bow before the mysteries of the Bible and the Gospel, and I hold aloof from scientific discussion and solutions by which men have attempted to explain them. I trust that God permits me to call myself a Christian, and I am convinced that in the light which I am about to enter we shall fully discern the purely human origin and vanity of most of our dissensions here below on divine things."

The New York Tribune.

We have, by the courtesy of the publishers, been receiving through the year the *New York Weekly Tribune*. It has been a favor both to us and our readers. We have frequently quoted most wholesome articles from its columns. When we were approximating to manhood's estate we were anxious to know what the world was doing. We knew of no means of learning this so readily and so cheaply as to take the best newspaper in the world. That from its origin has undoubtedly been the *New York Tribune*. We subscribed for it when there was but one other number taken in the State. We read it for a number of years. It was founded and conducted by Horace Greeley. He was sternly honest, eschewed all claptrap and humbuggery—was piquant, pointed, frequently harsh and bitter in his style, but he gave news from every part of the globe in as condensed and pointed style as we have ever seen. There was much to object to in his theories. He had nothing

fixed in religion or morals, was lacking much in practical sense, was in many respects a speculative theorist. But he furnished a good paper. He became so violent a partizan in many respects that we finally ceased to read his paper.

It is now all that it was, freed from its party politics, its socialistic hobbles. It is a thorough newspaper. Impartial and just in its comments, wholesome in its social and moral tendencies, giving full accounts of what is going on in the world of science, theology and politics, devoting a large space every week to agriculture, it is the completest newspaper we know. The only danger is, Christians reading it, if not guarded are liable to become too much engrossed with the world's affairs. Price of weekly \$2.00 per year. Address New York *Tribune*.

D. L.

ITEMS.

We publish this week a communication from A. W. Pryce, of Miss. We, the *Itemizer* of the *Advocate*, cannot agree with him in regard to the Insurance business. If we are not mistaken, we once heard Dr. Brents express a decided opinion that it was, when rightly carried on, in no way allied to gambling or immorality. Besides we think that nothing immoral ever added to the continued prosperity of any community at large, and it would ruin any large city, were the Insurance Companies all to withdraw from it. We hope that some one of our contributors, who has studied this matter, will reply to A. W. P.

We acknowledge the receipt of New York *Tribune* Extra, No. 25, containing Gladstone's Pamphlet, The Vatican Decrees, Reply by Archbishop Manning and Lord Acton's letter. These treat of a question which at the present time is absorbing the attention of scholars and statesmen throughout the civilized world, viz., the relation of the Catholic church to civil government. The above Extra is of the utmost importance to the student of religious or political history and can be obtained by enclosing 20 cts addressed to the New York *Tribune*.

Judge J. L. Rice of Clarksville, Tenn., favored us with a call last week. Although not holding the same opinion in regard to politics as the editors the Judge is an earnest worker in the Lord's vineyard and we have heard that he sometimes takes advantage of his position to do some good preaching.

Brother Elijah Elgan, of Hutchins, Texas, says that from the 4th week in Sept. up to Dec. 1st, he has preached forty discourses resulting in adding to the congregations, one by relation, four from the Baptists and sixteen by confession and baptism. At the expiration of six months he promises to give us a full report of his labors.

A new religious denomination has been organized in Cincinnati. Thos. J. Melish, who some years since left the Christian Church and joined the Baptist is one of the signers to the "Basis." The denomination is to be called the "Union Christian Churches of America."

A female applicant for aid appeared at the office of the director of the

poor, in Detroit, the other day, with a sad and anxious look, and, on being asked what she wanted, replied, "I'd like some money." "How much?" "Well, I can't say exactly. How much do you generally give out to them when they want to buy a bead belt?"

THE ART OF LIVING.

In American houses it needs a thorough revision. Extravagance is the rock on which society is going to pieces. Let us face the danger before it is too late to avert it. Single people shrink from marriage because they see married people are living in a perpetual whirl of bills and competition and social hypocrisy. An air of common deception hangs around all our houses. We are afraid to be poor. On one thousand a year, how shall we keep up the appearance of three thousand? That is the standing social problem. In such a case, luxury in the parlor necessitates meanness somewhere else. Our lace curtains tell dreadful lies. Let us have a reform and come down to a specie basis. The well-to-do people ornament their houses with mortgages: The poor run bills. High pressure marks all life from the cottage to the mansion, and in three directions it is ruinous.

It is financial ruin.

Any man who sinks a dollar into appearances is on the way to sink a fortune in the same miry slough. Living costs about twice what it ought, fully twice in America what it does in Europe. There is no reason for it. This is a land of grain and fruits, and abundant work. The man who spends two thousand a year

could live on one thousand and be happier. Perhaps not indeed by himself. The social level needs to sink from extravagance to thrifty economy. If this is the way out of national trouble, it is doubly the way out of family worries. Be brave enough to decline appearances. Be honest, straight through your domestic arrangements, though the two-story must yield to the cottage and the pudding to corn meal.

It is mental ruin.

The money that is spent on horses and dress and table unecessaries would fill all our homes with books. The expensive furniture would be well replaced by pictures, to be a constant refining and enlightening influence. The money it costs many a family of moderate means to keep up appearances at the sea shore, would fill their house with treasures of knowledge and art. Instead of that, the glorious month at Long Branch is followed by eleven months of scrimping in the kitchen and general meanness all around.

It is moral ruin.

People cannot systematically deceive without moral penalty, even though the lies are velvet and silken. The penalty comes in the loss of self respect. The man who mortgages his property to keep up the family style, thereby mortgages his name to the devil. Instead of studying moral philosophy to find the causes of general social disorder—loosening of home bonds and lowering of purity—let us come down to an honest way of living. Let us make our carpets and our table and our clothes tell the truth, and then perhaps our children will. A blight will surely fall upon

all our social life unless we recover ourselves from that American vice—trucking—and live honestly before men. The seeds of hypocrisy are in the heart of every child that goes out from a household whose whole life is a sham. In vain we preach honest and sincerity from the pulpit, so long as the life from the pulpit wood to the home management is all a pretense. Society, you must come down and dare to appear what you are.—*The Interior.*

General News.

The Supreme Court met in this city, Dec. 8th. The Docket is unusually large.—The amount of whiskey manufactured in this district during last month was 38,036 gallons; amount sold 53,983 gallons; balance on hand Nov. 30, 431,141 gallons.—Edgefield has a paper, *The Edgefield News*, conducted by W. Matt Brown, Jr.—Mr. Baur, a leading citizen of the Swiss colony in Grundy Co., was murdered Nov. 30th. Four men have been arrested and the evidence is said to be strong against them.—The Congressional Convention of the fourth District meets in Carthage, Tenn., on the 17th.—Congress met Dec. 7th. The President's message was received and read.—A collision occurred between the whites and blacks at Vicksburg, Miss., on Monday last. It seems that the negroes attacked the town from several different quarters at once, but were repulsed by the whites. About twenty negroes and one or two white men were killed. As usual, the trouble was fomented by low-minded white men.—Daniel Ames obtained

last week a divorce from his wife, Mary Clemmer Ames, the well-known authoress.—The State Senate of Ala. has ousted Congressman Miller, Republican, and seated Martin, Democrat.—The number of emigrants who landed at Castle Garden from Jan. 1 to Dec. 1 of the present year was 145,362, showing a heavy decrease.—California is outstripping every other country in producing bees and honey.—The *Chicago Tribune* estimates that one hundred and fifty millions of dollars will pass into the hands of the farmers of the West this Fall and winter for hogs and grain.—Maj. A. F Goff, a well known citizen of this County died suddenly Dec. 8.

FOREIGN.

The operatives of Dundee Jute Mills to the number of 30,000 have struck work in consequence of reduction of wages.—The king of Hawaii is on his way to this country.—A list of the public drunkards of Liverpool is published in the papers every Monday morning.—At the celebration of Hallow-e'en at Balmoral, Queen Victoria and the Princess Beatrice headed the procession in an open phaeton, and like the rest of the people carried torches.—The Prince of Wales, the Duke of Ujest and Prince Metternich are said to have recently broken a faro-bank at Baden-Baden, the Prince winning \$15,000 and the Duke \$20,000.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Popular Gambling.....	1151
Query	1153
The Christian Convention of Florida..	1154
Laying hands on Paul.....	1155
Away up in Tennessee No. 4.....	1156
Notes from Correspondence.....	1163
Correspondence.....	1164
Notes.....	1166
New Translation.....	1167
Obituary.....	1168
Addenda	1169
M. Guizot's Confession of faith.....	1170
New York Tribune.....	1171
Items.....	1172
The Art of Living.....	1173
General News.....	1174

THE
GOSPEL ADVOCATE

VOL. XVI.

LIPSCOMB & SEWELL, Editors.

No. 50.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, DEC. 17, 1874.

A PERSPECT.

The year that now draws to a close has been in many respects a remarkable year. It was ushered in by the cholera and the money panic of the preceding year. The earlier portion of the year was remarkable for the greatness of the waterfall. The floods were more excessive, the freshets more sudden and destructive, both of life and property, than had been known for many years. The excessive wet of the early season was followed by a drouth equally as unusual. Two or three months of the greatest amount of water fall, were followed by as many of the least amount known, for twenty years past. From the 3rd day of May until the 26th of August, in many places in Middle Tenn. there was not a sufficiency of rain to allay the dust.

The excessive wet of the early Spring hindered much the preparation for planting, the prolonged drouth soon baked the soaked earth and it became too hard for tillage, what was planted of course could produce but little. This little was made less by the discouragements

that these providential hindrances excite among the masses of the people. So that they become idle, neglectful and indifferent, and by failing to do their part aggravated the evils.

It is in the industrial world very much as it is in the religious, men will labor only when everything is prosperous and encouraging. But few are able to endure temptation, or are willing to labor against the current. Too much wet, or too much dry discourages them and they refuse to labor. A steady, persistent pluck that can persevere and toil against ill winds and adverse circumstances is the one that always reaps the reward in the material, the intellectual and the Spiritual world. Some persons during the dry season ceased to sow or plant waiting for the rain to come. Others, with persistent determination ceased not to sow and plant at frequent intervals, determined to do their part in the effort to procure food. These latter failed not to be rewarded by some of their labor bearing fruit. Solomon says, "In the morning sow thy seed and in the evening withhold not thy hand (from sowing); for thou knowest not whether

shall prosper either this or that, or whether both shall be alike good." In other words, whether wet or dry, perseveringly do your part, you cannot tell which will do well or whether both shall prosper. No better rule for the direction of a farm, has ever been given than this spoken by Holy Writ.

But when the reviving and refreshing showers of Autumn came, nature, invigorated by rest, put forth extraordinary efforts, nutritious grasses soon covered the earth with a luxuriance seldom seen. The farmer began to rejoice in hope, as every herb-eating animal showed the fatness of his luxurious keep, and late sown grasses promised an abundant crop of hay; when almost in a single night the army worm swept over the land leaving no green thing in his way, and the fields became a scorched and naked waste. This at the time was the most discouraging of the visitations of evil, because no time was left for renewing of the loss. So our country throughout Middle Tennessee has commenced the Winter with the most discouraging prospects by far we have seen. Want and suffering seem to be inevitable to many beings of the human and brute species. A kind providence has so far ameliorated the evils threatening by a mild, open Autumn and Winter, which if it continues in our climate will much mitigate the suffering threatened.

Our condition is not so hopeless as large sections in the North West—where the growing crops, the whole support of man and beast were wholly cut off by the grass-hoppers. The rigors of a long unbroken winter render their condition truly pitiable.

These things should all teach man how helpless he is in all of his learning, his pride, his skill, his inventive genius, his enterprise, his foresight and his wisdom. The meanest insect that crawls upon the earth can come forth at the bidding of his Maker, circumvent his plans, render useless his inventions, baffle his skill, humble his pride, bring his best matured plans to nought, show how foolish is his wisdom, how weak his strength, turn his riches into poverty and make of vain proud, boasting man a helpless beggar.

God has always used these means to remind man that he was not God, that he was helpless, poor and needy and that he had his being and all he possessed here as a bounty from his maker. These things come to remind him of his dependence upon the All-wise Maker of Heaven and Earth. He reminds him by gentle touches of his power, then stays his hand to give time for repentance. If this does not come, a fearful destruction will come upon those who obey him not. These dispensations of providence, are Heavens opportunities for trying the faith and trust of the servant of God. His servants have faith in God. They trust him. They trust him not only when he blesses, when enjoying the sunny smiles of his favor, but they trust him when he frowns, when the fruits of displeasure cloud his brow—the true child draws near to him, crouches close beside him and trustingly awaits the coming smile.

If God is angry who can comfort? If he punishes who can deliver from his wrath?

Christians ought to have confidence

for good and not be always foreboding evil, thinking he never intends to bless and be hoarding what they have against the evil day to come. God's promises are for good to those who love him. Why should they anticipate evil and with gloomy fears forebode dark days? "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Let us do our duty to-day, God will take care for the morrow.

Christians, then, who are possessed of this world's goods ought with a generous trust in providence, to deal liberally in furnishing employment to the thriftless, the indigent, the needy around them. Close, rigid economy, all that pertains to our habits of life and personal wants, is always proper for a Christian. He who has fewest wants is richest. The present necessity especially demands Christian simplicity and frugality.

Christians ought to be prepared for such times as these. As churches, as individuals, if they will do the will of God, live as he directs, they will be prepared to meet just such demands as the providences of God now require. They will have enough of good to tide them and their friends over the evil day. God knew exactly what fortuities and misfortunes would occur to the world. He gave just the laws, the precise directions needed to enable his children to meet the difficulties and avoid the ills. He gave the directions that will change the misfortunes to the world into blessings to his children. But we refuse to follow the direction, and share the curses of the disobedient, instead of receiving from that cloud of wrath to the sinner,

the blessing it bears to the child of God. The same cloud that bears the thunderbolt of wrath to the disobedient conveys the blessing to the obedient. But we distrust, we disobey and instead of the blessing we receive the curse.

If we were true disciples we would be prepared to help and bless others in trials and emergencies. But we are in debt. We are harassed, we are troubled, we are vexed, we are cast down, we are hardened by our cares. We are in debt because we are in haste to be rich—we want riches that our families may live fashionably, luxuriously, sinfully. They must dress and live like the sinful world. To do this we must act as the sinful world—make sinners of ourselves and reap the rewards of sin, sorrow and trouble and harrassment here, and oh, friends, find no home with God beyond this world. What is needed then is a trust that causes us to be content and happy here, makes us live plainly, simply as God directs, to kiss the rod that smites and to say, "Though he slay me yet will I trust him."

Let us look to the future for good because God is good. His hand guides that future. Let us so live that his providence will bear blessings instead of curses to us.

The year that is now nearing its close has been a bearer of sadness to the readers of the *ADVOCATE*—in still other ways. In the Spring season of the year we were all surprised, shocked with the announcement of the death of the founder of the *GOSPEL ADVOCATE*, President Fanning. He was a strong man, seemingly but in the vigor of his manhood. Disease smote

him, ere his neighbors and friends heard of his sickness he was in the grave. Strength was his characteristic. He was strong physically, he was strong intellectually, he was strong Spiritually. Seldom do we see a human form so manly, so commanding in its proportions. He was a large man, yet not a surplus pound of flesh upon his frame. He was at once bony and muscular—every muscle well compacted and firmly knit. His appearance was solid and robust. He was the impersonation of strength and endurance. Yet in the hey-day of his mature manhood he was smitten so suddenly. He was strong in his will, he was strong in his purposes. He was strong in his convictions and clear in his perceptions. A conclusion reached, no man was ever firmer in his convictions than he. His style in speaking and writing was chiefly noted for a terse and pointed strength.

He was strong in body. He was strong as a thinker, writer, actor. Strong in his will, his purposes and determination, strong in faith, in work. Strong in his passions, his prejudices, and partialities, his approvals and disapprovals. In a word strong in his excellencies and virtues, he despised half-told truths and one sided pictures, he was strong in his failings and faults. Strong in both his strength and his weaknesses. He had some faults of character and of life. He had also excellencies of character and merits that are golden, whose memory should be cherished.

His labors have never received the notice to which their extent and results entitle them. The planting of the cause throughout portions of Tennes-

see, North and South Ala. and Miss. was due to his labor more than that of all others combined.

The seed he planted was winged, and from Tenn., Ala. and Miss., wafted across the father of waters to Arkansas, Texas, Missouri. Numerous churches can there be found that are traceable directly under God to his labors. But with all of his labors, his public position, his readiness with the pen, he has left no data from which to complete an account of his labors. He talked but little of his own work even with his wife. She has been endeavoring through correspondence to collect materials for a short biography of his life. His work entitles him to such a memorial. He planted the cause at Russellville, Moulton, Marion, Selma, and various other points in Ala. At Columbus, Aberdeen, Jackson, Canton and many other points in Miss. He carried the truth to these and other States. Cannot the brethren at the points at which he labored furnish Sister Fanning with an account of his labors, of all incidents and facts of interest connected with him and his work. Any one able to furnish such, will confer a great favor by sending the accounts direct to her at Franklin College or to us at this office.

In the midsummer we were surprised and saddened to hear of the death of the beloved J. H. Banton, of Waco, Texas. He was a man of an excellent temper and of great usefulness. He was a young man with a loving wife and a family of young but interesting children. His talent was extraordinary. He divided his labors between church and State, between

the law and the gospel. He had risen to a commanding prominence as a lawyer in his State and at the time of his death was judge of the district Circuit Court. His ability as a preacher combined with his excellent spirit gave him a position second to none in the State. Had he devoted himself to the gospel his usefulness must have been great. He persuaded himself he could support his family by the law and freely preach the Gospel and do much more good than to act differently, yet we doubted the right of his course. During our visit to Texas we spent a week most pleasantly with him and his family, and became much attached to him. Although he became somewhat estranged in his feelings toward us in consequence of our severity toward Bro. Kendrick, we never lost our feeling of regard, esteem and endearment for him. He was somewhat governed by rules of policy, but he was a good and true man. We sincerely mourned his death and sympathized with his bereaved family.

Still later from Miss., came the shock of the death of Bro. J. C. Oliver by his own hand. How deep the suffering, the anguish that produced such a determination. Reason was dethroned, morbid anxieties and suspicions prey upon the mind until the soul seeks relief in death. Bro. Oliver was beloved of all who knew him. He loved the truth, was a successful and earnest laborer for the truth. Was doing much to build up the cause in North Mississippi. Why God in his fatherly care should permit one of his servants to come to such an end seems strange. Bro. Oliver's was the saddest death of all.

Only a few weeks gone by, from

North Alabama came the news of Dr. Barclay's death. Others have spoken much of his death. We feel more interest in his life. His visit to Jerusalem as Missionary and the publication of his book, "The City of the Great King," has chiefly made him known to the public. They were but incidents in a harmonious and persistent life of devotion to his convictions of duty. He was a true hero. The heroism of his life was devotion to principle—to what was right—to his duty. Something of what the world calls visionary and idealistic in his nature, he was the slave of his convictions of duty. What higher degree of heroism can man aspire and attain to than that of sacrifice of everything to truth—high, heaven-born spiritual truth? Religion is heroism. The religion of the Savior makes heroes of all its true devotees. His was of a high, unselfish order. Heroism is unselfish. Bro. Barclay was a man of heroic spirit, sanguine, trustful, full of courage, shy and timid as a maid, simple and transparent in his character as a child. He was a pure, guileless man, an heroic, chivalrous knight, ready to brave any difficulties, sacrifice all selfish interests for the sake of the object of his love—Truth. The plight of his heart was truth. His faith was simple, trustful, unwavering.

He was somewhat lacking in worldly wisdom, did not consult prudence and was too trustful of men and man's devices. His mission to Jerusalem in its main objects was greatly a failure, and was given up. Yet his heart was ever in the work. The failure was no doubt chiefly owing to his trust in men and man's devices. Had he

gone to Jerusalem determined to depend upon himself under God, he would have succeeded. Making his calculations and arrangements thus, all help received from other sources would have been pure gain. But he went depending upon the promises made by human societies and devices and when they failed as they always do, he was left helpless, all his calculations were overturned and he was compelled to give up the cherished object of his life.

When Paul went without consulting flesh and blood, laboring with his own hands to supply his own wants, yet thankfully receiving all help sent him to enable him to do his work, and complete his mission, he set the example for all successful missions. Carey and Judson went forth in the same Spirit, so must all go who would succeed. They went, they did not wait to be sent.

Our brother in the unquestioning earnestness of his faith never saw the cause of his failure. The last words he wrote were in behalf of missions.

Dr. Barclay, though living for a number of years in North Alabama, traveled but little in our own country, hence was personally known to but few readers of the Advocate. He was a man whose timidity and indisposition to push himself forward, prevented him being properly appreciated. He lacked greatly in self-assertion. He was well advanced in years—had been exhibiting a tenderness that age brings for some months, though buoyant, joyous and active. His end fitted his life. The world seldom sees a man of the singleness of mind, guilelessness of Spirit of Dr. Barclay.

The year that brought the death

of these men of God has brought remarkable triumphs to the cause to which they had given their lives. All through our Southern country where the word of God has been taught by men having faith in God and his appointments, where his children have been free from the entangling connections with human organizations, the numbers who have been brought into the congregations are remarkable. But brethren are we converting them to the practice of the religion of Christ our Savior? Are we making them followers of God, as dear children, in their lives? Here is the saddening failure. We baptize them into Christ—they fail to walk in him. Let us labor to bring about this end. And while working more earnestly than heretofore to bring men into Christ, let us strive diligently to induce them to live as Christ directs.

Numbers of those brought in will fall away. It was so in Christ's day. It will ever be so. The world, the love of the world will cause the love of many to wax cold. But those who do not fall away can we make them earnest, working Christians? This is a thought that troubles one sorely. Let us pray God for help to do better ourselves and to induce others to do likewise.

Seldom has one year afforded a death record of persons so conspicuous in the truth in this section of country. Yet they are not dead. All that is good of their teaching or their lives will live. For God conserves and watches over the good. Only the fleshly, the evil the bad of our lives perish. It is a strange yet comforting truth, that whatever is done in accordance with God's law or his

will is conserved, preserved, increased and multiplied by the working of that law throughout the eternal years of God. On the other hand whatever of feelings, thoughts, purposes, deeds institutions we cherish and upbuild must be destroyed by the workings of the law of God. Evil pertains to the wicked only, and must be destroyed. Destruction is hell. Hell is the final home, the eternal doom of all the works that are not of God. "Every plant my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. The gates of hell shall not prevail against my church." They shall prevail against every other church, kingdom, organization in the universe.

Child of God, take courage. The future is the future of God.—The future, the eternal future will preserve the good. The future, the unending future will destroy the evil, all evil deeds, thoughts, actions, devices, institutions and men. Let us be good, let us do good, let us build up the good, let us do the work of God. Let us labor in the Lord. That labor cannot be in vain. Let us build up God's institutions. They are eternal. Let us so live in harmony with the laws of God, that the good which those laws work will bring good, pure unmixed good to us. The dying year is in the hands of God. It is now beyond our reach to change or rectify forever. God will purify it and our labors in it, destroying the evil in hell, conserving the good in heaven. Let us bravely, hopefully look forward to the coming year with trust in God, determine that less of our labor shall perish in hell, more of it shall be saved in heaven, than

of any former year in our life. Let us work while it is day, the night cometh when no man can work.

D. L.

MEMOIRS OF JESUS.

THE STORY OF THE ROMAN GUARDS.

When the Heavenly Messenger came down to roll away the great stone which confined Jesus' body in the tomb of the Arimathean, the Roman Guards were so terror-stricken at his appearance, that they "fell backwards to the ground," as before narrated, "and became like dead men." But, recovering from the shock, and finding Jesus gone, they rose up immediately, it appears, and went away to the city. For Matthew writes (xxviii: 11-15) "While they (the women) were going (to tell the Apostles about the resurrection), some of the guard came into the city and told the Chief Priests everything that had occurred. And having met with the Elders, they held a consultation, and gave a large sum of money to the soldiers, and said:

"Say: "His disciples came at night and stole him away while we were asleep." And if this [matter] come to the ears of the Governor, we will persuade him, and make you safe."

Then they [the soldiers] took the money, and did as they were instructed. And their report of the matter is published everywhere among the Jews to this day."

What will not professional soldiers sometimes do for a little money!—But I shall not take up time in moralizing here: the reader can make his own comments.

With regard to the absurd story which the unprincipled guards were hired to tell, and which those equally unprincipled Jews so diligently circulated, it is proper to remark, that it could not possibly be believed by any reasonable man or woman. None but the foolish, the grossly ignorant, or those blinded by prejudice, could be induced to believe, that the guards could truthfully testify concerning what had happened *while they were asleep!* But they were in danger of punishment, if the report came to the ears of Pilate, that they had let the body of Jesus be stolen from the tomb. For the Roman military laws were very severe on him who slept while on guard.* Therefore, they must be screened, in some way; and the priests were the men to do it. They acted more magnanimously with the soldiers than they had done with Judas, a few days before. They left *him* to his fate. But they were afraid of the soldiers, perhaps; and with money which they had no doubt collected from the common working-class of people, they helped those hirelings out of their difficulty.— And Pilate, (if the report ever came to him) cared so little for justice, that he perhaps never inquired into the probability of the story; being glad to get the matter off his hands as easily as possible. But besides the improbability of the story, in itself considered, it may be argued further, from the evident disappointment of the apostles, that they would not think of removing and hiding away the body of Jesus to make people think he had risen from the grave. When

they saw Jesus a prisoner in the hands of his enemies, their hopes in him all fled, as we shall see more clearly hereafter; and therefore, they could have no inducement to venture to the guarded tomb, to take away the Teacher's body, which had been as well cared for, and as decently interred by Joseph and Nicodemus, as they could possibly wish. Nor is it likely that they would seek to verify the prediction, which they seemed never yet to have fully believed, that Jesus would rise again.—But the testimony of the soldiers, who at first told the truth about the mysterious disappearance of Jesus from the tomb, and whose story was a virtual admission of this fact, may be received as proof of the resurrection.

In the very full narration of circumstances, attending the resurrection, which have been collected from the four evangelists, and embraced in the preceding chapter, we discover a multiplicity of statements concerning a great variety of facts, which would be sufficient to expose any imposture to detection; but which, indisputable as they are, form a body of evidence most convincing.

Some difficulties, however, have been raised, respecting the *length of time* that Jesus was in the tomb, and the *moment* of his resurrection. It is not doubted, that Jesus rose on "the first day of the week;" but the Jewish day began *in the evening*; and it has been asserted, that the resurrection took place in the evening instead of in the morning, as generally supposed.†

But the difficulty about the length

* See Horne. Vol. II, p. 60; Acts xii: 19, and xvi: 27.

† See B. U. Revision of John's Gospel, and the Note on p. 130.

of time the body of Jesus was in the tomb, may be briefly stated thus: Jesus explicitly foretold, that "as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish, so the Son of Man would be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Now if Jesus was crucified on Friday, as Smith and others say, and was buried on the sixth day of "Passion Week," and then arose early on the morning of the first day of "Resurrection Week," he would only be *one* day and part of *two* nights in the tomb! The common method of solving this difficulty, by saying, that as the first day of the week was the third day after the crucifixion, a part of a day was, by a figure of speech, put for the whole, and the prediction of Jesus, that he would "rise the third day," was fulfilled,—may not be satisfactory to some; and therefore I shall try to give the reader another, though possibly not a better, solution.

I have carefully read a very well-written explanation of this difficulty, by the Bible Union reviser of John's Gospel, which is too long to quote here. And, in corroboration of what he says, I have also read, in the Gospel Advocate of 1869, pp. 1026-9, an article from another paper, which had been communicated by "T. P. Crawford, of Tung Chow, China, Feb. 25, 1859."

I shall endeavor, as briefly and plainly as possible, to state the views of these two able writers, believing that their solution of an historical difficulty is worthy of attention.

Jesus was crucified on Preparation day, and was hastily interred in the evening, because the next day was a

Sabbath. John mentions, parenthetically, that "*that* Sabbath was a great one," as if to intimate, that it was not the ordinary weekly Sabbath. Now, according to the Law of Moses, (Leviticus xxiii. 5, 7,) the Passover-day was the 14th day of the first month, (April 6,†) and the next day (the 15th of Nisan) was "the Festival of unleavened bread." "On the first day" (of the Festival) said Moses, "you shall have a holy convocation: in it, you shall perform no servile work." This "Paschal Sabbath" would sometimes occur on the seventh day of the week, but not always. The 15th of the month would not, more than once in seven years, fall on the weekly Sabbath, if a month was one-twelfth of a year, as it is now.

Assuming, then, that two Sabbaths, the Paschal and the weekly, came between the crucifixion and the resurrection; and that one day intervened between the Sabbaths, these commentators place the crucifixion at Wednesday, and claim that all difficulty is removed by this supposition. For if Jesus lay in the tomb from Wednesday evening till Saturday evening, the prediction that he would remain in the grave "three days and three nights," was literally and exactly fulfilled.

The reader can choose between the old and the new solution of an important difficulty.

THE FIVE VISITS TO THE TOMB.

I shall conclude this chapter, but not all the proof of the resurrection of Jesus, by quoting a part of Note a, c. xx., of the B. U. Revision of John's Gospel.

† See Smith's Bible Dictionary, Art. "Jesus Christ."

"Some have supposed that there is considerable discrepancy between the statements of the several evangelists, in regard to the resurrection of our Lord, and its attendant circumstances. Says Alford, in this place: "I attempt no harmony of the accounts; I believe all such attempts to be fruitless; and I see, in their failure strong corroboration of the truth of the Evangelical Narratives." Now while I should be extremely sorry to rob the Evangelical Narratives of any legitimate source of "strong corroboration," yet, believing that their truth will be felt and acknowledged, even though it should be shown that these accounts are in perfect harmony with each other, I do not hesitate to avow the firm conviction, that between the several narratives of the four Evangelists, as far as they bear upon this question, there is not even the appearance of discrepancy. Difficulties there may be, and doubtless are, in the interpretation of certain parts of these narratives; but there are no discrepancies whatever. If, in what follows, I should be charged with having abandoned the province of the translator, and invaded that of the interpreter, I reply, that the thorough discussion of this question has a most important bearing on the translation itself, not only in the passage under consideration, but in other passages supposed to be parallel. Still, I shall not go minutely into the details of this question; but simply state, in as few words as possible, certain conclusions which I have drawn from the historical records, after a careful examination.

There were at least five different visits to the tomb, subsequent to the

resurrection. We know these visits to have been different, first, because they are represented to have taken place at different times,—second, because they were attended by different circumstances.

1. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, came to see the tomb, just at the close of the Sabbath, "as it was beginning to shine, (spoken of the moon and stars,) towards the first [day] of the week." (Matth. 28 : 1) Neither of the other three evangelists makes any mention of this visit. * *

2. The next morning, the first [day] of the week, Mary Magdalene made a second visit to the tomb, before daylight, while it was still dark, (see John xx. 1.) This time she was alone, and came thus early, probably, in consequence of her eagerness to ascertain the truth of the resurrection, of which she had vainly tried to persuade the other disciples the evening before. She did not stay long this time; but ran to tell Peter and John what she had seen. No other evangelist gives any account of this second visit.

3. Peter and John, immediately after the arrival of Mary Magdalene with the news of his resurrection, started for the tomb. At what hour they arrived, we are not precisely informed; nor can we say positively whether this visit was contemporaneous with any other or not; but the strong probability is, that they did not arrive 'till after daylight, since they looked into the tomb, and saw what it contained. * * This third visit is recorded only by John.

4. Not only after the departure of Mary Magdalene, as mentioned above and probably soon after the arrival

of Peter and John, in the dusk of the morning (Luke xxiv. 1.) the women who had prepared spices and ointments before the previous Sabbath, came to the tomb, bringing those spices, for the purpose of embalming him. Who these women were is not particularly mentioned by Luke. The two Marys were not with them as appears from Mark's narrative. Luke is the only evangelist who mentions this visit of the "women."

5. A little later, (at sunrise,) Mary Magdalene, (who had by this time returned from delivering her message to Peter and John,) made her third visit to the tomb, being accompanied by Mary the mother of James, and Salome. They also brought their spices and ointments, and now probably joined the other "women" mentioned by Luke. This was the last visit of which we have any account, and is recorded only by Mark. Now as it regards these five visits, I think we may safely challenge any one to point out a single discrepancy in the various narratives." (B. U. Revision of John, p. 130,

W. PINKERTON.

Nov. 15. 1874.

QUERY.

Messrs. L. & S: I wish to ask you two or three questions. Do you believe in a change of heart? If you do, when does it take place, is it before or after the immersion takes place?

Another question or two, Is Sunday the first day of the week, or is it the seventh day?

I want information on these ques-

tions, and I think you are competent to answer them satisfactorily. Give me an answer as soon as possible, and in the plainest style.

And oblige, your friend,

T.

Petersburg, Tenn. Sept. 7, 1874.

The word heart, when used in connection with conversion, means the mind, the understanding, as in Matt. 13: 15. The whole mind, with all its affections must be turned to God. The sinner must believe on Christ, must repent, must love God and the Savior, and then upon the confession of the name of Jesus, must be baptized into Christ, and upon the doing of these has the promise of pardon. This turning of the heart and affections to God must of course take place before baptism, and in human language might be called a *change of heart*, but it is not so called in the New Testament, and we do not care to call it such. The day that is called Sunday is certainly the first day of the week, and Saturday is the last or seventh day of the week. If this be not so, then we have no correct count of time at all. Our Saturday is the Jewish Sabbath, the day on which the Jews were required to rest. Jesus lay in the grave on the Jewish Sabbath, and rose on the first day of the week and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.

E. G. S.

Gospel Success.

Embracing the first Lord's day in Oct. we held a meeting with the brethren at Roan's Creek in Carroll

Co. Tenn., which resulted in seven accessions by confession and baptism. This is the second meeting they have had at that place. The brethren there are working vigorously to carry on the work of the Lord successfully, and are doing well.

Embracing the third Lord's day of October, we held a meeting at Locust Grove Kentucky, resulting in two accessions to the congregation. One of them the wife of Bro. B. F. Rogers who teaches school at Rich Pond, near Locust Grove, and preaches for the brethren on Lord's days in that section of country. The cause is gradually gaining ground in that community, in spite of all the opposition brought to bear against it. We also held a meeting with the brethren at Allensville Ky., in connection with our much esteemed brother C. M. Day, who preaches regularly for the church there, embracing the third and fourth Lord's days in Oct., resulting in three immersions. The Baptists had just closed a long exciting meeting, and the people were tired out going to meeting, and besides we had rainy weather part of the time. Still we had a very pleasant and interesting meeting, and we trust a profitable one. We have a band of earnest brethren and sisters there, but like many other places, they have strong opposition to contend against; but if they will be faithful, success is theirs.

Including the second Lord's day in Nov. we held a meeting of several days at Fountain Creek, Maury Co. Tenn. The immediate result of the meeting was, that eighteen were baptized, and two more made confession, one of whom was to be baptized on

Lord's day after the meeting closed, and the other was hindered by opposition. The brethren there have an opening to accomplish great good, if they hold out faithfully in the good work.

The fifth Lord's day of Nov. we went to Woodburn Ky., to hold a meeting, but the house is a partnership one, and the Methodists had commenced a meeting three weeks before, and had gotten up a big revival, and had the excitement so high that they refused to give way, and so we had to yield, except to preach one discourse on Lord's day. We then went to a school house some miles away, but in the same County, to wit, Simpson, between two meeting houses one a Methodist house, and the other a Cumberland Presbyterian; both of which were closed against us. We preached three days in the Cumberland house in 1871, and one time afterwards in the Methodist house. They were then both closed against us for good, and we suppose forever. At all events, we do not expect to seek admission into either one of these houses again. Nor do we blame them, if they intend to remain Methodists and Cumberlands; for these isms and the plain simple truth of God's word cannot agree together. But while they can very easily keep us out of their houses, they cannot close the hearts of the people against the word of the Lord. We continued the meeting at the above school-house about a week, preaching principally at night, and baptized twelve of the first citizens of the community. The people turned out well, and listened attentively, and we think the prospect good for many others to

embrace the gospel of Christ in that community. The new members, with a few others that had previously come into the neighborhood, are fully determined to build them a house of their own, in which they can meet to worship the Lord and teach heaven's truth without molestation.

E. G. S.

Brethren L. & S: I have been preaching as I had opportunity this year, the result is as follows :

At Kennamer Cove three have made the good confession and were baptized. Many others fully convinced that God's decrees do not cause the people to act at they do, and are almost persuaded to be Christians. Eleven have been baptized here at Sorta congregation. Others would be if it was not for "father and mother."

At Rocky Spring, in Aug. Bro. G. B. Stone and Bro. Elijah Mears met me and we held a protracted meeting. Seven were obedient to the faith there.

On Friday before the fourth Lord's day in August I was called to visit a congregation near the Paint Rock Bluff. Oh what a desperate condition they were in (Bro. L. I talked with you at Salem about the man who divided them;) two years ago I visited them every other month through the Summer; 25 were added that year during my trips. But alas they were divided and subdivided by not using discipline. A little leaven sure enough leavened the whole lump. I gave them a talk Friday night as before stated, met again Saturday. I stated that I thought at least all the male members had sinned by negli-

gence if not otherwise and I wanted to know who if any, yet wanted to live Christians. I also stated that I thought Bro. Morris would be willing to get up and acknowledge. And when I was through Bro. Morris arose said he had sinned as I had stated and never, no never would he so neglect a duty again. I then proposed that he take the oversight of the congregation. And all who wanted to live Christians and were willing to accept him as their shepherd to watch over them &c, come forward and give their hand, and by their actions to confess their faults one to another and to God and to pledge themselves to live aright for time to come. A suitable hymn was selected and while we were singing 13 came forward and gave Bro. Morris their hand. Thus the meeting was started, I continued it ten days, preaching twice every day except one, making calls every day, both to restore the old members who had wandered off and for new volunteers; the result was thirty-five, I believe, restored, and eight more came forward for baptism one of which was too unwell to go to the river and so was not baptized, thus that congregation was made to rejoice greatly in the gospel of Christ. O Lord may they ever prove true to the cause is my humble prayer.

JOSEPH WHEELER.

Dry Cove, Jackson Co., Ala. Nov. 10th 1874.

Don't be discouraged if you cannot always succeed in what you hoped to do. You will often find that some purpose about which you have been very earnest seems to fail, and in

consequence you are vexed and disappointed. But remember, though you may fail in *your* intentions, God has been carrying out *his* intentions all the while. He had another purpose in his mind for you ; and though the thing you meant to accomplish has not come about, never mind if you have done his will.

Better and sweeter far than to see our own plans succeed is it to work God's will, and carry out his purpose. Only let us commit our work to God in prayer and faith, and take all the pains we can about it, and then we need never be disappointed. It will not "fail" to be of some use, and he will not "fail" to grant us his blessing.

Ninety Years Old.

With a good appetite three times a day, delicious sleep, and not an ache or a pain in the whole body, the mind all the while fully alive to what is going on in the world, and all the time in good spirits. This is said of the late Ex-Gov. Throup of New York. He retired at nine and rose at six, taking a nap in the forenoon and sometimes in the afternoon also ; breakfast at eight, dinner at one, and tea at sundown. In suitable weather he spent a greater part of the forenoon in his garden, directing his men and assisting them, and for a short time in the afternoon was employed in the same way. He used no spirituous liquors, but took claret wine every day at dinner.

There are three things in the above narration which, if persistently carried out in early life, would do more

than all others toward giving an enjoyable old age.

Regularity in eating.

Abundant sleep.

A large daily exposure to out door air.

Regularity in eating, either two or three times a day, with nothing whatever between meals, not an atom of anything, would almost banish dyspepsia in a single generation ; as frequent eating is the cause of it in almost all cases, especially if irregular and fast. Abundant sleep and rest from childhood make nervous diseases a rarity ; to insufficiency of regular sleep and insufficiency of rest may well be attributed nine tenths of all sudden deaths, and a premature wearing out before the age of sixty years. All hard workers, whether of body or brain, ought to be in bed nine hours out of the twenty-four, not that so much sleep is required, but rest, after the sleep is over ; every observant reader knows how the system yearns for rest in bed after a good sleep, and it is a positive gain of energy to indulge in it. Every hour that a man is out of doors is a positive gain of life, if not in a condition of chilliness, because no indoor air is pure ; but pure air is the natural and essential food of the lungs, and the purifier of the blood, the want of which purification is the cause or attendant of every disease, while every malady is alleviated or cured by an abundant exposure to out-door air. If city wives and daughters would average two or three hours every day in active walking in the open air, it would largely add to exemption from debility, sickness and disease, and would materially

enjoyment and the
of life.—*Hall's Jour-*

dence.

GOSPEL ADVO-

I see a ques-

erson signed

of my re-

o meeting

s, six by

ow "B."

entance,

e way,

of no

on-

ch

ns

of

I hope that Bro. B. will give a Scrip-
tural answer to the question and sign
his name in full so that I may know
who B. is.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life,

J. T. CROW.

Castorville, Stoddard Co. Mo. Oct.
22, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: I have just return-
ed from a short missionary excursion
along, and to points antignous to,
the N. & C. R. R. My more espe-
cial engagements are here, with
the Murfreesboro congregation; but
with their concurrence, and approba-
tion, I am endeavoring as far as the
circumstances will allow, to do, at
least a small portion of the work,
that ought to be confided exclusively
to one man; aye, the work of many
men; that is, the missionary work,
that ought to be done, in all these
founding regions. I visited Fos-

Wentzaco, Normandy Tulla-

I learn Mr. Ditzler is in this section of country. The great burden of his preaching is against us, as a people, denominating us, as the 'disciples of Mr. Campbell; the doctrine we preach, as 'the water cure salvation.' In regard to our people in Kentucky, he says, we were once a very considerable people; some years ago strong for debates, but since certain debates had taken place in which he had participated, things had changed very much; we are no longer the people we had been, losing ground, coming over and joining the Methodists, no desire for any more debates. With regard to Tennessee, he and Dr. Brents had discussed the issues here; while he had fully sustained his positions, Dr. Brents was far from sustaining his, even after all the aid he received from his (Ditzlers) books; indeed, "Brents was now laid completely in the shade," was scarcely ever heard of at all.

Now perhaps brothers S

a man of honor, and lastly the interest of the cause of truth imperative demand a correction. I would respectfully submit that prepared, not railing, but stating by reliable persons to be published in deemed preferable that a number Bro William and sister P. N. & C. R. they be cited and exposed and charged

M

R

I learn Mr. Ditzler is in this section of country. The great burden of his preaching is against us, as a people, denominating us, as the 'disciples of Mr. Campbell; the doctrine we preach, as 'the water cure salvation.' In regard to our people in Kentucky, he says, we were once a very considerable people; some years ago strong for debates, but since certain debates had taken place in which he had participated, things had changed very much; we are no longer the people we had been, losing ground, coming over and joining the Methodists, no desire for any more debates. With regard to Tennessee, he and Dr. Brents had discussed the issues here; while he had fully sustained his positions, Dr. Brents was far from sustaining his, even after all the aid he received from his (Ditzlers') books; indeed, "Brents was now laid completely in the shade," was scarcely ever heard of at all.

Now perhaps brothers Sweeney and Wilkes of Kentucky, can give us some information on these matters. Dr. Brents can also speak for himself.

He denounced brother Lipscomb, of the *ADVOCATE*, publicly, before a large congregation, as "a liar and a fool." In an article he (Bro. L.) had published, he said there were seven or twelve errors, falsehoods, or lies. He (D.) sent him an article, correcting them; and when he (L.) corrected some of them, he published about as many more, (errors, falsehoods, lies) and he (D.) finding it impossible to hold him (L.) to the truth, just gave him up.

The credit of men who have debated with him, Brother Lipscomb's character as an editor, a gentleman,

a man of honor, and lastly the interests of the cause of truth imperatively demand a correction. I would then, respectfully submit that an article be prepared, not rendering railing for railing, but stating facts, certified to by reliable persons; that this article be published in the *ADVOCATE*, or if deemed preferable, in an extra; and that a number of the same be sent to Bro William McQuiddy of Normandy, and sister Butterbaugh, of Tullahoma N. & C. R. R. with the request, that they be circulated in the community, and expose these misrepresentations, and charges preferred.

Fraternally,

G. W. ABELL.

Mar. freesboro, Nov. 2nd 1874.

The other brethren can do as they please but for ourselves, we never undertook yet to pen for ourselves a character for either truthfulness or sense. We do not think we ever will. If the cause of Christ is dependent upon any one following Mr. Ditzler around to correct his slanders and misrepresentations, it is in a very precarious condition. We have so thoroughly exposed Mr. D. as an unconscious perverter of truth, a slanderer of good men, a falsifier of what he pretends to read, quote and translate that we shall give no more time or attention to him. Those who wish to believe him will have it to do. Those who do not, themselves can detect the falsehoods lying upon the very surface of his statements.

D. L.

"Woman's best shere—a contented home, safe from home, safe from gossip."

add to domestic enjoyment and the average duration of life.—*Hall's Journal of Health.*

Correspondence.

Bros. L. & S.: In GOSPEL ADVOCATE No. 40 page 953, I see a question asked by some person signed "B." in reference to one of my reports, in which I stated the meeting closed with fifteen additions, six by confession and baptism. Now "B." wants to know if faith, repentance, confession and baptism is the way, what is the other way. I know of no other way for persons that are responsible to God for the manner in which they live. Those other nine persons had previously believed repented of their sins confessed the Lord and had been immersed.

Some who had belonged to other congregation, but at that time were not members of any particular congregation. Others were received from the Baptists, who had been immersed, but were ignorant to some extent of the conditions of salvation but were serving God to the best of their knowledge. But when they arrived at the knowledge of the truth, they were willing to forsake their errors, and embrace the truth.

Now one question for Bro. "B." to answer: If a person believes that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God and repents of his sins, confesses the Lord with his mouth and is baptized will God grant the remission of his sins or not, though ignorant of the design of baptism?

I merely ask for information, and

I hope that Bro. B. will give a Scriptural answer to the question and sign his name in full so that I may know who B. is.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life,

J. T. CROW.

Castorville, Stoddard Co. Mo. Oct. 22, 1874.

Bros. L. & S.: I have just returned from a short missionary excursion along, and to points antiguous to, the N. & C. R. R. My more especial engagements are here, with the Murfreesboro congregation; but with their concurrence, and approbation, I am endeavoring as far as the circumstances will allow, to do, at least a small portion of the work, that ought to be confided exclusively to one man; aye, the work of many men; that is, the missionary work, that ought to be done, in all these surrounding regions. I visited Fosterville, Wartrace, Normandy Tullahoma, Decherd, Stations along the N. & C. R. R. and Manchester, on the Mc. & M. R. R. and a point near Col. Strickler's in Coffee County; all of these are good points for missionary operation. At Fosterville, you recollect, there is an infant congregation; one also at Decherd, the residence of brother Smithson, our blind preacher; one at Manchester and an infant one near Col. Strickler's. At the other points there are only a few scattering disciples; but had we a proper man devoted exclusively to this work, he might soon, with the blessing of God, build up flourishing congregations at these and many other points. Brethren let us endeavor in the strength of the Lord, to discharge the duties devolving upon us, and for which we shall be held responsible.

Hard to Please.

A few years ago, the *Western Recorder* and the Baptists of Ky., very actively and bitterly opposed the connecting of the State agricultural college with Kentucky University. We then hoped they would succeed as we felt sure the connection would hurt the cause of Christ. Many of the brethren now see this and desire to surrender to the State the agricultural College; and strange to tell, the *Recorder* and the Baptists violently oppose this. We conclude they are hard to please.

D. L.

Heartiness in Work.

There is a great danger among active Christians of undervaluing heartiness in work. The discussion of methods is apt to put out of sight other elements of success. Critical minds are disposed to sneer at self-forgetting enthusiasm, and too often this foolish contempt is allowed to check the promptings of affection. This is a fatal mistake, a cruel wrong, which ought to be rooted up. Religious work is like music—it is worth nothing without soul in it. One may imitate a tune by turning the crank of a hand-organ, but he only is a musician who thrills us by the vibrations of his own heartstrings, who makes us feel that he feels the sentiment which the tune expresses.

In no work is heartiness more effective than in direct labor for the salvation of men. The truth spoken in love, the plea made from unalloyed affection, the loyalty which is manifestly a personal attachment to the

Savior—these make the conquering force which it is not in the heart of men to withstand. And it is a mockery to attempt Christian work without it. Heartily, as to the Lord, should be the motto of every one who believes that God is love, and that love rather than knowledge is the seat of power.—*The Testimony*.

EGOTISM.

BY AUNT FANNY.

What a long word! What does it mean? Perhaps the little story will tell you.

Once upon a time Fred was arranging his library in a dear little book-case—his last Christmas present.

"How nice they look!" he exclaimed. "I'm the boy to fix things up tip-top! On the first shelf, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Nightcaps*, *Popguns*, and *William Henry's Letters to His Grandmother*; on the second, *The Rollo Books*, *Socks*, *Jack Hazard*, and *Doing His Best*; and on the last all my *St. Nicholas* magazines. Aha!" he chuckled, "that looks jolly, I declare!" and, standing on one foot, he whirled round and round, until he tumbled against the wall.

"Lend me your *Robinson Crusoe*," said his little brother Charlie, who stood near, smiling at Fred's antics.

"No, sir! I will not lend it to you."

"Oh! do, Fred. I will take the greatest care of it. I won't hurt it the least bit."

"No, I tell you!"

"Why not?"

"Because you can't read, and your

hands are always dirty, and—and—you shan't have it, there!" and Fred began to shut the doors of the book-case.

"Just let me look at the pictures," begged the little fellow.

"No, get your own *Nonsense Book*, and look at the pictures in that."

"Why, brother," said Charley, with trembling lips, "how cross you are to me."

"Well, it's because you are such a plague and a bother! You are nothing but a little troublesome boy, and I am almost a man."

Then Fred sat down before his bookcase, and began to whistle, and teeter backward and forward in his chair. Presently he took a card out of his pocket with a funny picture on it, and began to read this ridiculous stuff:

"Benny Bowbell bothered and bantered a little bumpkin or booby. This little bumpkin and booby bore his bothering and bantering without bobbing or blinking. But, by and by, the little bumpkin or booby began to be belligerently bounceible."

"Am I a little bumpkin and booby?" asked Charley, with quivering lips.

"Yes, you are," said Fred.

"I lent you my big hoop this morning, and I did not call you a bumpkin and a booby."

"Oh, you are going to stick that in my face, are you?"

"No, Fred; I didn't mean that; I——"

"Well, I'll never borrow anything of you again, and don't you ever ask me for anything, because I won't lend it to you. Do get away, I can't bear the sight of you!"

At this cruel speech poor little Charley burst into tears. Then Fred mocked him, saying, "boo-hoo, boo-hoo," stooping over and dancing round him with his hands on his knees; then he pulled out his handkerchief and wiped his eyes, and pretended to wring the tears out of the handkerchief—at which last insult Charley fairly howled, and his mother, who was entertaining company in the parlor, thinking that bumped heads or cut fingers must be the matter, excused herself, and rushed up stairs into the room.

The moment she appeared Charley stopped crying, for the generous little fellow did not wish to have his brother reproved; but Fred was too full of *egotistical selfishness* to notice any one but himself, or to stop talking. He did not see his mother, but kept on dancing before Charley, saying: "Cry, baby, cry, stick your finger in your eye, and tell your mother it was I."

"Stop, Fred! What is the meaning of this?" asked his mother, very much displeased.

Charley did not answer, but Fred began to tell what a bother his brother was—"wanting his books just as he had put his library in such splendid order."

"Oh; so Charley began the quarrel, did he?"

"Oh no, mamma, I did not say that; he did not want to quarrel, he was only a bother and a plague."

"Did you call him so?"

"Well," said Fred, standing on one leg, and turning red, "I did."

Just at this moment the sister of the boys, a pretty young lady, stood at the open door and called out

"Charley, you dear little curly-wig, come here; here are two golden bananas, and I must have a kiss apiece for them."

Charley ran and curled his arms round her neck, crying, "Oh, thank you, Sister Kate," and kissed her so hard that he made a deep rosy spot on her cheek. Then what do you think he did? Why, he flew to Fred and gave him the biggest banana.

Fred took it eagerly, and was just about to strip off the golden skin, when his mother said, "Stop, Fred, you have your books *all* to yourself; Charley can easily eat both the bananas; I am surprised that you would accept one—the biggest one, too—from such 'a plague and a bother'!"

It was Fred's turn now to feel unhappy. He laid down the fruit, and going slowly to his book-case, he took down *Robinson Crusoe* and said, "Take it, Charley, and look at it long as you like."

"Oh, thank you, brother," cried the little boy, running to Fred and kissing him affectionately.

Big tears sprang into Fred's eyes. He was ashamed to look at his mother, as she drew him to her side, and putting her arm round him, said, "I am sure you have found out how mean and selfish you have been; how full of egotism. You were thinking, 'What a fine fellow I am! What a fine library belongs to me. I'm not going to disturb my books for such a snip as Charley.' This feeling is called *egotism*, and now that you know the meaning of the word, I do hope that you will never again practice the vice."

"And may he have the *bandan-*

ner?" asked dear, generous little Charley.

"Yes," answered his mother, and she kissed both her boys.

My dear little readers, do pray and strive against such a selfish, mean feeling. Never boast of yourself or your possessions. Lend your books and toys to each other gladly; by doing thus, you will keep that dreadful monster with the long name—Mr. Egotism—out of your dear little hearts.

And now I am not certain whether I have preached a sermon, or told a story. Which is it?

WHISTLING.

It is a prevalent notion that a propensity to whistle indicates an indolent or trivial nature. When we are indulging in it by way of soliloquy, and some one meets us, we stop short, snapping the whistle in two, as though we had been doing something disreputable. There is nothing more healthful than this exercise. The faculty has been granted to those of us who cannot sing much. Though we might lose our way in a tune if we attempted the customary soprano or bass, we revel in the sounds which, without any skill, rush with the breath through the contracted lips. Grumblers seldom, if ever, whistle. The art is left only for the blithe and cheerful. whether it is the whistle that makes the good cheer, or the good cheer that makes the whistle, we have now no time to analyze. This kind of music is an inspiring accompaniment of work. Let two masons be busy on the scaffolding, their strength alike, their hods and trowels alike,

the one who whistles will better set the bricks and rear the truest wall. Do not rob us of any of our helps. What the world wants is an augmentation of diversions and entertainments: not less skip and romp and curvetting, but more. God has no objections to it, or he would not fill the kitten with play and the lamb with frisk and the dog with facetious bark, and send the night wind around the gable with mouth full of whistle.

—*Christian at Work.*

Was Christ an Impostor?

Can it be true, that Jesus was only an impostor? Could twelve illiterate men, by asserting and preaching a falsehood, lead thousands to believe the falsehood? Some of them, too, the profound scholars, and best lawyers of the time? Could it be possible that these (the twelve apostles) should preach a lie—suffer all the indignities that could be heaped upon them, persist in telling and preaching a falsehood, and afterwards die rather than denounce it? Could it be possible, that Jesus as an impostor should change times and seasons, and move in his own way, the whole world of mankind, establishing a new religion, changing the old church polity; in fact, abolishing old religions and establishing his own—changing the great Sabbath, or rest day of the week, from the seventh to the first day, and making the change universal? So incorporating his own doctrine, the truth of his teaching, in the hearts of the people, as in a great measure to direct their civil law, and government? In so much that time is measured from the

New Era, the birth of Christ. And no document, public or private, can be legal, unless bearing on its face "The year of Our Lord."

The man who can believe all this, has more credulity than is required to make a Christian. For he can believe something without evidence, whereas Christianity requires faith of no man, without first presenting the evidence, or testimony to be believed. The man who can see no good in Christianity, is wofully blind: Liberating its millions from bondage to sin, superstition and idolatry, it gives peace, and permanent happiness to men. It lifts up humanity, energises the soul and awakens all our better propensities, and feelings: And when burdened by sorrows in this life—when wearied with the toils and anxious cares of the present, it inspires with hope of a better life, an everlasting rest, an existence where trouble shall never mar our joy. Where all tears shall be wiped away forever, and the soul bask in the sunshine of God's presence forever. Who would not be a Christian?

J. T. P.

For Others.

Search the wide earth over, and mark all its happiest souls. Among all there are none so purely, humbly happy as those who almost forget themselves in bestowment of consideration for others. The seeking of happiness is its sure destroyer. It comes unsought, as the dawn-light over the earth, yet raising all hearts to meet it.

INDEX TO VOLUME XVI.

Another Denomination.....	5	Big Martyrs.....	732
Away up in Tennessee... 7, 41, 78, 151, 1042, 1088, 1112, 1141, 1156.		Bethany College.....	856
A New Congregation.....	20	Business Christianity.....	899
Agassiz and children.....	114	Brevities.....	958
A card from the Moderator.....	135	Being his own Pilot.....	1003
Anno Domini.....	166	Burritt College.....	1021
Action of Baptism.....	169, 313	Be ye steadfast.....	1065
Alphabet of Proverbs.....	191	Bro. Hundley's Queries.....	1100
Another Debate.....	253	Church News 46, 89, 112, 160, 190, 203, 234, 256, 283, 305, 333, 360, 378, 403, 429, 453, 466, 516, 567, 597, 617, 644, 669, 694, 712, 733, 762, 773, 802, 855, 880 901, 930, 948, 1025, 1052, 1068, 1086, 1128,	
Advertisements.....	311	Correspondence 139, 148, 359, 475, 487, 833, 939, 977, 1023, 1258, 1110, 1164, 1189.	
A dangerous Medicine.....	334	Conformity to God's will.....	143
A True Picture.....	335	Crusade of the women upon the whiskey sellers.....	217
A new process of washing.....	359	Church Union.....	232
A Misrepresentation.....	452	Church organization.....	350
A sentence.....	463	Correction.....	357, 809
A trip to Barren Co. Ky.....	520	Co fession of Christ.....	388
Absurdities.....	654	Commendatory.....	447
A talk to students.....	659	Children and toys.....	454
A word in Season.....	695	Cleanliness.....	662
Am I baptized into Christ.....	699, 801, 874	County meeting of the Christian Church....	586
Angels.....	707	Church Work.....	635
A sermon on Repentance.....	743	Co-operation.....	665, 678, 753
A trip to West Tenn.....	767	Change of address.....	674
Answers to Queries by J. Creath.....	855	Changes in the Religious Denominations. 702, 837.	
A good School.....	857	Climatic.....	716
A word to the Young.....	861	Co-Education.....	740, 906, 1071, 1147
A Northumbrian sermon.....	885	Care of new Converts.....	664
A child's Fate.....	908	Christ the great need.....	768
A Lad just beginning to run.....	920, 954	Cho era.....	809
A Request.....	960	Consultation Meeting.....	810, 933
Answer of J. Creath to F. F. Taylor.....	961	Co-operation Meeting.....	898
Announcement.....	1029	Church Legislation.....	915
A talk with the Boys.....	1099	Courage and Cowardies.....	996
Addenda.....	1169	Commands vs Traditions.....	1048
A Prospect.....	1175	Christian Convention.....	1049
Brents and Ditzler debate.....	54	Co-operation Meeting in Ellis Co Texas... 1074	
Bro. Wm. E. Hall.....	64	Confiding in God.....	1078
Born of the Spirit.....	109	Ch rist's Second Coming.....	1115
Books for Boys.....	204	Christian Employers.....	1127
Baptism.....	205, 443		
Baptism and Remission of sins.....	409		
Be Diligent.....	431		
Beware.....	477		
Baptism a sign.....	649		

Dr'slerisms.....	124	I must have a Religious Newspaper.....	380
Death.....	137	Is the Bible definite.....	405
Dancing Christians.....	155	In the servants coil.....	528
Drudgery and Work.....	168	In Memoriam.....	488
Death of B. C. Sewell.....	261	Imposition of hands.....	730
Dress.....	307	Is Faith Obedience.....	799
Dress in Church.....	310	Items 956, 981, 1004, 1029, 1063, 1077, 1101, 1124, 1148, 1172.	
Druggists selling Liquors.....	341	Is it right for Christians to aid in the man- ufacture of strong drinks.....	960
Death of Geo. S. Morton.....	363	Is the Devil safe.....	963
Deserving Fellowship.....	444	Is it true.....	965
Death of Bro. T. Fanning.....	450, 521	Is faith a command.....	1036
Discussion at Locust Grove Ky.....	577	Jesus Consolatory discourse to his disciples..	29
Death of Bro. J. C. Olliver.....	483, 640	John Jones' new Leaf.....	140
Death of C. L. Randolph.....	805	Justify'ng Jonah.....	512
Difficulties of a Devious way.....	865	Jacob and Esau.....	505
Dr. Brents' "Gospel plan of Salvation"....	893	John Leland's Ordination.....	862
Defence of a Dogma.....	944	Jesting.....	834
Discussion.....	1051	Just a few more stitches.....	956
Educational.....	45	Kings of Business.....	1103
Extreme Views.....	60	Life.....	68
Elder G. W. Abell.....	222	Light, Trashy reading.....	258
Early Recollections.....	395	Little Foxes.....	381
Erastus the Chamberlain.....	420	Laying on hands.....	385, 625, 529, 1055
Evangelising.....	453	Life Insurance.....	391
English Mothers.....	480	Lights and Shades.....	406
Evangelizing among the Col'd people.....	713	Life of Elder W. Scott.....	474
Explanation.....	500, 790, 1112	Leipers Fork Congregation.....	486
Errata.....	833, 1029, 1053, 1149	Last half of Vol. xvi.....	596, 622, 641, 698
Easy Way.....	875	Love to God.....	601
Egotism.....	1191	Letters to J. Creath.....	681
Future Rewards and Punishments.....	34	Lost Money.....	672
Faith, not Works.....	83	Look to your cellars.....	740
Faith, what is it and how does it come.....	345	Lines to the memory of T. Fanning.....	763
Folly and sin are fretting.....	750	Lessons for the day.....	771
Giving.....	47	Laura's self-denial.....	812
Get the right pattern.....	92	Let us have fair play.....	951
Gossiping and Tattling.....	230	Laying hands on Paul.....	1155
"Gospel Plan of Salvation".....	404	Marriage.....	66
Graduating Paraphrenalia.....	642	Meeting of col'd brethren in Franklin Tenn.....	88
God's Plan of pardoning men's sins.....	702	Memoirs of Jesus 130, 265, 433, 543, 984, 1031, 1079	
Giving Alms.....	739	Mar's Hill Academy.....	114
General Convention.....	901	McMinnville School.....	115
General News, 609, 633, 957, 982, 1005, 1030, 1053, 1078, 1101, 1125, 1150, 1174.		Murfreesboro Female Institute.....	115
Go Forward.....	939	May a Christian live in adultery.....	163
Gospel Success.....	955, 965, 922	Moral Culture.....	167
Golden Wedding.....	995	More about the Brents & Ditzler Debate..	193
Gratitude to God.....	552	Mark XVI. 16.....	255
Henry Compton Sr.....	18	Matthew XIX. 12.....	270
Health Hints.....	278	Meeting House.....	284
How to save Money.....	378	Mass Meeting of Disciples at Jackson Tenn.	329
Habits, good and bad.....	384, 806	Matthew xii. 29.....	418
Hymn Books.....	429	Man and Woman.....	419
Hopkinsville School.....	468	Missionary Evangelist's work.....	469
Healing the Sick.....	593	Music.....	475
Honor to whom honor is due.....	615	Ministerial Supply.....	608
He is not Crowned except he strive lawfully	638	My Captains orders.....	648
Human Organization.....	662	Marriage with unbelievers.....	760
Her silence saved me.....	859	Making things right.....	808
How to keep our actions right.....	991	Maxims for a young man.....	907
Hard to Please.....	1191		
Heartiness in work.....	1191		
Intercession by Spirit.....	39		
Infant Baptism.....	184, 248		

INDEX.

Ministers of the Gospel meddling in politics	924	Queries on Church Organization	159
Materialism	947	Queries on Christian Discipline	226
Manufacture of strong drink	960	Queries on Co-operation	839
Mother	972	Query on Repentance	890
More of my experience	964	Queries on Holy Spirit and Paradise	99
Murfreesboro Meeting	1016		
Mrs. Winslows Soothing Syrup	1098	Reformation in Catholicism	47
M. Guizot's confession of Faith	1070	Repentance toward God and faith in Christ	212
		Reply to Brother Ramsey	298
New Year's Address	1	Real kindness to the sick	835
Not Governed that way	96	Romans vii. viii. and ix.	337
No one perfect	192	Religion in daily Life	351
Now ready	310	Repentance, what is it?	361
New Music	360	Review of Rev. J. Atkins Sr.	412
New Advertisements	360, 910, 934	Read Carefully	686
No number next week	672	Reason—Faith	706
Not by Chance	742	Reply to Bro. I. N. Jones	793
No Success without industry	765	Restitution	860
Notice	1054, 1077, 1101	Remarkable marriage Ceremony	931
Notes from Correspondents	1163	Real Religion	932
Notes	1166	Re-Baptism	1093
New Translation	1197		
N. Y. Tribune	1171	Shall Christians act as Jurors	97
		Support of Teachers	104
Obituaries 20, 46, 67, 115, 189, 213, 284, 310, 333, 353, 404, 475, 644, 674, 719, 735, 764, 807, 856, 901, 999, 1075, 1146, 1168		Singing and working	116
Our Chat with the Little Folks	21	Something new under the Sun	186
Our Motto	49	Sewing-machines	191
One more appeal	256	Shall Christians withdraw from the disorderly	223
Old Harding's Revenge	214	Social Lives and Christian work	287
Officers Again	293	Sunday School books	330
Objections Answered	343	Swinging on the gate	406
Our Money	385	Supply	500
Open Hearts and ready hands	741	School Teacher	523
Only one way to pardon Men's sins	796	Strange things	543, 778, 1008, 1135
Our convention at Murfreesboro	822	Striking God's children	571
Our Bible class	876	Sunday Schools	572
Our own sins	885	Something for the Girls	697
Our Murfreesboro Meeting	1033	Spare well—Spend well	646
Ordaining to the Ministry	1087	Spiritual Gifts	658, 998
		Supposed Contradictions in the Bible 683, 691, 863.	
Personal	65, 621	Schools	713
Pluck out your right eye	90	Satisfactory	821
Power of simple preaching	166	Self-murder of Jesse Oliver &c.	822
Prayer of Jesus	179	Short Notes	886, 910, 933
Prayer in meeting	185	September	907
Postponing baptism	231		
Preaching Funerals	257	The Frank in Debate	24, 73
Peter's Renunciation	322	The Limits of Science	66
Political rights of Christians	371	The fatal year of Popery	62
Perfection	423	Teacher Wanted	68
Pay your small debts	754	The art of loving	71
Preaching on a Velocipede	672	The sinner's four steps	77
Plainness of the word of God	701	Taking up the Cross	84
Paul's Confidence	841	The appearance of evil	115
Praying for an outpouring of the Holy Spirit	846	“ Cob-House	116
Put away Lying	861	“ Treasury and other things	125
Prayer for Conversion &c.	1095	“ Ditzler Debate	127
Parental Responsibility	1139	Talent and force	161
Popular Gambling	1151	The Christian Name	164
		“ Fireside	165
Queries 65, 87, 111, 163, 207, 234, 247, 277, 328, 357, 367, 401, 423, 448, 471, 490, 540, 568, 594, 609, 640, 712, 826, 869, 906, 916, 965, 999, 1027, 1075, 1121, 1148, 1183.		Religion needed	168
		“ Serpent of appetite	190
		“ Fullness of the Gentiles and the Future	

INDEX.

of the Jews.....	196	The bankrupt Law—Church Discipline.....	845
“ mode of baptism.....	199	The Cause of Christ in Johnson Co. Texas	850
The condition of the Jews.....	202	The Way men obtain pardon.....	867
“ College Pen.....	216, 621	To our Readers.....	896
“ Deacon’s Excuse.....	237	The Hippodrome.....	897
“ Great Commission.....	241	The Faithful boy.....	908
“ Gospel Plan of Salvation.....	252, 451	The’sin against the Holy Spirit 911, 935, 990,	
“ Olive Branch.....	260	1060.	
To the Little Folks 262, 285, 311, 581, 526,		The needed Comfort.....	953
575, 645, 870, 835, 758		The cost of coffins.....	976
The law of sin and death.....	276, 364, 514, 652	Tardy Justice.....	989
Teaching the colored people.....	281	The value of man.....	1003
Tenn. Penitentiary.....	296	The Rothschild women.....	1028
They know and do not.....	307	The Louisville Plan.....	1064
The Bible proves itself.....	379	The Murfreesboro Meeting.....	1120
“ Main thing in life.....	405	The Christian Convention of Fla.....	1154
Temperance Societies.....	417	The art of Living.....	1173
Things that are wanting.....	441	Unequally yoked.....	113
The Caskey and Price Debate.....	442	Union.....	975
“ Fort Worth Debate.....	463, 485, 516, 566	Unspotted from the world.....	1060
“ Little people of sorrow.....	478	Visit to Locust Grove.....	481
“ Birth of the Spirit.....	495	Whither are we drifting.....	3
“ Sins of youth.....	551	Women as Tacticians.....	13
To brethren Pessimus and Poe.....	564	Worship God.....	38
The name.....	565	Why so few are saved.....	145, 175
“ Repentance and Death of Judas.....	569	Words of comfort.....	225
“ Third Heaven.....	570	Woman’s worst foe.....	240
“ Point of change.....	596	Woman’s work in the household.....	267
“ Difference.....	599	Woman’s Work.....	305
“ Lineage of Christ.....	605	What is it, when all is done.....	381
Teaching and Baptism, etc.....	606	What kind of company do you keep.....	393
The Methodist on intoxicating liquors.....	620	Why cannot farmers be neat.....	430
“ Strange Class.....	624	Wayside Blessings.....	454
Truth progressing.....	641	We all have faults.....	522
To the Disciples of Christ in Texas.....	661	With what judgment ye Judge &c.....	524
To the brethren and friends of Education... 661		West Tenn. Co-operation Meeting.....	587
The Spread of the Gospel.....	669	What is Christ to us.....	647
The new birth.....	679	Witness of the Spirit.....	716
That fine.....	683	Waco State Meeting.....	749
The Lord’s Supper.....	685	Women as housebuilders.....	825
The Gospel Plan of Salvation.....	690	Whose are the kingdoms of the world.....	999
Teachers wanted.....	711	Wayside Words.....	1000
The Bible Immortal.....	715	What shall we offer.....	1004
Taxation that kills.....	736	Weddings.....	1076
The A. & S. business.....	754	Whistling.....	1193
The sewing Goblin.....	814	Was Christ an Impostor?.....	1194
The sin against the Holy Spirit.....	815		
The pure Heart, What is it?.....	817		