

HYDROPHOBIA

AND

ITS CURES

BY

ONE WHO WAS A VICTIM.

PUBLISHED BY

DANIEL SOMMER,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

COPYRIGHTED BY
DANIEL SOMMER
AUGUST, 1895.

INTRODUCTORY.

COURTEOUS READER—You are hereby introduced to a volume which is intended for the benefit of mankind. I kindly request that you will carefully examine what it declares. The first chapter thereof has been written with the hope of giving comfort to multitudes concerning one of the most mysterious and most dreadful of physical diseases. The other chapters thereof are intended to save you from a spiritual ailment that is more common and more dangerous than any physical disease of which mankind have ever been victims. If you be personally free from the spiritual ailment that I mention you may use this volume in saving those of your friends therefrom who are afflicted therewith. But every one into whose hands this volume may be placed is earnestly and URGENTLY requested to read it carefully chapter after chapter. Unless it be read with care, and each chapter be read in its order as given, the best advantage of this volume can not be gained.

THE AUTHOR.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., June, 1895.

HYDROPHOBIA AND ITS CURES.

FIRST CHAPTER

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

The word Hydrophobia means *fear or dread of water*. In this chapter will be found a statement of what I know concerning physical Hydrophobia and its cures. There is a spiritual ailment which may be justly called Hydrophobia. That shall be considered in the succeeding chapters of this book.

A FEW WORDS TO THE SKEPTICAL.

A certain Quaker in eastern Pennsylvania did not believe that any kind of cancer was curable. He said that if twelve of the best physicians would say that a man was afflicted with cancer, and the man would get well he would deny that it was a cancer. But if the man would die with his affliction then he would admit that it was a cancer.

This incident illustrates the idea which many physicians have with reference to Hydrophobia. If the patient whose ailment is declared to be Hydrophobia recover they will deny that he was afflicted with that particular ailment. But if the patient die thereby then they may admit that he was really afflicted with that ailment.

As time has passed external cancers of all kinds have been cured. There are remedies which will kill cancers and cause them to drop out by the roots. The man who

denies this is not well informed. No doubt the time will come when Hydrophobia, even as cancer, will be regarded as curable. This chapter on the subject is a contribution, in that direction. The last persons to yield on this subject will probably be the mature physicians of the Regular School. One of their latest books declares thus concerning Hydrophobia: "There is probably no other ailment which so generally proves fatal." But there are physicians of one or more of the other schools who are satisfied that no case of Hydrophobia must prove fatal by reason of the nature of the disease. The writer of this chapter is a living demonstration that a man can be afflicted with Hydrophobia, be treated, get well, and live sixteen years afterward.

MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH A MAD DOG.

In January of 1879 I was living at Kelton, Chester Co., Pa. I owned a black dog of good size that I kept chained most of the time because he would run and bark at people who were passing the house on the public highway. One morning early in the month just mentioned the young woman who was serving as a domestic in my family came in the house with her dress torn. Referring to the condition of her dress she said, "See what that hateful dog did!" I went out and watched the dog for a brief period. Seeing that he seemed very restless and that the strap around his neck was rather loose I went to him and buckled it a little tighter. As I did so he took my left wrist in his mouth and I felt his teeth thereon, but he did not bite me. Turning from him I went into the house by way of the kitchen. By the time I reached the dining room one of my little boys in the parlor exclaimed, "Sport's loose!" Upon hearing that exclamation the second of my boys opened the dining room door and started to go out to see the dog. As he did so the dog met him and bit him on the leg just above the boot top, sinking one tooth.

in his flesh. I then decided that the dog probably had the Hydrophobia, otherwise called rabies. So I went into the kitchen, took up a wire muzzle, which I had sometimes put on the dog when I turned him loose, called him to me, and as he came I slipped the muzzle over his head and fastened it around his neck. I then shut the kitchen door on him, called for a new muslin band and the chain with which he had been previously tied, and therewith secured him. As he had bitten my son I was anxious that he should live till I could know certainly that he was a rabid animal, But in order that he might be made more secure I concluded to put him in the cellar. So I unfolded the doors, that opened outside of the house, and tried to coax him down into the cellar. He drew back. I pulled him and he became vicious. I then took hold of him and forced him down and ordered the doors to be shut. I then began to fasten the chain to the cellar steps. But he pounced upon me and snapped viciously. I put my thumb in the band around his neck and held him off with my left hand while I tied the chain to the steps with my right hand. He turned on my hand and still tried to bite me, but could not because of the wire muzzle that was over his head. Yet in his effort to bite me he scratched my wrist and tore open the skin just across where he had previously had it in his mouth. That was when the mischief was done, though at the time I tried to think that as I had not been bitten there was no danger. But that was a mistake.

After fastening the chain as well as I could with one hand I moved every thing of importance in the cellar up on a swinging shelf out of the dog's reach. By some means he managed to get loose and get the muzzle off, and then he tried his teeth on every thing in the cellar on which he could get a hold. He seemed vicious in the extreme, and spent much of his time snapping his chain.

The next day I decided to kill him. So I borrowed a gun and proceeded to shoot him from the door leading from the dining room into the cellar. The gun was defective about the lock, and I had some difficulty in making the hammer burst the cap. As a result my aim was not well directed, and the shot only broke the dog's shoulder. He neither howled nor even yelped. In fact he showed no signs of pain, but walked around on three feet dragging his disabled leg. *Then I knew that he was mad.* A second shot killed him dead, and I dragged him out into the woods near by and buried him. Thus ended my personal experience with a rabid dog, but the results thereof were then in the future.

SYMPTOMS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DISEASE.

I was very anxious about my little boy who had been bitten, but endeavored to think that my own wound was too slight to endanger me. So I watched the boy both day and night. Three weeks elapsed and no evil was developed. In the meantime my wife had taken our babe and had gone on a visit among her relatives, leaving me to keep house with the older children and the hired girl. When three weeks had elapsed I found myself restless at night. I would rise and sit up in bed because unable to sleep. The girl who served as a domestic afterwards stated that I seemed irritable, and, contrary to my custom, would send the children out of the room when they would come in where I was writing. Besides, sharp pains in the upper part of the stomach began to manifest themselves. Then my eyelids became inflamed. But with all this it did not occur to me what these symptoms meant. I was thinking about my little boy, and while he seemed well I tried to feel satisfied. But on the evening of the twenty-fourth day after my conflict with the dog I was sitting at the supper table, and the girl poured out a glass of water. As soon as I saw that water and heard it in

motion the most terrible sensations were felt in the regions of the stomach and upward, I at once arose from the table saying, "Excuse me, I am not well." As I did so I found myself unnerved as I had never been before, though the sensations had somewhat subsided. Walking out into the garden I wondered what such symptoms meant. The sight of water, the sound of water in motion, and even the thought of water had become dreadful beyond all expression. Besides, I was unnerved and trembling so that I could hardly recognize myself. Nothing had ever before shocked me. I had never heard it thunder too loud, nor had I ever seen a flash of lightning too vivid, nor had I ever beheld a storm cloud too black and threatening for me to enjoy. Then what such symptoms could mean I knew not. Yet I suspected that they might mean Hydrophobia. So I decided as a test to go and pump a bucket of water. Accordingly I went into the kitchen and walked to the bucket. Some water was in it. As soon as my eyes fell on that water the terrible sensations I felt at the supper table arose in me again like a flash. I turned from the bucket and walked to the door. As I did so I said in audible tones—"*It's Hydrophobia!*"

DECISION WHAT TO DO.

Thinking of the injury I might do others I went up stairs. Then I called the young woman who was the housekeeper at the time, and requested her to go for a neighbor named Henry Rudy. When he came I sent for another named Charles Mason. This second neighbor I sent across the fields about a half mile to a Quaker named Singley, who was a retired Thompsonian physician. When he came I explained the symptoms to him so that no doubt was left on his mind concerning the character of the ailment,

TREATMENT OF THE CASE.

Friend Singley then sent Charles Mason back to his

home with the request that his wife should send him his lobelia and accompanying herbs. When they were brought over the old doctor proceeded to give me a lobelia emetic. Before so doing he inquired of me how I thought I would feel if some one should bring me a cup of any kind of fluid to drink. I answered that I did not know. But I had not more than made that answer before I felt a sickened sensation at the thought of drinking anything. This being made known to him he told me, when he brought the first cup of lobelia steepings, to close my eyes and fix my thought on some other object or subject as intensely as I could, and while thus holding the thought to take the cup and drink its contents. I did so, and thus continued to do until sufficient had been drunk to upset the stomach. Then with lobelia, and his accompanying herbs he gave me a thorough emetic. When this was over and the stomach was drained of its contents, including the virus which had brought on the attack by its accumulation in the stomach, I felt better, especially in my left arm which previously felt very uncomfortable. Then the emetic was followed by a heavy sweat under cover, after which the sheets on the bed and my underclothing were changed. The next day in the forenoon another emetic was given me, followed by a heavy sweat, after which my body was well wiped and rubbed, and the sheets and clothing changed as before.

ANOTHER PHYSICIAN.

While undergoing the discomfort, and I might say torture, of the second emetic I decided to send for Dr. John Mulberry, an Eclectic physician of Chatham, a village about five miles from Kelton P. A., or Penn Station. As memory serves me a young man named Will Kelton was selected to go after the doctor. The doctor came and brought with him Paine's Treatise, in which was a chapter on the treatment of Hydrophobia. On examination it

was found that Paine endorsed the treatment that had been begun, except that he recommended vapor baths instead of sweating under cover. But as they were not prepared to give vapor baths the two physicians agreed to continue the treatment as it had been begun, making the emetics and sweats as severe as my system could bear and giving me a dose of lobelia (third preparation) every hour or two between the emetics. I said to them, "Doctors, you have in me a hundred and seventy pounds of body to work on, and I wish you to crowd the treatment, as I do not feel as if my life's work has yet been accomplished." According to the decision rendered by the physicians, and the request made by the patient they proceeded. Friend Singley (Edward, I think was his first name) gave me from one to two lobelia emetics each day, and after each one he rinsed the stomach well with warm water, and then gave me a cup of gruel to drink, which I always relished. Notwithstanding the estimate which certain physicians place upon lobelia, yet when the stomach was rinsed after each emetic I was always hungry. When the cup of gruel had been drunk I laid myself back on the pillow and generally slept an hour or more as peacefully as a babe.

This treatment continued for about one week. When lobelia would no longer upset my stomach the old Quaker brought me an admixture of salt and mustard. That was horrible to drink, and would sometimes upset my stomach before I could swallow it. I asked, "What is that stuff?" In his Quaker language he said, "Thee is becoming rather inquisitive."

After each sweat was over and my clothing had been changed I was at liberty to walk about over the house and occupy myself as I felt disposed. In the meantime my wife was sent for and came home. When five or six emetics and periods of perspiration were over I found that

I could wash my hands and face in water if I would not look at it, and would be careful not to splash it while washing. I could also drink a glass of water if I would not look at it, nor think about it while drinking. The sound of water in motion disturbed me almost as seriously as the sight of water. Once when everything was quiet I was shocked by hearing the water pour in the bucket while some one was out doors pumping. While the active symptoms of that ailment were upon me, I verily believe that I would have leaped over a precipice or leaped into a fire rather than to have even looked upon clear water. It was dreadful "beyond all expression to my sight, and the sound of water in motion was horrible to my hearing.

But after a week or more of the mentioned treatment had continued I found that I could pump a bucket of water if I did not look at it steadily. Yet even then I had another strange experience. A dog was barking some distance from the house, and my inclination to bark was so nearly beyond my control that, as memory serves, I put my fingers in my ears so that I could not hear the barking.

Dr. Edward Singley, the Quaker, was highly gratified with his success, partly because the treatment he had adopted was with him a conclusion of his own. He knew nothing of Dr. Paine's work till Dr. John Mulberry brought it to my house. As a result Dr. Singley seemed willing to give up the case as cured when the active symptoms had chiefly subsided. But I felt that I was not yet out of danger. A poison which in twenty-four days could so multiply itself as to overthrow a man in the vigor of life was to my mind so dangerous that I was unwilling to leave the slightest vestige thereof in my system. With this conclusion Dr. Mulberry agreed, after Dr. Singley had pronounced me out of danger,

ELECAMPANE TREATMENT.

Doctor Paine, of the Philadelphia Eclectic School

think, in his Treatise already mentioned recommended elecampane as possessing properties which will antidote the poison of Hydrophobia.. Accordingly Dr. Mulberry decided that it would be a safe precaution for me to take one of two courses of elecampane. Indeed, as soon as he became aware that the active symptoms had developed in my case he recommended that my little son should be treated with that remedy. Accordingly, a lady member of the Church who was very devoted to the little fellow took him in hand and gave him a full course of elecampane. That has been over sixteen years ago, and up to this writing he has shown no symptoms of the disease.

What is called a course of elecampane consists of nine doses given every other morning until three doses have been taken by the patient, and then after omitting three mornings let three doses be again given as the first three were given, and then, after omitting three mornings again give three doses more as the first and second course of three doses were given. In other words, if the first dose be given on Monday morning the second should be given on Wednesday morning, and the third dose on Friday morning. Then after passing over three days give the "next dose on Tuesday morning, the next on Thursday morning, and the next on Saturday morning. Then pass over till the following Wednesday when another dose should be given, and another on Friday, and another on Sunday morning. This is called a full course of elecampane, and is thus given so as to pervade the entire system. A dose for an adult consists of a table-spoonful well heaped in a quart of new milk and simmered to a pint. In order that this process may have proper results the milk must be closely watched and constantly stirred unless the simmering be done in a farina kettle. When the medicine has been thus prepared it should be taken warm on an empty stomach and nothing else eaten for at least six

hours. Such a course of treatment Dr. Mulberry gave me once, and then I took one or two courses afterwards myself as a precaution against a second attack. One experience with Hydrophobia was sufficient for me. Whether it was necessary to take so much elecampane, or even a single course thereof, I know not. I simply know that after the active symptoms had been overcome by the use of lobelia that I took several courses of elecampane and have lived up to this date (sixteen years since) enjoying good physical health.

GRADUAL RECOVERY OF MY NERVES.

Though I state that I have lived in health for sixteen years since my experience with Hydrophobia, yet I do not wish the reader to suppose that my nervous system at once recovered from the terrible shock that it had received. As previously stated the virus was received through my left wrist. After the active symptoms of the ailment had passed away the nerves on my entire left side gave me considerable trouble. I thought for a time that I would be stricken, with paralysis. Shooting pains through the left side were common. Other symptoms not really painful were frequent. The left hand was not as steady as the right. I took one or two remedies which seemed to benefit somewhat. In course of time most of these symptoms subsided, and for years my health has been as good as it probably would have been had I never been afflicted with the rabies. Besides, the dreadful recollection has passed from my mind in its vividness, so as not to annoy me as it did for several years after the attack. Yet I assure my readers that the effort to write this detailed account for their benefit has been a very unpleasant task. I dreaded it before I began and now rejoice that it is finished,

SEVERAL CURES.

The reader may have been hitherto puzzled to know

why I have spoken of "cures" of Hydrophobia. My answer is, because there are several cures. Of these I shall now speak in their order.

THE MAD STONE CURE.

Many of our readers have no doubt heard of the celebrated and mysterious mad stone, which is alleged to be a stone that will cling unto a hydrophobia wound until charged with the virus, and then after being put in a fluid of some kind will cling again and again until all the virus is drawn from the system. For years I had but little confidence in the existence of such a stone, but the testimony in favor thereof is overwhelming to a rational mind. Therefore though I have never seen one, yet I have no doubt concerning its existence in different parts of the country. But such a stone is so seldom found that it is sometimes difficult to have access to one. Besides, the mad stone is not always reliable, or is not always applied with such care as to make it reliable. Several years ago a man wrote me stating that his wife had died with Hydrophobia after having used the mad stone. To those who are skeptical concerning the mad stone because of its mysterious character I kindly ask, Why not be skeptical concerning Hydrophobia itself because of its mysterious character? Possibly some are, and if so it would be well for them to be skeptical on the question, whether they themselves are rational human beings.

THE ELECAMPANE CURE.

I have often thought that should I ever be bitten by a mad dog, or in any way get the poison of Hydrophobia again in my blood I would first try to find a mad stone. Even if successful in so doing I would, after using the stone, then take several courses of elecampane. The ailment is so insidious and so terrible that assurance should be made doubly sure, if possible, in opposition thereto. No one without a personal experience with

Hydrophobia can have any just conception of its terrible character. I have been told that my physical health, nerve power, and will power had much to do with my recovery. But I know that the poison of Hydrophobia, when sufficiently accumulated in the system, takes no account of health or strength, but will shake a man from center to circumference as readily as a child. In fact, it takes hold of the nervous system, the very citadel of a man's being, and shakes him in a manner which implies, *You are my victim*. If I had not been so situated that I could turn instantly from the sight of water when I saw it there is no doubt in my mind that a terrible spasm would have been the result. To have looked at water five seconds would have been, sufficient to have produced a spasm, or to have heard water in motion that long would no doubt have produced a spasm. Think of such a poison from the smallest particle multiplying itself within a few weeks or even a few days so as to overthrow a strong man, and then its insidious, its *mysterious*, its DREADFUL character must at once be admitted. I thought for years that I would possibly have another attack nor do I yet feel as comfortable with reference thereto as if I had never been a victim thereof.

THE LOBELIA CURE.

This I regard as the best cure for the active symptoms of the disease. If the patient can swallow a fluid then give an emetic and drain the virus from the mucus membrane of the stomach, and continue the treatment, as in my own case it was continued, until the active symptoms subside sufficiently to give elecampane time to work. If the patient cannot swallow the medicine in fluid form then give it in a pill. If convulsions have made this impossible then bind a lobelia plaster to the throat and stomach until relaxation takes place, and the medicine can be taken internally so as to produce a thorough

emetic. After each emetic the stomach should be thoroughly rinsed with some warm fluid which has no lobelia mixed therewith. Then the patient should have gruel to drink so as to support the system, thereby enabling it to bear up under the treatment. When the active symptoms have subsided I would suggest that the elecampane treatment be adopted, as it is by no means so unpleasant nor so weakening as the lobelia emetics. In those conditions of the system that would not admit of a lobelia emetic it would be necessary to depend wholly on the use of elecampane. In such instance I would regard it as necessary to give the patient two or three doses a day, relying entirely on the milk in which the elecampane is cooked to nourish the system.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

I might have incorporated in the foregoing statement certificates from the physicians who treated me, and from certain of my neighbors who were with me in course of my sickness. Dr. John Mulberry, of Chatham, Chester Co., Pa., is, so far as I know, still living. Whether Edward Singley, of Kelton, Chester Co., Pa., is yet living I know not. He was a retired Thompsonian physician. Dr. John Mulberry is an Eclectic physician and even yet (Feb. 14, 1895), so far as I know, is in his regular practice. But I have not felt the need of certificates, as I have not presumed that any one who would read my story would question its correctness, except a few physicians of a certain school. Even such are only skeptical because their books have not taught them that Hydrophobia is curable. Those physicians are like the politicians who accept nothing unless it is advocated by their party, and like the religionists who are disposed to reject everything not found in their creeds. In each case the mind is afflicted with *sectarianism*, and *sectarianism*, whether in religion, politics, or medicine is one of the meanest commodities on

God's footstool. In religion it has closed the eyes and ears of multitudes against the gospel of Christ as taught in the Sacred Text. In politics it has caused millions to disregard everything pertaining to character and cling wholly to party notions. In medicine it has caused many physicians of a certain school to disregard everything not taught in their text book. For instance, you may tell a physician of a certain school that Hydrophobia and lockjaw are curable by the proper use of lobelia, but in a majority of cases he will let a patient afflicted with either of those ailments die on his hands before he will try that remedy. Indeed, in many instances he has held that remedy in such contempt that he would not know how to use it should he be disposed to give it a trial. Tell him that cholera is curable by the use thereof and he will probably laugh in your face. Yet when the cholera raged in the city of Baltimore, Md., in the early half of this century the Thompsonian physicians made a grand success there in handling that disease. But prejudice against the remedy, because not introduced by the Regular School, and the indiscreet use thereof by some not acquainted therewith brought it into disrepute. But this is nothing to excite astonishment. Men claiming to be rational have in all ages been the victims of prejudice or prejudgment, by reason of which they have denied important truth. Sir William Hamilton, the Scottish Metaphysician, declares in his remarks concerning prejudice that when Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood there was not a physician in Europe above the age of forty who would admit the principle! Until a recent date the regular physicians bled many patients so as to make recovery impossible. Now they are annually making thousands of opiate victims by the undue use of their hypodermic syringe. With many excellent advancements in surgery and some other departments, yet each generation seems

destined to be afflicted with irrational treatment in the hands of men who claim to be rational. But the physician who will permit a patient to die because he is himself a victim of prejudice, and the politician who will permit his country to be ruined because he is enslaved by prejudice, and the preacher who permits a soul or spirit to be lost because he himself is blinded by prejudice will each receive a just reward in the final judgment. The mistakes that others have made by reason of their prepossessions or prejudices should cause all who are in any measure informed thereof to resolve that they will accept nothing and reject nothing which challenges attention without a fair investigation. The Grecian Socrates was accustomed to say, "Whoever would enter the temple of philosophy must banish prejudice, passion and sloth." This statement is evidently correct. Prejudice will prevent investigation, passion will cause any investigation to be hastily made, sloth will cause indifference in the investigation that may be attempted. Either of these three evils in a man will make him unreliable; all of them together will cause him to be regarded as unworthy of confidence. Therefore all those who would be instrumental in blessing mankind and honoring God should always hold themselves ready to read and hear whatever may be presented as important, examine and investigate whatever may be proposed as worthy, accept and adopt whatever may be approved as best.

SECOND CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

The relation of this chapter to the mental or spiritual ailment called Hydrophobia may not at once be apparent. There are preliminary steps necessary in the cure of physical Hydrophobia, and the same is true of the spiritual affliction bearing that name. In both cases the preliminaries may not be understood in all their bearings by those unacquainted with the treatment. For this reason the reader is kindly requested to exercise sufficient faith to read with care the chapter to which he is now introduced. The author thereof assures him that he will be richly rewarded in so doing.

GENERAL REMARKS.

The first five books of the Old Testament are commonly called "the writings of Moses," because they were mostly, if not altogether, written by him. Some suppose that the last chapter of Deuteronomy was written by Joshua, as it gives an account of the death and burial of Moses. This supposition may be correct.

Besides the record given by Moses of the Law, which the Lord delivered through him, we find in his writings the only authentic or reliable history that we have of mankind, and God's dealings with them for over twenty-five hundred years.

After we pass from Moses' writings we remain among

historical books until we reach the Psalms of David.

In the writings of David and Solomon we find wisdom, piety and poetry.

After we pass from what David and Solomon wrote we end prophetic writings to the close of the Old Testament.

GENESIS.—The first book of the Old Testament is properly called Genesis. That word means the *origin* or *beginning*, and this first book contains an account of the beginning of this material world, the beginning of man, the beginning of the Jewish people, and the beginning of Gentilism. For these reasons we can understand why the first book of the Old Testament should be called by such a name.

In the first and second chapters we find a brief record of the origin of this world and all things therein found. In the third chapter we have an account of the sin of our first parents and their expulsion from Eden. Then comes an account of their descendants. In the sixth, seventh and eighth chapters we have a record of the flood. Then again we find an account of the descendants of Noah till we reach Abram near the close of the eleventh chapter. After that the record of Abram, or Abraham, and his descendants, chiefly fills the book of Genesis. The death of Joseph and the embalment of his body in Egypt are mentioned at the close of the last chapter.

EXODUS.—The second book of the Old Testament is called Exodus. That word means going *out of* or going *away from*—*departure*. It is so called, no doubt, because it contains a record of the departure of the Israelites or Jews from the land of Egypt. In the first part of this book we learn that after the death of Joseph the Egyptians made slaves of the Hebrews or Jews who were among them. But the Lord did not forget his people, and so in the fulness of time he delivered them with a high hand and an outstretched arm. Ten plagues were necessary to

cause Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to relax his grasp on his slaves. Yet when the first-born of Egypt were slain he could not longer refuse, and the Israelites or Jews went forth from bondage.

In the twentieth chapter of Exodus is found an account of the ten commandments, and in connection therewith is a record of the circumstances under which the entire Jewish law was given. The book continues with a history of the Jews and God's dealings with them, and finally it closes leaving the Jews still in the wilderness.

LEVITICUS.—The third book of the Old Testament record bears the name Leviticus. That name is traced to Levi, who was the father of one of the Jewish tribes. From the tribe of Levi the priests were to be chosen, and thus the book which contains the law especially pertaining to the priesthood is justly called Leviticus. It is a book of law rather than a book of history, though certain historical facts are therein mentioned.

NUMBERS.—One of the prominent features of the fourth book of the Old Testament, and that from which its name was received was the numbering of the Israelites according to their tribes. All were numbered except the tribe of Levi, from which the priests were to be chosen. The Levites were not numbered. This book contains a record of the conduct of the Jews and God's dealings with them through a great part of their life in the wilderness. It also records many of the statutes which belonged to the code of laws given them. It closes leaving the Jews near the Jordan.

DEUTERONOMY.—The fifth book of the Old Testament has rather a long name. It comes to us from two Greek words and literally means second law, or repetition of law. This name has been coined for this book, no doubt, because it contains a second giving or repetition of many laws that were previously recorded. But the laws that

we find in Deuteronomy are often given in statements, and in connection with them are exhortations, such, as are not found in previous writings. This book seems to contain a record of the events which occurred just before the death of Moses. The 'book ends with an account of his death and burial in the land of Moab after he had ascended Mount Nebo, even to the top of Pisgah, from which he looked over on the land of promise. It is generally supposed that Joshua wrote this last chapter as a fitting appendix to what Moses had previously written,

JOSHUA.—The word Joshua is the name of a man, and the book wearing this name is so called "because it records the deeds of Joshua, who was the successor of Moses as leader of the Israelites after the death of Moses. Under Joshua's leadership the Jews crossed the Jordan, entered Canaan (now called Palestine) and after overcoming seven nations were settled upon their inheritances according to the divine arrangement. The tribe of Levi from which the priests were chosen was not permitted to have landed estates like the other tribes, but they were given cities to dwell in among the other tribes, as we learn in the twenty-first chapter of the book of Joshua.

JUDGES.—The book of Judges covers a period of over four hundred years. It received its name, no doubt, from its contents, as it records nearly all of the period when Israel was ruled by judges, which period Paul informs us in Acts 13:20 was about four hundred and fifty years.

RUTH.—After Judges comes the book of Ruth, which is chiefly important as a historical connecting link with reference to a certain family whereby the reader can see the relation of David to Abraham.

I SAMUEL.—Judges continued to be set over the Israelites till the mature life or old age of Samuel the prophet. Then they called for a king to be set over them like the nations around them. This displeased Samuel and

offended God, who regarded such a call as a rejection of him as their ruler. Yet he commanded Samuel to grant them their wish and Saul was anointed as king.

II SAMUEL.—The second book of Samuel begins with mention of Saul's death and an account of the beginning of David's reign. By examination we find that the entire book is devoted to the events pertaining to David's reign. He was a successful warrior, and in course of his reign the enemies of Israel were led to respect the God of Israel. Because he was a man of war, and thus a man of blood, the Lord would not permit him to build a temple, but reserved that for his son Solomon. This second book of Samuel is, strictly speaking, the book of David's reign as king. Though attributed to Samuel, probably because he had anointed David, yet it was doubtless written by David or some one else, for Samuel had died before the end of king Saul's reign. An account of his death and burial is found in 1 Samuel twenty-fifth chapter.

I KINGS.—The document that is called the "First Book of Kings" is really the third book which speaks of the kings. The first book bearing Samuel's name is largely filled with the history of Saul as king, and the second book attributed to Samuel is almost entirely filled with the history of David. The book that is called the "First Book of Kings" in its early chapters concludes the history of David and gives an account of the reign of Solomon (the son of David. Each of the three kings thus far named—Saul, David, and Solomon—reigned over the twelve tribes, and each reigned forty years. But soon after the close of Solomon's reign the kingdom was divided. Ten tribes revolted and chose Jeroboam the son of Nebat to be their sovereign, while two tribes (Judah and Benjamin) still held to the Rehoboam, who was Solomon's son, and was thus of the house of David. The remainder of this book is filled with records of the divided kingdom

—rather, of the two kingdoms called the kingdom of Judah and the kingdom of Israel.

II KINGS.—The document that is called the "Second Book of Kings" is a continuance of the history of the Jews as a divided people. The ten tribes that revolted soon after the beginning of Rehoboam's reign seem to have decided that they would be called the "kingdom of Israel," while the two tribes that held to the house or line of David seem to have adopted the name "kingdom of Judah." By examination of the history of these two kingdoms the reader may learn that the kingdom of Israel led the way in idolatry and other iniquities, and finally in the days of Hoshea God gave that kingdom into the hands of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria. (See 2 Kings 17th chapter.) Then we find that the kingdom of Judah followed Israel's example in going after idols and other iniquities, until in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria, Judah was likewise given over into the hands of the Assyrian power. Thus the two kingdoms were overthrown.

I CHRONICLES.—The first book of Chronicles contains a: "brief record of the human family from Adam to the death of Saul, and then the history of David as king is given to the time of his death.

II CHRONICLES.—The second book of Chronicles begins with the history of Solomon and ends with an account of the captivity of Judah, in which the chief Jews of Judah were held for the period of seventy years, until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths. That is to say, God had ordained that every seventh year the land of Canaan, now called Palestine, should not be tilled, and thus should have rest. (See Leviticus 25th chapter.) But the Jews had violated this ordinance for nearly five hundred years, until the land had been cheated out of seventy sabbaths. Thus when God gave them over into the hands of their

enemies they were held seventy years, or until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths. The Jews who constituted the Kingdom of Israel were in captivity, as a people, near or about two hundred years before they were permitted to return. Their captivity began about a hundred and twenty five years before the kingdom of Judah was overthrown.

EZRA, NEHEMIAH, AND ESTHER.—The books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther are all historical and really conclude the inspired history of the Jews, as given in the Old Testament. Those books tell us concerning the Jews in captivity, and their return to their own land at the close of the seventy years that the kingdom of Judah was held in bondage to the Assyrians. In Ezra and Nehemiah we also learn of the rebuilding of the temple, and the re-establishment of the worship in Jerusalem. After returning to their own land the Jews were permitted to remain, therein through a period of about four hundred years until Christ came, and in the year seventy-two of the Christian era we learn that they were dispersed by the Romans, and scattered into different parts of the world, according to the prophecy found in the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy and elsewhere in the Old Testament. They still remain dispersed, and will continue to be until the fulness of the time of the Gentiles mentioned in Luke 21:24, and Rom. 11:25.

JOB.—The book of Job contains a brief history of a man "by that name, and God's dealings with him. We therein learn that he was a good man. But the Devil challenged the Most High to afflict him, declaring that under affliction Job would not remain faithful. Then the Devil was permitted to afflict him to the utmost, except to spare his life. But Job remained faithful. His three friends reasoned with him and against him, and Job reasoned in reply. In their reasonings they probably gave the best of

human philosophy which they could produce. The three friends philosophized concerning Job's afflictions, and Job philosophized in reply. Finally God answered Job out of the whirlwind and made him acknowledge his ignorance. When he had been fully tried God blessed him richly and abundantly till the close of his life.

PSALMS.—The book of Psalms is a book of Hebrew poetry. Therein we find that David sang descriptions of good characters and bad characters among men. He also sang prayers and praises, thanksgivings and adorations to God, together with a considerable part of the history of the Jews, and the character of the Divine word, in connection with the Divine attributes. It is a book which is exceedingly valuable even for us under the gospel dispensation, though we cannot adopt, without modification, David's prayers for the destruction of his enemies. He prayed that God would destroy his enemies, but it is the duty of Christians to pray that God may lead their enemies in the way of salvation. True Christians may pray for the overthrow of their enemies in wrong doing in order that they may be led to repent. In so doing they really pray for the salvation of their enemies. This is right.

SOLOMON'S WRITINGS.—The writings of Solomon are found in the books called Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. The first and second of these books set forth the wisdom of that great man on all the different phases and features of human life. Those books are, by mature minds, regarded as containing more practical wisdom than all the uninspired books ever written on the same subject. No doubt the Lord intended that the Bible when completed should be perfect in every particular, and thus the wisdom of Solomon was permitted to constitute an important part thereof. The book called "Song of Solomon" has been regarded as referring to the Church.

But that is a mistake. It seems to be a collection of expressions of fleshly love in which Solomon had a large experience. It sets forth in choice expressions the unutterable love which should exist between husbands and wives. Regarded with this application and bearing it is a book of value.

ISAIAH.—The prophetic writings are next before us. The book of Isaiah is first on the list. In order to understand this book it is necessary to learn when it was written, so as to have in mind the position in history which Isaiah occupied. In order to learn when his prophecies were written we turn to the first verse of the first chapter, and there we find that he wrote in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. By examination of the body of his writings we learn that Isaiah wrote prophecies concerning the captivity of the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of Judah. He also wrote respecting God's judgments against several other nations. Going back to the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, as a record of them is given in 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles, we are enabled to understand in a great measure the bearings of Isaiah's writings with reference to those kings.

JEREMIAH.—The book of Jeremiah is of later date than that of Isaiah, as may be seen by the first part of the first chapter. In this book which bears Jeremiah's name a record is given of the overthrow of Jerusalem and the beginning of the captivity. According to that record Jeremiah was well treated by the king of Assyria through his chief captain. The prophet was permitted to remain with the poor people who were left in Canaan or Palestine when the leaders of the people and the rich people were led away into captivity. God punished the leaders among the Jews severely because they had misled the people,

LAMENTATIONS.—By examination we find that the book

of Lamentations consists of the lamentations of the prophet Jeremiah over the ruined condition of the Jews as a people and of Jerusalem as a city.

EZEKIEL.—According to the first part of the book of Ezekiel it is evident that he was a prophet of the captivity among the Assyrians. The statements in the former part of the first chapter give us the historical standpoint from which to consider what that prophet wrote, and thus we are enabled to understand what is contained in chapter 36:25. The language in that verse is frequently used in favor of sprinkling for baptism. But that is a mistake. Ezekiel was speaking of the time when the Jews should return from captivity among the heathen, and the sprinkling of "clean water" or "the water of cleansing" on them was to cleanse them from their contaminations among the heathen. Let all read the language and they will be able to see for themselves. There is no reference whatever in the passage to the institution called baptism in the New Testament. The twenty-fourth verse of the thirtieth chapter shows when the sprinkling was intended to be done.

DANIEL.—The book of Daniel comes next in the list. Therein the reader may learn that the prophet who wore that name was among the Jews in captivity in the days of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar of Assyria, and that he was in the city of Babylon the night that it fell into the hands of the Medes and Persians, also that he lived for some time under the Medo-Persian reign. Through him God made revelations concerning the future of the Jews and several other nations. In the last chapter of that prophet's writings is a clear statement concerning the final resurrection and of everlasting life which will be given to some, while everlasting shame and contempt will be inflicted on others. This shows that the Old Testament

mentions the final resurrection together with future rewards and punishments.

THE MINOR PROPHETS.

Attention is next invited to those writers commonly called "minor prophets." Their names are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. By examination of the writings of these prophets the reader may learn something of the time when several of them were inspired to write. For instance, Hosea wrote in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam, son of Joash, king of Israel." This fact shows that he wrote in course of the same time that Isaiah was inspired to write, Amos wrote during a part of the same period, and so did Micah. Then it is evident that Zechariah wrote near the close of the captivity of the Jews among their enemies. The reader will bear in mind that while the Jews were captives the great Assyrian, empire fell into the hands of the Medes and Persians. By keeping this fact prominent in thought many statements found in the prophetic writings will be clear which will otherwise seem obscure. The reader will also do well to consider, while examining the books given us by the prophets, that nearly all of them wrote somewhat concerning other nations besides the Jews. Finally, it should be held in mind that time and again in the midst of certain, visions the eyes of several prophets seem to have been unsealed with reference to the Messiah, who is Jesus Christ., the humility and glories that should attend his coining, and should result therefrom.

CONCLUSION.

Now, reader, have not your diligence and patience been richly rewarded? The Old Testament may have heretofore been regarded by you as a sort of wilderness. For that reason you have seldom read therein, except, perhaps,

in the Psalms of David, or Proverbs of Solomon. You did not pretend to understand even its outlines, and very few of its details. But now it is altogether different. You understand that the book of Genesis gives an account of creation and a brief history of man till the Jews had gone into Egypt. Then you understand that Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy are chiefly filled with a record of the Jews from the time of their enslavement in Egypt until they were ready to enter the land of Canaan or Palestine. The book of Joshua tells of the settling of the Jews in the land promised to their fathers. Judges records the leading events of the period when the Jews were ruled by Judges. The first book of Samuel gives account of the close of the rulership by judges, and also the introduction of the ruler ship of the Jews by kings. Then the second book of Samuel, together with, the two books called Kings, and the two called Chronicles, give accounts of the history of the Jews throughout the period of the kings until the captivity of the Jews by the Assyrians, otherwise called Babylonians. The books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther inform the reader concerning the return of the Jews from captivity, the rebuilding of the temple, the walls of the city, and finally of the city itself, which occurred something over four hundred years before the advent or coming of Christ into the world. Finally, the writings of David, Solomon, and the prophets, can be mostly understood by what they declare, so that the intelligent reader's mind need not be in confusion concerning them.

Throughout the entire Old Testament many facts are found which are very different from some to which we are now accustomed. By reason of such facts the mind should not be staggered concerning the Inspired Record. The God of heaven is the author of all life as certainly as that he is God, and therefore he had the right to take life

at any time and under any circumstances. The innocent ones whom he caused to be slain at different times were cut off from an evil world and saved from corruption in this life. When God saw fit to check the speed of the earth's revolutions in order to lengthen a day, he was able to do so as certainly as that he is God. Moreover, when he permitted his people to spare the lives of certain ones among their enemies whom they had taken captive he instructed them how they should treat their captives. Thus when the Old Testament is read with care and honesty it yields its important meaning, and richly rewards its reader. Throughout the entire Volume it is evident that God always meant just what he said, and it was always dangerous for those whom he addressed to treat what he said with indifference. Cain's offering was not accepted because he varied in some way from God's instructions, and serious were the results. Nadab and Abihu varied from God's directions and lost their lives. Saul and David tried experiments and were severely rebuked and punished. Thus it was with all others who lived under the Old Testament ages. This should teach us that everything that Christ has commanded us through his apostles he certainly meant, and it is at our eternal peril that we differ therefrom. For us to pronounce any command of Christ, which is addressed either to the sinner or saint as such, a non-essential is unutterably dangerous. The same is true of saying that it makes no difference how we attend to certain of his commands. Christ meant what he said and said what he meant.

THIRD CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

When children begin to learn the alphabet they cannot understand why the letters thereof should wear the definite names that are given them. But when the relations of those letters to syllables, and the use of syllables in forming words, and the value of words in conveying ideas are all understood then the reasons by the letters of the alphabet should wear certain definite names become altogether clear. Thus it may be with the reader in regard to the chapter to which attention is now invited. Its relation to the title of the book in which it is found may not at once be understood. But a diligent examination thereof will be well rewarded now and more fully rewarded hereafter. Then "let patience have her perfect work."

MATTHEW.—The first writer of the New Testament is called Matthew. He gives us an account of Christ, beginning with a statement concerning Christ's earthly parentage and ending with the great world-wide commission which he gave to his apostles. Between these extremes we find an account of Christ's birth, brief mention of his early life, of his baptism by John the Baptist (his forerunner), of his trials in the wilderness, and severe conflicts with the Devil. We also have a record of his public ministry wherein we learn that he spoke, wonder-

ful words, such as had never before been uttered, and performed wonderful works, such as had never before been seen. We learn that he gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, strength to the lame, and in some instances raised the dead to life again. Finally we learn that he was betrayed, was falsely accused, was crucified and was buried. But on the morning of the third day he arose and appeared to his disciples. After he had been seen of them so as to be fully recognized he told them to go into all the world and teach all nations, baptizing them in or into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. To this he added that they should teach the baptized ones all that he had commanded them, and then promised to be with them even unto the end of the world.

MARK.—The second writer of the New Testament was named Mark. He commences his account of Christ with what he calls, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Thus while Matthew commences his record by speaking of Christ as the Son of man, Mark begins his record by speaking of Christ as the Son of God. Moreover, Mark makes no mention of Christ's birth or early life, but at once mentions his forerunner, John the Baptist. Then a statement is made of Christ's baptism, and of the beginning of his public ministry. Next we find a record of his wonderful words and works very much like that given by Matthew, only it is more brief and, in style, seems more vigorous. Mark seems to have been specially impressed with Christ as the Mighty Wonder Worker, while Matthew specially spoke of him as the Fulfiller of the Law and the Prophets. Mark's account of Christ closes with a statement of the world-wide commission and of the ascension to heaven.

LUKE.—The next writer is called Luke. He was not an apostle, but seems to have been an inspired evangelist, By examination we find 'that he begins his record with

mention of the parents of John the Baptist and shows that John's father was a priest (Zacharias by name), and that his mother (Elizabeth) was a cousin to Mary the mother of our Savior. Then Christ's earthly ancestry is by Luke traced back to Adam. This being set forth we find that Luke gives us a record in many respects like those previously considered, yet with the mention of some teachings and facts which the others omit. He seems to have been strikingly impressed with Christ's human nature, and thus that Christ was specially the Friend of Man. Besides his record of Christ's words and works before the crucifixion Luke makes mention of the great commission, the promise of the Holy Spirit, and of the ascension to heaven. Mark and Luke, are the *only* ones of these biographical writers who mention the ascension.

JOHN.—The fourth writer of the New Testament is named John. His name means *the grace of God*. He seems to have been specially impressed with Christ's divinity, and so he begins his record by informing us who Christ was before he came to earth. In so doing he declares that the one who is revealed to us in the New Testament as the Son of God was not a creature such as man is, whose personal existence altogether began in this world but that he was a divine being called "the Word of God" even before the world was created. Having set this much before us John then makes mention of the forerunner of Christ and of Christ's public introduction to the world. The wonderful words and works of our Savior then seem to engage his attention till the close of his record is reached. Matthew seems to have regarded Christ specially as the Fulfiller of the Law and Prophets, and Mark seems to have regarded him as the Mighty Wonder Worker, and Luke as the Friend of Man, and John seems to have considered him as the Son of God.

ACTS OF APOSTLES.—The fifth book of the New Testa-

ment is by men commonly called "The Acts of the Apostles." This is a mistake. Such a name would indicate that *all* the acts of *all* the apostles were therein recorded, whereas only *some* of the acts of *some* of the apostles are therein placed on record. Acts of Apostles is thus the proper name, and not "The Acts of the Apostles." The special purpose of this book was to show how both Jews and Gentiles became Christians, and thus how the Church of Christ was established. The four accounts of the gospel were written in order to prove unto all who might read them that Christ is the Son of God, and the book of Acts was written to show believers in Christ how to become Christians. This is clearly understood by many yet it is sadly in confusion in the minds of certain religious people. As a result the great majority of persons in the so-called "Christian world" do not understand how faith is produced, nor what those who are believers in Christ should do to become Christians, though the four Gospel Records and the book of Acts give us full information thereon.

LETTER TO THE ROMANS.—Now we come to the Epistles or Letters which were written by five of the apostles—Paul, James, Peter, John and Jude. There are twenty-one of them, and if all of them be mentioned in this chapter they would be considered very briefly.

The first of these letters was written by Paul to the Christians in the city of Rome. After his salutation or introduction he made mention of the gospel that he preached, the course of conduct by which many of the ancients became idolaters, and the fact that some Jews were guilty of the same kinds of immorality that the heathen practiced. He then entered upon a critical argument concerning justification by faith without the Jewish law, and afterwards set forth the advantages of the gospel over the law. He also mentioned the con-

dition of the Jews at that time and their future destiny. Finally he gave instructions to the saints in Rome concerning many phases and features of their life, and closed with a chapter of kind words to certain individual disciples.

I CORINTHIANS.—To the church at Corinth in Achaia, Paul wrote two letters. The first is, now before us for consideration. By examination we find that after his introductory he exhorted the brethren to unity or oneness and rebuked their divisions in calling themselves after the names of men, and thus rebuked them for esteeming men more highly than they should. Next we find instructions concerning the great questions whereon they needed information and rebukes for all their errors both public and private. He gave detailed instructions concerning the special gifts of the Holy Spirit and their use in the public congregation. In the eighth and thirteenth chapters he set forth the law of love which will save Christians from strife and division, and then in the fifteenth chapter he presented his grand argument in favor of the resurrection of Christ and of mankind generally. This letter closes with directions concerning the Lord's day contribution and appended statements and exhortations. It is the most lengthy epistle of the entire list.

II CORINTHIANS.—As was previously mentioned, Paul wrote two letters to the brethren in the city of Corinth. The second of these is now before us. Therein we find [that the great apostle informed those brethren of the great trials and afflictions which he endured for the gospel's sake, and then informed them carefully concerning the differences between the law and the gospel. In so doing he set before them that while the former was glorious, the latter is more glorious. After writing these differences for the brethren he next engaged their attention with the Christian's hope of blessedness beyond this life,

and thereon based an argument in favor of enduring all that might afflict them in this life. Considerable instruction was then given concerning liberality for the relief of poor saints, and the letter closes with statements concerning himself personally in his various trials and forewarning words concerning his next visit to them.

GALATIANS.—The letter of Paul to the disciples in Galatia (which was a province in Asia Minor) next engages our attention. It is much shorter than either of the previously given letters, yet it forms an important part of the perfect revelation. In the early part of this letter Paul asserted his apostleship in a vigorous manner, invoking a curse on either man or angel who would preach any other gospel than that which he had proclaimed. He was specially careful to set forth that he had received his commission from Christ, and not from those who were apostles before him. Then he proceeded to rebuke those brethren for permitting themselves to turn aside from the gospel as he had preached it unto them and accept Jewish circumcision which had been advocated among them by certain Judaizing teachers. The differences between the law given through Moses and the gospel of Christ were next set forth, and the epistle ends with certain instructions of a very practical character.

EPHESIANS.—The brethren at Ephesus in Asia also received a letter from the Apostle Paul. In that letter we find that he regarded those brethren in need of instruction concerning the fact that the apostolic character had been foreordained in the divine arrangement, and that they had been sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise when they believed in an acceptable manner. In the second chapter of that letter Paul presented several times over in bold contrast what they had been by nature and wicked works on the one hand, with what they had become through Christ on the other hand. The third

sets forth what it is the divine intention that Christians should know and Paul's prayer concerning the high spiritual condition to which they should attain. The fourth chapter presents an exhortation to oneness and mentions seven grand considerations as the ground of that exhortation. The remainder of the book is filled with teachings pertaining to the practical life of the Christian.

PHILIPPIANS.—The letter to the Philippians is remarkable by reason of the absence of rebuke. It is a beautiful letter largely filled with kind words which Paul regarded it proper to write unto those brethren because they were so devoted to the truth. By giving this letter special examination we learn that Paul first informed them how affectionately he thought of them, and then declared that the things that had befallen him had turned out to the furtherance of the gospel. After this we find that the apostle said that he rejoiced in the preaching of the gospel even if it were done through envy and strife. But to have anything like a just idea of what this letter contains it is necessary to read it many times over, and study it carefully. Then the reader will be able to receive some just notion of how very dear to that apostle were those Christians who were walking uprightly according to the truth. In the midst of the strifes and corruptions of this 'age it should be refreshing to us to read such an epistle, and always bear in mind that whatever was possible at Philippi is possible at other places.

COLOSSIANS.—The letter to the Colossians is very much of the same order as the one written to the Philippians. The brethren at Colosse must have been in excellent condition, judging by the spirit of the letter addressed to them. It contains fore warnings, and exhortations, but no pointed rebukes such as are found in some other letters. It seems as if there were no doctrinal errors specially troubling the Colossian brethren, though they were in

danger by reason of human philosophy on the one hand and Judaism on the other. Hence the second chapter of this letter is chiefly devoted to the important matter of forewarning the brethren against their danger in both of these directions. The central thought in this second chapter is found in the tenth verse which reads thus: "And ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power," The remainder of the letter is devoted to such teachings as are specially calculated to build Christians up in the gospel, and to giving certain directions with reference to prominent disciples whom he names.

I THESSALONIANS.—The first letter to the Thessalonians comes next before us. Therein we find that Paul makes considerable mention of himself, his trials, and his success in preaching the gospel. At the same time he commends the brethren in Thessalonica for their behavior. The letter is more personal, less argumentative, and more intended to assist in building up the individual Christian than some other letters that Paul wrote. It seems that the brethren at Thessalonica were not troubled with doctrinal errors, yet they needed (as Christians always do) much pointed instruction on questions pertaining to their personal life as followers of Christ. In this letter such instruction is found in the clearest and concise form. This is specially evident in the fifth chapter, which the reader will do well to examine.

II THESSALONIANS.—The second letter to the brethren in Thessalonica is shorter than the first, consisting of only three brief chapters. By examining the first sentence we notice that Paul associated the names of two other brethren with his own. This is also true of the beginning of his first letter to these same brethren. The first chapter of this letter is quite familiar by reason of what it says concerning the second coming of Christ and the final

judgment. The second chapter is quite familiar to many because of what it says about the great falling away from the simplicity of the gospel and the development of that great and wicked character which is called "The Man of Sin."

I TIMOTHY.—Paul's first letter to Timothy now opens up before us for brief notice. Timothy was an evangelist and Paul addressed him two letters, in both of which he wrote as a father to a son, giving instructions concerning all that he thought would be important. Indeed, Paul speaks in the second verse of the first chapter to Timothy as his "own son in the faith." That is to say, Paul was no doubt the one by whom Timothy was led into the full light of the gospel, and for that reason he calls him his "own son in the faith." But we find in course of this letter that it was not written concerning private affairs, though it appears as a personal letter from one man to another. On the contrary, it is from first to last filled with instructions that are important to every preacher, and indeed to every Christian. Therefore this letter forms an important feature in the revelation which Christ has made to his people.

II TIMOTHY.—In the beginning of the second letter which Paul wrote to Timothy we find that he speaks to that young preacher as his "dearly beloved son." But as Paul was never married, he certainly used such language concerning Timothy by reason of their relations in the gospel. Timothy was Paul's son in the gospel, and thus such words were simply used in regard to spiritual matters. Certain features of this second letter are very important to us, and have become quite familiar. The fifteenth verse of the first chapter is often read by persecuted disciples when their brethren forsake them. It reads thus: "This thou knowest that all they that are in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and

Hermogenes." Then the fifteenth verse of the second chapter is a common text for a sermon. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." To many Bible readers the sixteenth and seventeenth verses of the third chapter of this letter are as familiar as Acts second chapter and thirty-eighth verse. Finally, the early part of the fourth chapter is very familiar by reason of the solemn charge it contains to Timothy as a preacher, and the prophecy concerning the great apostasy.

TITUS.—The letter to Titus follows the second letter to Timothy, and is very much of the same order. That is to say, Paul addressed Titus as his "son after the common faith," and gave him instructions that he deemed important to a young preacher. The first chapter of this letter mentions the qualifications of bishops or overseers, very much as they are mentioned in the third chapter of 2 Timothy. In the second chapter Titus is instructed to speak the things "which become sound doctrine." and is specially directed what to teach aged men and women, also young men and women, and is given the charge to be himself a pattern. In the last chapter and fifth verse we find language that is commonly regarded as an explanation of John 3:5. It reads thus: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

PHILEMON.—The letter to Philemon is the briefest of Paul's documents. It consists of only one chapter, and is a very kind and tender communication. It is more nearly a personal letter than any other of the entire list of epistolary writings. Yet it is of advantage to us, especially in view of what it reveals to us concerning Paul's disposition. He was a bold proclaimer of the gospel, severe in his rebukes, yet kind and gentle in his addresses to those

who were doing right. He was even tender toward those who erred through ignorance or weakness which they could not avoid. In all these respects he was an imitator of Christ who is called both the "Lamb of God" and the "Lion of the tribe of Judah." Many people forget Christ's "boldness and severity. By reason of this they speak of him simply as "the meek and lowly one." But he was bold and severe toward certain wrong doers, as may be learned by reading Matthew twenty-third chapter.

HEBREWS.—The letter of Paul to the Christians who had been converted from among the Jews is among the longest and most argumentative of the entire list of his writings. The first chapter speaks of Christ's sonship, and thus of his superiority over the fathers spoken of in the Old Testament, also that he was greater than the angels. The second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters are devoted to a discussion of the priest-hood of Christ in its differences from the Jewish priesthood. The eleventh chapter is devoted to the subject of faith, while the twelfth and thirteenth chapters are chiefly devoted to exhortation and encouragement. Altogether it is a grand document, and it seems as if a long life-time would not be more than what is necessary to understand and appreciate it fully. With this letter close the writings of the Apostle Paul. Of the twenty-one letters found in the New Testament Paul wrote fourteen; that is, he wrote two-thirds of the entire number.

JAMES.—James was one of the apostles. The first and second chapters of his letter are chiefly devoted to the subject of faith. The third chapter seems chiefly devoted to the subject of conversation, and thus he deals pointedly with the evils of an unbridled tongue. In the fourth and fifth chapters the strivings of ambition and passion are severely handled. Then in the conclusion of his letter he

again deals with the subject of faith. His style is that of a very vigorous writer, and shows that he was a man of strong, and even severe, convictions. His letter is an important part of the New Testament.

I PETER.—The first letter of the Apostle Peter is now before us and deserves special attention as a part of Christ's revelation to the Church. By examination we find that Peter was also a vigorous writer. He mentions and briefly handles a great variety of themes. The Christian's hope, the trial of faith, the prophetic view of Christ, the redemption which Christ wrought, and the living word— all these and several other themes are mentioned in the first chapter of this letter. Then he proceeded to give instructions to all classes in the Church concerning all departments of life. The impulsive disposition of Peter is somewhat manifested in the style of his writings. This shows that inspiration did not ignore the natural temperaments of those who were inspired. The Holy Spirit used the apostles as instruments or mediums for making known the truth. There is no reason for supposing that the Holy Spirit changed the quality of any apostle's voice, nor any other feature of his natural temperaments.

II PETER.—In his second letter, which is now before us, Peter gives us more of his vigorous style. He seems not to have been the man for detailed argument, and thus the Holy Spirit did not use him for that purpose. The first chapter of this second letter is quite familiar to many because therein is found the statement that Christ's divine power has given to his people "all things that pertain to life and godliness." It is also familiar because Peter mentions seven items of conduct which will so strengthen the Christian's character that he "shall never fall," but shall have an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom. The second and third chapters deal with false teachers and the just retribution which God will inflict

upon them, closing up with this exhortation: "But grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ: To him be glory both now and forever: Amen."

I JOHN.—As we leave the writings of Peter we are confronted with the first letter of the Apostle John. This is the same John that wrote the fourth record which we have of the gospel. He was the brother of James whom Herod slew, and thus was the son of Zebedee, as Matthew 10:2, informs us. In Mark 3:17, we learn, that Christ surnamed these two men Boanerges, which means "sons of thunder." Such a name may have been given them because of their positive and severe dispositions. These were the men who (according to Luke 9:64), proposed to call fire down from heaven on certain characters. The subject of love is John's chief theme. Yet all that he said about love shows that he had a practical view thereof from first to last. In John's mind there was nothing gushy about love, but it was a plain, practical something. His writings on this subject are wholly misunderstood by many people who think that love is simply an affectionate feeling. Let all study this subject carefully.

II JOHN.—John's second letter is addressed to one whom he calls "the elect lady." There has been much dispute about whether this "elect lady" was a certain sister in the Church or the Church as such. I do not pretend to" decide for others, but for myself think that she was probably some prominent woman in the Church, for the next letter is addressed to a person called by John "the well-beloved Gains." Besides, John closed by saying, "The children of thy elect sister greet thee." The Church has no sisters, and thus it seems that John wrote to a woman. The ninth verse of this letter is very severe against all those who go beyond the divine requirements in religion. To "transgress" means to transcend or go beyond what is

laid down as a restriction. With this explanation, let the reader notice what the ninth verse of John's second letter declares. He says, ""Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God: He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." The word "hath" in this sentence means "holds" as any one may see who can examine the Greek text of this passage. So it is evident that all who do not abide in the doctrine of Christ, but go beyond it and add things not mentioned in the doctrine of Christ, which is the gospel, do not hold unto God and Christ. This is very severe and should be seriously considered by all those who think that it makes but little difference what religious doctrine or practice they have if they be only sincere.

III JOHN.—This epistle is addressed to a man named Gaius. Though it is a brief document, yet it is instructive. For instance, the ninth and tenth verses make mention of a man named Diotrephes who was disposed to have the pre-eminence, and was a very objectionable character. The description given of his mischievous work shows that Diotrephes was very much like certain persons that are now found in some of the churches. They are of the "rule-or-ruin" class, and that makes them very troublesome. When people are disposed to "rule or ruin" then if they be permitted to rule they will ruin by their manner of ruling.

JUDE.—The epistle of Jude is the last of the letters that were by inspiration written, as separate documents. It is short, consisting of only one chapter. Yet it is very severe on vile characters. Indeed, all three of the writers whose names begin with the letter "J" are very severe. James, John, and Jude all wrote with great intensesness of speech. Probably the most familiar verse in Jude's letter is the third verse which reads thus: "Beloved, when I gave

all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that you should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." By the expression "the faith" Jude doubtless meant the gospel of Christ, which was delivered by Christ to his apostles, and through them was delivered to the churches.

THE REVELATION OF CHRIST IN A VISION THROUGH JOHN THE APOSTLE.—Now we come to the last book of the Inspired Volume. John was an exile for the gospel's sake on the Island called Patmos. He was in the Spirit on the Lord's day and in a vision he heard a voice and received a separate message for each of the seven churches in Asia. Next we find that he was permitted to behold grandeurs and glories which pertain to both time and eternity. Among these are the rise and fall of the great apostasy, the binding of Satan, the setting of the final judgment, the everlasting salvation of the righteous, and the everlasting condemnation of the wicked. Such are the outlines of this book over which many have speculated and; blundered. But whether we understand all its details or not, yet in the last chapter is this consolation: "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." By such language we may all learn that salvation depends on doing the divine commandments'. Not that obedience on our part will deserve or purchase salvation. Christ is the Savior, yet he proposes to save those who obey his commandments, and not those who treat his commands with indifference. Besides, we may all learn that whatever Christ has mentioned as a Condition of salvation should not be called a non-essential the course of his personal ministry here on earth Christ gave some instruction which referred back to the Jewish Jaw, and some instruction which only referred to the par-

ticular period in which he was then living. But all the commands given through the apostles to sinners in order to their salvation from sin were doubtless necessary to be obeyed. The same is true of all that Christ required of Christians in regard to worship and work.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The reader has now secured an excellent reward for the patience exercised in reading the foregoing chapter. The New Testament is a wonderful book, and has done more to purify, adorn and elevate mankind than all other volumes ever written. Therein is found the purest morality that was ever advocated on earth, as even infidels have been constrained to admit. Moreover, the worship and work therein required of the Christian are the simplest and most exalting that mankind were ever required to consider and observe. How to become a Christian, how to live a Christian, and how to die a Christian so as to reach the Christian's home in glory—these are the leading, practical, and all-important themes of the New Testament. It is the book which above all others should be read and studied. By reason of its simple style many casual or incidental readers of the New Testament have misjudged its dignity. Superficial minds may have regarded its themes and style of expression as commonplace. But as man is the most dignified being on earth certainly man's best interests for both time and eternity are not commonplace nor trivial themes. Besides, the serious style of the New Testament cannot be denied. It is not a book of jokes, nor is there the slightest evidence that even the sentence thereof was intended to produce a smile. But from first to last it is a book of solemnity as well as simplicity, It challenges the attention of all in a manner which deserves consideration by both its friends and foes. It is emphatically the book of Christ, though Christ is not absent from the Old Testament. Indeed,

the Old Testament referred forward to Christ and was fulfilled in him. Having come to earth Christ endorsed the Old Testament as a record of God's revelation to man, and as a revelation of man to himself. Moreover, Christ is strictly the author of the New Testament. Though he did not write it with his own hand, yet he furnished the subjects and objects, the principles and details which constitute its contents. From first to last there is no evidence that Christ ever said a word that he did not mean, nor that he ever gave a command that it was not necessary for those to obey unto whom it was given. By all authority in heaven and in earth he gave the great commission to his apostles just before he ascended to heaven. In that commission, as recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, he gave belief, repentance, and baptism as conditions of salvation or remission of sins. He also mentioned unbelief as the one condition of condemnation. Those who refuse to believe that Christ is the Son of God certainly cannot repent nor be baptized. Those who will not examine the divine testimony so that they may become believers undoubtedly secure their condemnation by such a course of procedure. But all those who sincerely desire to be saved will do themselves the justice to read and reflect in order that they may become intelligent believers. When people believe whole-heartedly that Christ is the Son of God they are not disposed to speak of repentance, confession, baptism, prayer, the communion, nor anything else that Christ has enjoined through his apostles as non-essential. The entire notion that non-essentials are found among the commands addressed to the sinner in order to become a Christian, or the commands given the saint in regard to worship and work—this entire notion is banished by a whole-hearted belief or faith that Christ is the Son of God. All who have a whole-hearted faith in Christ as the Son of God believe that he was always sincere in what he commanded.

FOURTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

The chapter to which attention is now invited will serve as a connecting link between the apostolic period and the present time. In former chapters a connected view has been given of the entire period mentioned between the first of Genesis and the end of the book called Revelation. The purpose of the following chapter is to give a connected view of church history from the establishing of Christ's Church in the first century of the Gospel Era to the present time. Such a view or survey will touch spiritual Hydrophobia more closely than has hitherto been done. The reader should proceed with care in order to secure the rich reward which is offered to all who will read this volume with patience and persistence.

FIRST BOOK.

The book called Acts of Apostles is the first of church history, and it is the most important chapter inasmuch as it records the beginning of the Church of Christ under direction of the apostles. In that book we learn how alien sinners from among both Jews and Gentiles became Christians, and how these became united, and worshiped according to the divine directions. To be more detailed in statement, the contents of the book of Acts may be described in the following manner:

1. The testimony was presented in favor of Christ's

divinity, and the people were taught to believe on him as God's Son.

2. Those who believed were required to repent, confess, and be baptized, calling on the name of the Lord.

3. Those who complied with these requirements continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine or teaching, and In the fellowship or contribution, and in the breaking of "bread or communion, and in the prayers that were divinely required to be offered in the name of Christ. (Act 2:42.)

4. We also learn in the same book that the first day of the week was the time when the Church came together for worship and teaching. (See Acts 20th chapter.)

5. We likewise find an account in this book of the selection of deacons as officers to attend to the temporal affairs of the Church (Acts 6th chapter), and we have mention made of elders who had been made overseers of the Church, and whose business it was to watch over the disciples in regard to their spiritual welfare, and feed them with spiritual food. (Acts 20:17-31.)

6. "We further find an account in the book of Acts of the beginning of the work of false teachers in the Church, land the evil results following their efforts. (Acts 15th |chapter and Galatians 1st chapter.)

Therefore, whoever would understand the history of the Church of Christ must begin with the "book called Acts of Apostles.

SECOND BOOK.

The letters to the churches may be called the second book of church history because of the statements they contain concerning the errors in doctrine and in life that gained a hold on the churches. One of the first errors |, was the disposition of some who were converted from among the Gentiles to adopt Jewish circumcision, and the disposition of others who were converted from Gentilism

to adopt human philosophy and a heathen feast. Besides, those converted from among both Jews and Gentiles were constantly in danger of going into worldliness, as we learn by various fore-warnings and exhortations from apostolic pens. The language of Paul with reference to certain prominent individuals also contributes in the direction of church history. What he said concerning both friends and enemies tells about the current of events. Both Paul and Peter also foretold the great falling away or apostasy, and by examination we find that borrowing from Judaism, borrowing from Paganism, and borrowing from the world, were the secrets of that apostasy as it was divinely foretold. Such borrowing began in apostolic days and has ever since been continued by multitudes who profess to be followers of Christ.

THIRD BOOK.

John's vision on the Isle of Patmos, which is commonly called "The Book of Revelation" may be termed the third book in church history. The address found in the early part of that book to each of seven churches in Asia tells what the condition of things was at that time in many churches. Besides, the prophecies given through John set forth the history of the Church, in general terms, even till the close of time. Therefore it, may be said that the New Testament contains all that we really need to know of church history in order to be saved. We are therein told how the people who desired to be saved became Christians under apostolic direction, and we are told how Christians needed to conduct themselves both individually and collectively, and we are told what shall be the final destiny of both the faithful and the unfaithful. This is sufficient for our salvation, and so it is evident that the New Testament will thoroughly furnish

us unto all good works, that we may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing.

UNINSPIRED HISTORY.

But as the apostles Paul, Peter, and likewise John all spoke of a great falling away from the truth there is a natural desire to examine the uninspired history of the Church and learn when this began and what were the different steps of digression or descent from the divinely arranged position. As previously stated it was through borrowing from Judaism, Paganism, and from the world, that the apostasy was accomplished. To this it may be added that "ambition" and "indolence" are the two words which explain the secret of this borrowing business by which the apostasy was accomplished. Ambition on the part of some to have more power and authority than the Lord intended they should have, and indolence, or the love of ease and indulgence, on the part of the masses led them to submit and surrender their liberties. Ambition for power on the one hand resulted in establishing the Romish priesthood with the Pope at the head of that arrangement, and love of ease and indulgence on the other hand resulted in establishing the Romish laity with all the ignorance and superstition therein found. Such are the general principles of the apostasy, and now it is important to mention more of the details. In so doing attention will be invited to five periods or governments, namely, the *Congregational*, the *Diocesan*, the *Metropolitan*, the *Patriarchal*, and the *Papal*. Of these mention shall be made in their order.

CONGREGATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

The churches of Christ established by the apostles were congregational in their form of government. This is evident to all who will carefully read the New Testament. Besides, I have examined Coleman's Church History on this subject and he quotes from Drs. Mosheim and Nean-

der, both of whom declare that each congregation managed its own affairs, selecting its own officers, exercising its own discipline, settling its own difficulties, and working as an independent community. This state of affairs continued until some time in the second century, when a change gradually took place of which a statement shall now be made under what in church history is called by a name which implies centralization of power.

DIOCESAN GOVERNMENT.

In course of the second century congregations began to associate themselves, and have their leading men to meet as delegates to confer concerning the affairs of the churches. Whether this was first suggested by the churches or by the leaders who consisted of bishops and preachers we know not. Yet when we read the third epistle of John we find that a man named Diotrephes loved to have the pre-eminence, would not receive the apostle John, and even cast certain ones out of the Church. This was the very spirit which developed the Diocesan system. Men who had been chosen for overseers and preachers gradually assumed more authority than was originally given them, and in course of time enlarged their boundaries, until instead of being local officers and ministers they had control of a considerable number of congregations. Thus, what is commonly called a "diocese" was formed, which word in modern English means the jurisdiction of a bishop, or the entire number of churches over which he has control. Such a bishop was unknown to the primitive or apostolic Church. In proportion as this Diocesan period progressed the rights of the masses were taken from them, and they were under the dictation of the clergy. This order of things arose in the second century and continued throughout the third century with a constant tendency toward centralizing power, and then in the early half of the fourth century in the East and

later in the West it gave place to that which followed. A statement of what followed will next be given.

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT.

The form of church government which succeeded the Diocesan was called Metropolitan. The word Metropolitan, as many are aware, means *central city or chief city*. As the churches increased the bishops or clergy enlarged their powers or authority. They met in councils and disposed of the affairs of the churches as they saw fit. The council of Nice met A. D. 325, and ordered that the "bishops should in the provinces be subject to the Metropolitan;" and that "no one should be appointed bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan." The council of Antioch in A. D. 341 defined and fully established the rights of the Metropolitan government. Jerusalem, Antioch, Caesarea, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, Carthage, Lyons and others were cities in which this Metropolitan government was established. In course of time that government took the place of the Diocesan over the entire Church. The evils of this system only tended to make the clergy more powerful and haughty, and to make the laity or masses of the members more ignorant and indifferent. Step by step and inch by inch those constituting the clergy took possession of everything pertaining to the Church, and in their rivalries with each other prepared the way for what followed.

PATRIARCHAL GOVERNMENT.

Next to the Metropolitan government came the Patriarchal, which resulted from a further centralization of power. This was accomplished in the fifth century. The word "patriarchal" means father-leader. In the course of the period from the fourth to the sixth century there arose four great ecclesiastical or religious divisions, each of the leading bishops of which bore the title of "Patriarch." These divisions were Rome, Constantinople,

Alexandria, and Antioch. Soon after these Patriarchs were established there arose a strong contest between Rome and Constantinople for the supremacy or title of Universal Patriarch, or Head of the Church Universal. Great political events, among which the rise of Mahometanism was prominent, finally decided in the sixth century in the West, and in course of the seventh century in the East, in favor of Rome. This decision resulted in the establishment of the Pope.

PAPAL GOVERNMENT.

This government is so-called because the Pope, who is its head, claims to be the great Papa or spiritual Father of the entire Church that is under his control. "When the Papacy or Popish government had been established, then the highest desire of cunning, and love of power had been reached. Besides, when a human being was enthroned as head of the Church, then Christ was displaced, and then was fulfilled the prophecy of Paul in 2 Thes. 2:3, 4, which reads thus: "Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come [the day of Christ's return], except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Then was fulfilled also what is recorded in Paul's first letter to Timothy 4:1-3, and reads as follows: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth."

DOCTRINES OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

As many of my readers may not know what are the

leading features of the Popish government, or the Roman Catholic Church I shall mention them.

1. The doctrine of original sin, or guilt of sin, transmitted or entailed upon every infant born into the world, which doctrine had been decided upon in the second or third century, was accepted and taught by the Pope.

2. The doctrine of infant baptism which had been previously established in the course of the falling away from the primitive or apostolic teaching was accepted and enforced by the Pope.

3. Many orders of the clergy unknown to the New Testament, which in course of the falling away had been regarded as beneficial to the Church as it had been perverted from primitive simplicity, were accepted and enforced by the Pope. To these orders many other orders of clergy were added as time advanced, and the common people were held in abject submission. Thus began a long, dark period of oppression which remained in a great measure unbroken until the early part of the sixteenth century. Thus Rome's power remained almost undisputed for nearly a thousand years over what was known as the western part of the Church.

4. As time advanced in course of that long, dark period the confessional was added in order to increase the power of the clergy. In other words, the members of the Roman Catholic Church were required to confess all their sins to the priest in secret, and receive instructions and a sentence of pardon from him.

5. From the Pope down and through all the ranks of the clergy even to the humblest all members of the clergy were forbidden to marry.

6. The Monastery for training men and the Convent or Nunnery for training women for the work of the Church were also established. These two institutions were both

called by that other name—"Cloister," which means a place of seclusion.

7. In course of time the communion was given to the common, people only in part. That is to say, the bread only was given to them while the priest drank the wine, for them all, or in behalf of them all.

8. The use of beads, crucifixes, and other emblems in worship, praying to angels, and the virgin Mary, together with other real, or imaginary saints, gradually came to be introduced.

9. "With the gradual establishment of the Pope came the gradual union of Church and State. Finally, the ambition for power caused the Popes to grasp for everything that they could gain of secular power until empires trembled before them. The eastern portion of the Church, commonly called "the Greek Church" never went beyond the Patriarchal government, and thus never established the Papacy or Popish government in its fulness.

THE DAYS OF REFORMATION.

Now the reader's attention is invited to the days of Reformation. Pious men had arisen in the Church of Rome or Roman Catholic Church who revolted against the iniquities of both the clergy and the laity. But they were not permitted to work a reformation. The Waldenses arose about the middle of the twelfth century. Peter Waldensis, a wealthy merchant of Lyons, is supposed to have been the person after whom this people was called. He employed a certain Catholic priest, about the year 1160, in translating, from Latin into French, the four accounts of the gospel, with other books of holy scripture. After comparing the teachings of these books with the doctrines and practices of the Romish Church, he concluded that Catholicism was not Christianity, and in 1180 became a public teacher of what he understood to be the doctrine of Christ. This set of reformers flourished until

1696, when an effort was made on the part of the Romish Church to oppress and persecute them to their entire destruction. The few that remained were indebted for their existence to the intercession made for them by English, Dutch, and other governments. John Wickliffe arose in England in the fourteenth century and exposed many of the errors of Rome. He died in 1382, leaving many works behind him to prepare the public mind for reformation. John Huss arose in Bohemia in the early part of the fifteenth century against Rome, but the Roman Catholic clergy burned him at the stake in the year 1415.

But in the early part of the sixteenth century there arose men whom Rome could not burn, nor otherwise destroy. There had been a ripening of the public mind for revolt against the clergy and their assumptions of power. This was true in Germany, Switzerland, France, and England. The Pope's sale of indulgences, or licenses to commit wickedness, for the purpose of securing money to build what was called "St. Peter's Church at Rome"—this sale of indulgences seemed to give the final touch to the work of ripening the public mind for rebellion. That is to say, there were pious men in the Church of Rome whose minds revolted at the sale of a license to commit sin. The idea of selling to the people a slip of paper or parchment giving to the purchasers the permission to lie, steal, get drunk, and be guilty of almost any other offense for a period of days, weeks, or months, according to the amount of money paid—this was more than many could bear. Hence Martin Luther arose in Germany, Ulrich Zwingli arose in Switzerland, John Calvin arose in France, and the bishops of Henry VIII arose in England, all of whom revolted against Rome, and thus the voice of Reformation broke forth in those four countries with such vigor that it was soon beyond the Pope's control.

PARTICULARS.

All of the Reformers just mentioned assailed these capital errors of Borne which I shall now name.

1. The sale of indulgences to increase the revenues or treasury of the Church.
2. The celibacy or non-marriage of the clergy.
3. The confessional, or the doctrine which required the members of the Church to confess in secret to the priest.
4. The monastic life for men, and convent life for women in order to prepare them for the service of the Church.
5. The practice of giving the communion to the common people in the bread only, while the priest drank the wine.
6. The doctrine of transubstantiation, or changing of the real bread and wine of the communion into the real body and blood of Christ was also rejected by most of these Reformers, though indirectly held by Martin Luther, who refused to accept as otherwise than literal the language of Christ when he said, "This is my body." Though he denied that the bread and wine were really changed, yet he held that the real body and real blood of Christ were in or under, or in some way present with the unchanged bread and wine. Thus he differed from the other Reformers who held that the language of Christ concerning his body and blood was figurative.

RESULTS OF THE REFORMATION.

But the results of these efforts at reformation now deserve attention. In each of the four countries just mentioned the Bible was in course of time given to the people in their own language, and in connection therewith a human creed was given. Luther's work gave to the people the Bible in German and in addition thereto gave them the Augsburg Confession of Faith. Ulrich Zwingli's work in Switzerland gave the Heidelberg Catechism. John Calvin's work resulted in giving to the people the

Westminster Confession of Faith. The bishops of Henry VIII. of England began a work which in course of time gave to the people our Common Version of the Scriptures and the Episcopalian Prayer Book, which contains thirty-nine articles of religion, and a ritual or liturgy to govern the Episcopal Church in its religious services both in public and in private.

None of the Reformers just mentioned seemed to have grasped the idea that the Bible is practically a perfect guide-book, nor that the New Testament contains the gospel in all its features, nor that the gospel of Christ is God's power unto salvation to all that believe. It is true that they all acknowledged that the Bible is infallible, and is the final standard of appeal on all points of doctrine, yet to none of them did it seem to occur that the Bible would be or could be sufficient without a human creed. Hence the German Reformer gave to the people the Bible and the Augsburg Confession of Faith; the French Reformer gave to the people the Bible and the Westminster Confession of Faith; the English Reformers gave to the people the Bible and the Prayer Book; and the Swiss Reformer gave to the people the Bible and the Heidelberg Catechism.

None of the Reformers of that period grasped the thought contained in Col. 2:10, which says to Christians that they are "complete" in Christ. But all of those Reformers seemed to think that the people could only be made "complete" in Christ if a man-made creed were added. To their minds the creed was necessary to draw lines of demarcation between them and the Romanists, and was necessary also for their own establishment and regulation as churches. Besides, none of them seemed to think that the Church could exist and worship without the preacher. So they thought that the creed was necessary to the existence of the Church, and the preacher was

necessary in order to the worship. The great apostasy or falling away took its form or shape by exalting a class of men to be the clergy, and by the making of human creeds. That order of things reached its perfection in the Romish Church. Yet these Reformers of the sixteenth century gave to the people in their Protestant creeds and clergy the very something which had originally given to the apostasy shape and stability. The Romanist said that the Church through its clergy had the right to *change and make doctrine*; the Protestant said that the Church through its clergy had the right to *formulate and arrange doctrine*. The Romanists so exalted the clergy as to say, "*No priest no worship*;" the Protestants so exalted the clergy as to say, "*No ordained preacher no worship*." Hence, the Reformers of the sixteenth century, while breaking the power of Rome, stopped far short of the apostolic Church. They protested against certain capital errors of Rome, yet borrowed others. They did tremendous good, yet stopped far short of restoring the primitive faith, They were *Reformers*, but not *Restorers*. They aimed to turn the people away from certain prominent errors of the Roman Catholic Church, but they did not know the importance of restoring to them the gospel in its primitive simplicity. In other words, they tried to lead the people *away from Rome*, but did not try to lead them *back to Jerusalem*.

APOLOGY FOR THE REFORMERS.

But those Reformers probably did their best. They had all been educated in the Church of Rome, and could not at once deliver themselves from bondage to her errors. It becomes us to praise them for all the good that they did, and withhold all censure for the mistakes they made. If their followers had only imitated them in reformatory work, then no doubt the primitive faith and practice would have been restored. But the creeds that were

formulated prevented this, and stereotyped the views of the sixteenth century, so that in many denominations they are yet in a great measure held with confidence, though the errors in them have been many times exposed. For instance, the fatalistic doctrine of predestination and salvation "by grace only," advocated by Calvin and Zwingle, and the doctrine of salvation "by faith only," advocated by Luther and the English Reformers, have been exposed thousands of times. Yet they are held and advanced even in this generation by thousands who ought to know better. That mankind are saved by the grace or favor of God is true, but they are not saved by grace only nor by grace alone. Salvation by faith is also taught in the gospel, but not salvation by faith alone. Thus the doctrines of "grace only" and "faith only" are serious mistakes.

LATER DEVELOPMENTS.

From Luther's work resulted the Lutheran Church and its various branches which still exist. From Calvin's work resulted the Presbyterian Church and its various branches that continue to live. From the Bishops of Henry VIII of England, finally came the Church of England, or the Episcopalian Church, and from that in the eighteenth century came forth the Methodist Episcopal Church, from which have come many shades and grades of Methodism. As for the work of Ulrich Zwingle, it is represented in this country by the German Reformed Church, which accepts the Heidelberg Catechism as its Confession of Faith. Thus several scores of denominations have arisen which either hold the original creed or some modified form thereof. Until the early part of the nineteenth century it seems that the idea of *reformation* was the highest that had been attained in the Protestant world. To *restore* the gospel of Christ in its primitive simplicity seems not to have occurred to any living man.

A NEW ERA.

But now an account shall be given of a new era. In the early part of this century—the nineteenth of the Christian Era—several men arose in certain parts of the United States of America who determined to reject all creeds except the Bible, and all authority in religion except that which is found in the Bible. After considerable investigation they decided to accept the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible as their guidebook in religion. As the New Testament contained the gospel of Christ, which is God's power to save, they decided that in the New Testament was recorded their only safe rule of faith and practice. As a safeguard against errors of all kinds they further decided that where the Bible speaks they would speak and where the Bible is silent they would be silent. To this they added, that they would not insist upon anything in either faith or practice for which there could be found no "thus saith the Lord," either in command or approved example.

These were the principles on which and by which those were guided who endeavored to restore the primitive order of things to the world. To the extent that they were faithful to such principles they made a grand success, and the result has been the re-establishment of the Church of Christ, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone. In accomplishing this work they repeated the primitive testimony in favor of Christ's divinity in order to prove that Christ is the Son of God. Then to those who became convinced of Christ's divinity and desired to obey him they repeated the primitive requirements to repent, confess and be baptized. Those who thus obeyed they instructed to continue steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and breaking of bread and prayers, together with singing of psalms, hymns and spiritual

songs, even as Acts of Apostles and the Epistles require, and to do all other things divinely indicated either by commands or examples.

The primitive church government was likewise restored. Christ was recognized as King, the New Testament as his statute book, the local bishops or overseers together with the deacons were regarded as the executors of the divine will. Evangelists or preachers were not considered as officers in the Church, but were servants of the Church to proclaim the gospel and establish new congregations in addition to the work of strengthening and confirming those already established. Each congregation managed its own affairs, and thus the primitive congregational government was restored. There were no lordly bishops, nor lordly elders dictating for a community of churches. But each congregation or church was under Christ as the Head. The New Testament was regarded as his statute book. The local bishops, or overseers, sometimes called elders, had in hand the business of executing or carrying out what the New Testament ordained in regard to the spiritual affairs of the Church, while the deacons had in hand the business which the New Testament ordained with reference to the temporal affairs of the Church. The chief business of the overseers is summed up in the words "feed," "watch," "rule." (Acts 20:28, 31; 1 Tim. 5:17; Heb. 13:17.) The chief business of the deacons is indicated by the sixth chapter of Acts where a record is given of the choosing of seven men to attend to certain temporal affairs of the Church. But neither overseers nor deacons were intended to be wholly confined to the local affairs of any particular congregation. Both classes of servants had the privilege of preaching the gospel according to their abilities. The qualifications for both overseers and deacons are found in 1 Timothy third chapter and Titus first chapter.

REFLECTIONS.

The foregoing historical statements indicate that a complete circle was made from the simplicity of the gospel as recorded in the New Testament around through the apostasy and back again to the New Testament record of the gospel. From the simplest form of congregational church government there were changes made in the direction of centralizing power until the Pope instead of Christ was regarded as head of the Church, and those changes may be considered as having constituted one half of the circle. Then from the Pope as the reputed head of the Church changes were made until the simplest form of congregational church government was reached, with Christ as the great Head of the Church, and these changes may be regarded as the other half of the circle. "When the Pope was enthroned Christ was in a certain sense dethroned. The divine order was then utterly discarded, and the human order fully established. But when the congregational government was again reached and the lordly bishops discarded, then to that extent the Pope was dethroned and Christ recognized as enthroned, and occupying his place as "head, over all things to the Church." (Eph, 1:22, 23.) Thus when the New Testament church government was restored, and the New Testament worship was restored, and the New Testament faith, repentance, confession, and baptism were restored, then the gospel of Christ in its simplicity and purity was re-established among mankind. The reader is now informed that all this has been actually done, and all this is now in existence on the face of the earth. The following chapters of this book will give further information concerning the treatment which the Inspired Volume has received and the treatment it should receive.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

It was the falling away, or apostasy, from the New

Testament order of things that introduced spiritual Hydrophobia. The Church of Rome, or Roman Catholic Church, is responsible for its existence in the world. Wherever that dreadful spiritual ailment exists Roman Catholicism may be found. The misfortune is that multitudes are afflicted therewith who are not aware thereof. They regard themselves as in good spiritual health, but they are spiritually diseased. Whether the reader is thus afflicted or not can only be determined by a careful reading of the chapters that follow the one that is now about to close. Each man must diagnose his own case, and each woman must decide for herself with reference to her condition. Indifference concerning the Bible is a strong symptom of the ailment.

FIFTH CHAPTER.**EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.**

The Bible, its name and divisions, reasons for believing in the authenticity or reliability of the Bible as a volume, reasons for believing the Bible in all its parts, reasons for regarding the Bible as perfect, and additional remarks with reference to the Bible—these are the subjects which are to be considered in the chapter to which attention is now invited. The reader will find in this chapter much thought concerning the Bible presented in simple form. The importance of the subjects considered suggest that earnest attention be given thereunto.

NAME.

"The Bible" is a name which comes to us from the Greek language and literally means *The Book*. The Bible is thus *The Book*. It is sometimes called "The Book of books" by reason of its great and various contents. Certainly it is the greatest book in the world. It has been translated into more languages, and read by more people than any other book in the world. Besides it has been more loved and more hated, more prized and more persecuted than all other books ever written.

FIRST DIVISION.

The first great division of the Bible is at once evident to all Bible readers. It consists of two great departments called "The Old Testament" and "The New Testament."

The word "testament" means will, and thus the Bible consists of the Old Will and the New Will. That is to say, it consists of the will of God as anciently made known through Moses and the prophets, and the will of God as made known later through Christ and the apostles. The Old Testament is intended to make known the history of God's dealings with the world and specially with his ancient people, the Jews. The New Testament is intended to make known God's will through Christ concerning how people can become Christians and remain Christians, and how he will deal with all mankind in the last Great Day— the Day of Judgment. As otherwise expressed, the Old Testament reveals God, while the New Testament reveals Christ, in that it reveals the will of God as made known through Christ. The Old Testament contains the types, shadows, and prophecies, while the New Testament contains the fulfillment thereof. The two Testaments are in harmony,

SECOND DIVISION.

The Bible as a whole reveals three different dispensations or ages of religion. These are commonly called the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian or Gospel dispensation. The word "patriarchal" comes to us from the Greek language and literally means *father leader* or *leadership by the father*. The name patriarchal is thus properly applied to that religious age during which each father was priest for his family. The Patriarchal age was therefore the age of family religion, or when the father of each family conducted his own religious worship. Throughout that period there was, so far as we can learn, no written revelation. But the people had information concerning the true worship by tradition handed down, no doubt, from our first parents and their immediate descendants. Besides, in course of that period God made new revelations from time to time by dreams, by heavenly angels, or

earthly messengers as it pleased him. That period, by reason of having no full written law, has been called the *Starlight Age*. This name seems appropriate because in starlight we do not see very clearly. That age or dispensation continued until the law was given on Mt. Sinai.

The Jewish dispensation is commonly called the *Moonlight Age*, because of its numerous types and shadows. It was fully introduced by the giving of the written Law through Moses on Mt. Sinai in Arabia. During that age the priests were chosen from a certain tribe—the tribe of Levi. The Jewish age continued till the Law was fulfilled in Christ and the Holy Spirit came down on the day of Pentecost, mentioned in Acts second chapter. Some suppose that the Law was finished when Christ died on the cross. But that is a mistake. What was typified by the high priest's officiating in the holy place was not fulfilled till Christ ascended; and the presence of God over the tabernacle was not fulfilled till the Holy Spirit descended on Pentecost.

The Gospel dispensation has been called the *Sunlight Age*, because of the full revelation thereby made of God's love and goodness toward mankind. During Christ's personal ministry preparation was made for its full introduction, which occurred on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection. While the truth revealed in course of the Patriarchal and Jewish ages seems to have been intended for a limited period and a select company, yet it is evident that the Gospel age is intended for all time till the end of the world, and for all nations and individuals.

THIRD DIVISION.

Taking the Bible again as a whole we find that its contents from beginning to end may be divided into History, Law, Poetry, Aphorisms and Prophecy. The Old Testament consists chiefly of History and Law until we come to the Book of Psalms, which is the chief poetic work of

the Bible. Next we come to the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes which consist of aphorisms or wise sayings. Passing over Solomon's Song, which is a poetic work, we come to the Prophecies, many of which are also written in poetry.

Coming to the New Testament we find the first five books to be historical. Four of these give the personal history of Christ on earth, while the fifth gives the history of the establishing of the Church of Christ among both Jews and Gentiles. Then we find twenty-one books called Epistles that are chiefly filled with the law of life, or the disciplinary regulations for Christians in all departments of their earthly pilgrimage. The last book called the Revelation of John is chiefly prophetic.

FOURTH DIVISION.

Again viewing the Bible as a whole we find that it consists of sixty-six separate documents called books. Thirty-nine of these constitute the Old Testament, and twenty-seven of them constitute the New Testament.

These documents were written by kings, priests, prophets, shepherds, fishermen, and artisans or tradesmen. From the time Moses began to write till John finished his vision on the Isle called Patmos a period elapsed of fifteen hundred years or more. Yet these documents when compared are found to possess wonderful harmony of statement, and in nearly all of them is contained the acknowledgment of God as Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor. Very few of the writers of the documents or books of the Bible, specially of the Old Testament, knew each other or had any possible means of conference. Yet we find in most of them references to the future in types, in shadows, and in definite statements. In the fulness of time, when Christ came as the Glorious One spoken of by the prophets and foreshadowed in the ceremonies of the former dispensa-

tions, he looked back over the record and endorsed it without a criticism.

FIFTH DIVISION.

By examination we further find that the entire Bible may be divided into what may be called *affirmations* and *negations*, or *affirmative* and *negative teaching*. A general survey of the Holy Volume will reveal that about one half of its instructions are devoted to teaching mankind what is right and urging them to obedience, while the other half is devoted to pointing out what is wrong and forewarning mankind in opposition thereto. As an illustration take the language of 2 Tim. 3:16. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." In harmony with this Paul said in the next chapter to Timothy, "Preach the word . . . reprove, rebuke, exhort." Here we find that "doctrine" and "instruction," "preach" and "exhort" are all affirmative, while "reproof" and "correction," "reprove" and "rebuke" are all negative. Thus it is throughout "both Testaments. The Lord who made man decided that he needed to be told what is right and also what is wrong; likewise that he needed to be urged to do what is right and forewarned against what is wrong. But certain human beings, who are made of the same clay with other mortals, have decided that it is sufficient to preach and teach what is right without saying anything about what is wrong. All such presume to be wiser than God and Christ.

REASONS FOR BELIEVING IN THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE BIBLE AS A WHOLE.

It is impossible that these reasons be clearly set forth. Certainly all who accept the Bible as a revelation from God, and thus as the Book of God, should have good reasons for en doing. Atheists and Deists, together with Agnostics and other classes of skeptics, are disposed to

reject the authenticity of the Bible. That is to say, they deny that the Bible came from God or is an inspired volume, but declare that it is a cunningly devised fable, or at least that it is the work of hypocrites or self-deluded impostors. All such challenge the Bible as a whole at the point of its alleged inspiration. Hence it is deemed important to set forth a few reasons for confiding in the Bible as God's book.

FIRST REASON.

It is the only book that pretends to give a history of man for both time and eternity. This is a bold declaration, yet not extravagant. All other books are in confusion with reference to the origin and destiny of man unless they have copied from the Bible. What am I? Whence came I into being? Whither do I tend? These are questions which no other book than the Bible boldly answers. Though all other books are not before the mind of him who makes this declaration, yet he well knows of what the human mind, unaided by revelation, is capable, so far as discovering the origin and destiny of mankind is concerned. There is a mystery connected with the questions that arise concerning whence we came, what we are, and whither we are going that no human mind can fathom. That mystery the Bible boldly explains, without reasoning or speculation, in declaring that we consist of body, soul or life, and spirit, that we came from the hand of God, and that we are bound for eternity. It also declares that those who obey the gospel and live in harmony therewith are destined to live forever at God's right hand, while those who live and die in disobedience shall be forever separated from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power. Such information no other book than the Bible boldly gives, and this is one great reason for having confidence therein as the Inspired Volume which has been divinely given for the guidance of

mankind through their life of probation here on earth.

SECOND REASON.

The Bible is the only book which boldly answers the questions which arise concerning the origin and ending of this material world. On every hand the observing eye is confronted with the wonders of this world. Whence came these wonders? Who originated them? Man knows that he did not. He also knows that he could as easily create a world like this as to create a single grain of sand or particle of dust. Creative power, in the sense of originating material, is beyond the power of mankind. Yet here is the earth with its animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. Besides, around and about us is the immensity of space filled with air, while over and above us we behold the blue canopy of the heavens with the sun, moon, and stars. Whence came all these? Who created them? Unto whom are they justly chargeable? These questions the Bible alone answers so as to satisfy the thinking mind. The sceptic may say that they came by *chance*, but the question then arises, *Who made the chance?* Here the skeptic is thrown into confusion.

THIRD REASON.

The Bible is the only book which makes no apologies for the mistakes of its friends. It is the only "book that is supremely impartial. Human biographies, if written by a friendly hand, pass over errors, foibles, blunders. They are generally written by friends on the principle of a funeral sermon, wherein virtues are magnified and faults are in charity unmentioned, or are briefly spoken of with apology. But the Bible is altogether different. Though, written by its friends, yet it makes no apology for the faults of its friends, but mentions them boldly. Thus the drunkenness of Noah, the fear and falsehood of Abraham, the treachery of Jacob, the rashness of Moses, the sins of David and Solomon, the fact that Peter denied his Master,

that Ananias and Sapphira lied, that Peter acted hypocritically at Antioch, that Paul and Barnabas had a quarrel, and that many of the churches practiced or permitted things that were wrong—such facts are mentioned without apology, and in most instances they are mentioned with censure or condemnation. In this respect the Bible differs from any other book containing a biography or life history. Herein is found an evidence of the Bible's superhuman origin. In its impartial character is beheld a feature which proves that it is divine.

FOURTH REASON.

No other book than the Bible reveals a religion that claims to have a perfect exemplar. But the biographical records of Jesus Christ, as given by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, declare him to be absolutely perfect. When he was on trial the Roman Governor, Pilate said, "I find no fault in him." Friends and foes have ever since surveyed his life, and their united testimony is the same. He stands before the world of mankind as the only absolutely perfect one that ever walked the earth as a man. Very different is this from what is beheld in the systems of Paganism. None of the Pagan deities are supposed to possess all the supposed divine attributes. But there is among them a parceling out or distribution of those attributes. Some are supposed to possess one or two of one kind, while others are supposed to possess one or two of another kind. Then we read in heathen mythology of war between the gods. It was supposed by the ancient heathen that each nation had its own gods, and these had their own jurisdiction. Thus imperfection is stamped on the character of heathen gods, as well as on heathen kings and princes. But Jesus Christ is declared in the New Testament to be a partaker of his divine Father's attributes, and he stands before us as the universal friend of mankind, and as the one who possesses universal

authority. "God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life." John 3:16. "And he is the propitiation [satisfaction] for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2:2. "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power [authority] is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Matt. 28:18. Such declarations indicate the universal character of Christ's friendship for mankind and of his authority over mankind. Herein is found evidence of his perfect character, and thus is found an important reason why we should accept the Book as authentic which reveals him as perfect.

FIFTH REASON.

The Bible's addresses to mankind are in harmony with the human constitution. Man is so constituted that he must have testimony in order to have faith, and the character of the testimony determines the character of the faith produced. Accordingly we find that when God desired to produce in the Jewish mind the conviction that the law he was about to give was from heaven, he accompanied the giving of the law with thunderings, lightnings, the voice of the trumpet and the quaking of the mountain, so that the people trembled. By such manifestations the conviction was riveted in the Jewish mind that God spake to them in the law.

Then when the law had about finished the purpose for which it was given and a new religion was to be introduced the Lord recognized the need for more supernatural testimony. Hence Christ came before the world as a mighty worker of mighty miracles. Though he spoke wondrous words, such as had never "before been heard by the people whom he addressed, yet he did not ask them to accept him on words only. But he said to them, "If I do not the works of my Father, "believe me not." John

10:37. So then the universal need for testimony in order to produce faith or belief in the human mind is recognized and fully met in the Scriptures. Besides, the need for simplicity in the testimony presented is met, in that the evidences that are intended to prove that Christ is the Son of God are presented in the plainest and simplest manner. The need for repetition in order to impress the common mind is also fully recognized and fairly met. In all this is found a strong reason for accepting the Bible as a whole with entire confidence as the word of God. Now we come to another department of evidence in favor of the Bible.

REASONS FOR BELIEVING THE BIBLE IN ALL ITS PARTS.

Here is an important department of thought, especially in these latter days of so-called "Higher Criticism." For men of higher conceit than that possessed by common mortals are calling in question much that has heretofore been regarded as the Sacred Text. Hence it is highly important for us to know whether we should accept as inspired all for which inspiration has heretofore "been claimed, or whether we should permit conceited mortals formed of ordinary clay to sift for us the Sacred Text and decide for us what should or should not be accepted as sacred. On this subject a few reasons shall now be presented.

FIRST REASON.

The different parts of the Bible are in harmony with each other. This is true concerning the separate documents or books, and it is true concerning the many statements found in those books. Occasionally a discrepancy is seen, which for a time may puzzle the Bible student. But a discrepancy or apparently contrary statement is not a contradiction, and it may result from an incorrect translation, or from a different basis of calculation, or from different points of view from which a given case is regarded. But even discrepancies of this kind are seldom

found in the Scriptures. The rule is that all for which inspiration is claimed is altogether harmonious, or may be thus explained without violation of the principles of right reason or honest interpretation. This is what we should regard as right in the Book claiming to be inspired. Harmony exists in external nature, whether we take a survey of what is on the earth, in the earth, or above the earth. All the works of God in nature are harmonious with each other, and we find all the words of God to be , in harmony with each other. We *may* as easily find a contradiction in nature, or in the outworking of nature's laws, as to find a contradiction in the words of God as revealed in the Bible. From beginning to end the different parts of the Bible are in harmony with each other, are in harmony with the needs of the world of mankind, and are in harmony with the claim that the Bible came from the mind of God. This is an important reason for believing it to be in reality as divine as it claims to be, and this confutes the critic who would sift the Bible through his intellectual sieve and reject what he presumes is unworthy of divinity. For instance, the endeavor on the part of critics of higher conceit to reject the book of Job as fabulous or parabolic is found to be absurd when Ezek. 14:14, and James 5:11, are considered, wherein Job is divinely declared to have been a man of righteousness, and is classed with other righteous men. Thus in the harmony of the different parts of the Bible with each other is found a strong reason for accepting its pretentious to inspiration.

SECOND REASON.

The Bible is the most dignified and concisely written book that the world has ever seen. Its themes are the most lofty, and its style is in harmony therewith. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Where can be found in the domain of human literature a

sentence that can be justly compared with that declaration which begins the Sacred Volume? As another illustration take this from David: "He spake and it was done; he commanded and it stood fast." Psa. 33:9.

Much has been, said concerning the dignity and conciseness of Shakespeare's writings, but it would not be difficult to overshadow all the respectable sayings of Shakespeare by utterances of the word of God. In setting forth that the Egyptians could do his people no good God said, "Their strength is to sit still," Isa. 30:7. Where in all the domain of Shakespeare's writings do we find anything to equal such a declaration as that just cited?

Then the declarations of the Savior are as far above all human composition as human language with divine precision chosen could set forth differences in style of speech and depth of thought. "What document ever penned will equal the Sermon on the Mount as recorded in. Matthew fifth, sixth and seventh chapters? That speech alone will ever place Jesus of Nazareth as the most original and the most profound speaker that ever addressed an audience.

Finally, let the mind pass to John's vision on the Isle of Patmos. Therein is found dignity and grandeur that is superhuman. His description of the New Jerusalem is sufficient to place him above all others after whom mankind, have ever read, except the other inspired writers, His conception of a city fifteen hundred miles in length, in breadth and in height, gives evidence of inspiration not born of earth. Thus the dignity and conciseness of the Bible is an important reason for accepting its teachings as true.

THIRD REASON.

The Old Testament was first written in Hebrew and afterwards was translated into Greek. In the Hebrew language it was in the hands of the Jewish scribes, than whom a more faithful company of men in regard to their

work never lived. The history of their care in copying the Sacred Text is almost marvelous. They would not only transcribe and compare letters and words with diligence, but they would even count the letters of the copy made, so that it could not possibly deviate from the copied document. Besides, it is evident to the Bible reader as soon as it is stated that Christ never charged the scribes with corrupting the Sacred Text. He called them "hypocrites" and classed them with the Pharisees, yet he did not even intimate that they had not been faithful in copying and keeping the Scriptures. Their faithfulness was indeed marvelous, especially when it is borne in mind that the Old Testament recorded so many iniquities of which the Jews had been guilty.

FOURTH REASON.

The New Testament was first written in Greek. Soon after it was completed, it fell into the hands of those who are generally regarded by Protestants as enemies to the plain and simple truth. Certainly the Church of Rome cannot be justly defended as the friend of the Bible in all its teachings. The Romish clergy seems to regard the Bible as a dangerous book for the masses, and the secret of this is no doubt found in the fact that those who have free access to the Bible generally cease to be Romanists.

Yet it is admitted that for a thousand years or more, Rome was the custodian or keeper of those copies of the Bible, and especially of the New Testament from which translations were afterwards made into other languages.. True, the Old Testament was no doubt still preserved in Hebrew among the Jews, and therefore if Rome had corrupted the text of the Old Testament it could easily have been detected. But the same is not true concerning the New Testament. As the Jews generally rejected Christ they were not disposed to keep as sacred the book which specially revealed him. Then the question arises, How

can we have entire confidence in the text of the New Testament? Fortunately the early writers of the Church— those who wrote soon, after the apostles had finished their course on earth—copied largely from the original documents that came from inspired hands, or from copies carefully made therefrom. In the essays and controversies of those who wrote before the apostasy was established very nearly the entire New Testament was copied, these writings were preserved by Rome in their integrity, and thus by them nearly all the New Testament can be verified. The Greek Church also preserved the Scriptures and thus a comparison of what the Romish or Latin Church preserved with what the Grecian Church preserved gives the fullest assurance that we now have the New Testament in its integrity. A few discrepancies may be found, but no contradictions are discovered therein. Besides, the entire New Testament is in harmony with the character of Jesus Christ as set forth by his biographers —Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

FIFTH REASON.

But had there been no writings beside the New Testament which copied largely therefrom, and had there been no Greek Church to preserve the New Testament, yet confidence in the integrity of the Sacred Text should not falter. Let it be admitted that God once was sufficiently interested in the welfare of mankind to make a revelation to them and that will give confidence; for the same divine interest that would cause a revelation to be divinely made would cause that revelation to be divinely preserved. Therefore it should make no difference to Christians concerning the hands into which the Scriptures fell, and by which they were held. The God of heaven was able to make his enemies just as safe custodians or keepers of his revelations to man as he could make his friends. The Prophet Daniel was just as safe in the den of lions as in

his own bed while he had God's protecting care. On the same principle the Bible was just as safe in the hands of Romanists as it was with any other class of people. Therefore those who wish to regard the Bible as true should have no misgivings. The Inspired Volume was safe while in God's keeping, and, as previously remarked, the same divine interest which caused a revelation to be made doubtless caused that revelation to be preserved in its integrity.

REASONS FOR REGARDING THE BIBLE AS PERFECT.

There is no position that any one can reasonably occupy between a whole hearted acceptance of the word of God on the one hand, and a whole hearted rejection thereof on the other hand. If the Bible be worthy of any confidence it is doubtless worthy of all confidence. Its pretentious, and the relations of its parts to each other, are such that, if sound reason prevail, it must be accepted as perfect and thus worthy of *all confidence*, or it must be rejected as imperfect, and thus worthy of *no confidence*. A few reasons for regarding the Bible as perfect shall now be submitted.

FIRST REASON.

Perfection is found in all departments of external nature. The sun, the moon, and the starry hosts in their calm mysterious constancy declare that they are perfect and that their Author is perfect. The blue canopy above and beyond the great light-bearers make the same declaration. On earth are found the evidences of harmony and perfection in all that God has done. From the giant tree of the forest down to the little flower that buds along the pathway; from the mighty beast down to the smallest insect; from the cyclone to the gentle breeze—on every hand one may behold the evidences of God's infinite power and perfection. All nature is perfect though nature is only intended for time. Certainly then the great Author of

nature in giving a Book involving eternal interests did not give anything less than a perfect Book. The unavoidable conclusion therefore is that the Bible is perfect.

SECOND REASON.

God is declared to be perfect in the language of the Bible. "He is the Rock; his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth and without iniquity; just and right is he." Duet. 32:4. "As for God, his way is perfect." Psa. 18:30. With the conviction settled that God is perfect there can be but one reasonable conclusion with reference to the Book that he has given for the guidance of mankind. The Bible like all else that came from the hand of God must be perfect in itself, and perfectly adapted to the end for which it was given.

THIRD REASON.

"The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul." Here is a familiar declaration in the nineteenth Psalm which declares that the word of God is perfect. Closely related thereto is the following: "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure." Psa. 111:7. Then a New Testament writer in speaking of the purpose of Inspired Scripture says, "That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," 2 Tim. 3:17. Such declarations leave no ground for doubt with reference to the Bible's testimony concerning its own perfection. Moreover, it leaves no doubt concerning what God thinks of his own word. It is perfect in itself and will perfect the man of God, thoroughly furnishing him unto all good works. Hear David again. "The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times." Psa. 12:6. Imagination itself can go no farther. It is impossible to think of silver more pure than when purified in a furnace seven times. When thus purified no doubt the last vestige of dross is separated therefrom. So it is

with the word of God. Coining from Him who is infinite in all his attributes it is thoroughly tested and entirely separated from all error. Hence the word of God is perfect and is worthy of whole hearted confidence.

FOURTH REASON.

On examination we find that the Bible contains a perfect code of morals. This is true whether we take the law given on Mt. Sinai in Arabia, or the gospel that went forth from Mt. Zion or Jerusalem in Palestine. No better code of morals has ever been seen than that found in the law given through Moses. It was a moral, a religious, and a political or civil code. Besides, the sanitary or health regulations of the Jewish law are the best. Modern science with all its pretensions has not been able to give us regulations which can be generally practiced that will insure such health as the regulations given by the Most High through Moses. Statistics prove that the Jews by following the instructions of the law pass through epidemics with a smaller per cent, of death than any other people. Besides their morality and longevity are remarkable.

Then take the gospel, and while we have no detailed instructions therein concerning personal cleanliness, yet in all other respects the code is perfect. All phases and features of immorality are forbidden under the threat of everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.

FIFTH REASON.

The Bible is perfectly adapted to the spiritual longings and yearnings of mankind. Man naturally desires something more and something better than this life. The Bible informs him that he may have it—that he may have eternal life at God's right hand. Mankind desire to have treasures which will endure. The Bible teaches all to lay up treasures for themselves in heaven where moth doth

not corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal. Mankind long for friends who will always endure, and who can do them good in their time of greatest need. The Bible teaches that there is a friend who "sticketh closer than a brother," and that in heaven there are friends who, when we fail here, "will receive us into everlasting habitations." Mankind desire good company that shall never be broken. The Bible declares that the redeemed shall "praise God and the Lamb forever and ever," Mankind desire that their loved ones shall not sleep eternally in the grave. The Bible teaches the resurrection of all who sleep the sleep of death. Thus it is that the Bible is perfectly adapted even to the longings and yearnings of mankind. Here is a grand evidence that it is perfect, and that it came from the hand of Him who is altogether perfect in all his attributes. In the perfection of the Bible is an overwhelming reason why all mankind should believe and obey it without doubt or gainsaying.

Woe unto those who treat the Bible with indifference! Woe unto those who refuse to read and obey what it requires! Woe unto those who know their duty and do it not! Woe unto those who live and die in disobedience! It would have been better that they had never been born, and better a thousand fold if they had died in infancy or early life before they reached the years of responsibility. The Bible is perfect in its instruction for those who desire to be saved, and should be accepted by all.

ADDITIONAL REMAKES WITH REFERENCE TO THE BIBLE.

The amount of reading necessary to acquaint one with the history of the United States, or the history of England, if devoted to the historical portions of the Bible will enable us to secure a clear view of the history found in the Bible from beginning to end. Then why not read the Bible?

The time and attention it will require to become ac-

acquainted with the life of Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Napoleon Bonaparte, or George Washington will be sufficient to become intimately acquainted with the words and works of Jesus Christ when here on the earth. Why then will people remain ignorant of what is recorded concerning Christ?

The amount of study needed to fasten in thought the contents of an elementary school geography if devoted to Acts of Apostles would enable the student to become well acquainted with both the doctrinal and historical features of that book. Then why not devote that much study to the book of Acts?

The degree of thinking necessary to understand an ordinary arithmetic, if centered on Paul's letter to the Romans would enable the pupil to grasp the profound meaning of that great document.

The time and attention necessary to obtain an ordinary English education is sufficient to acquaint one with the entire New Testament and grasp the historical features of the Old Testament.

If a thousand dollars were offered each person over fifteen years of age who would learn within a month the full answer that inspired preachers gave in Acts of Apostles to alien sinners who wished to know what they should do to be saved very few would fail to get the thousand dollars.

If five thousand dollars a year were guaranteed each preacher who would, during the remainder of his life, preach to sinners the same conditions of salvation which the apostles set forth, there would soon be a mighty revolution.

If all Protestants were permitted to hold the Bible, but persecution unto death was urged against all who insist on having human creeds and societies and names and musical instruments in religion, there would be no

martyrs. All would give up humanisms rather than die if permitted to hold and believe and obey what the Bible teaches and requires. Does any one doubt these statements?

If all Protestants were required to give up the Bible and accept human creeds, societies, musical instruments, and human names, or be put to death, then there would be millions of martyrs. Who questions this?

Whatever is divine in religion is worth dying for; whatever is worth dying for is worth contending for; whatever is worth contending for is worth having. "Whatever is not divine in religion is not worth dying for; whatever is not worth dying for is not worth contending for; whatever is not worth contending for is not worth having. Protestants generally are divided over things that are not divine; hence over things ,not worth dying for; hence over things not worth contending for; hence over things not worth having.

The Bible should be read by all with as much diligence as is necessary in order to understand any ordinary text book used in common schools.

The Bible should be read with profound respect and even reverence, because it is the oldest book and has stood the test of the ages.

All who read the Bible should examine it with reference to themselves, and for their own spiritual benefit, rather than for the benefit of others.

All who would be specially benefitted by what the Bible declares to them should read its statements of doctrine in the light of their historical position in the record. By so doing many errors will be avoided which will otherwise be made.

Only those are spiritually blessed in reading the Bible who read slowly and meditate thereon. Hurler reading

of the Blessed Book does not lastingly impress what it declares.

By slowly, carefully, meditatively, reverently reading the Bible we learn to delight therein, and those who delight to read the Bible will not find it a hardship to obey what it requires.

The Bible is the only book which will strengthen the spirit of man in all the trials of life, and finally give consolation to the obedient in the hour of death.

It is questionable whether any who have the privilege of reading the Bible can live a godly life without reading the Bible. All must be learners or disciples of Christ in order to be saved, and in order to be learners of Christ it is necessary to read the book of Christ, namely, the New Testament. In order to love the Bible it is necessary to read it chapter after chapter, and to read it day by day. The Psalms of David are excellent for private and likewise public devotion. David's prayers were an outgrowth of his work, his sins, and the persecutions inflicted by his enemies. His expressions of praise and thanksgiving were an outgrowth of his deliverance from trial, and his reflections concerning the goodness and mercy of God. Our prayers are the outgrowth of what we are required to endure, and of our sins, while our thanksgivings are an outgrowth of the divinely bestowed favors that we enjoy. Hence the Psalms of David are excellent reading for Christians who desire to learn the language of prayer, praise and thanksgiving. All Christians should have this desire, and thus all should be constant readers of the inspired utterances of the Psalmist David.

Before any one can pray as a child of God it is necessary to be born again—born from above—born of water and of the Spirit. In other words, obedience to the gospel is necessary. The gospel in its facts is chiefly found set forth in "Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and its com-

mands addressed to sinners are chiefly found in Acts of Apostles. Then to the book of Acts let all go who wish to learn what is required of sinners to become Christians.

CONCLUSION.

The reader has not yet examined one half the chapters of this little volume in their order. Besides the chapter on physical Hydrophobia only four others have been submitted for perusal. The first of these four gave a connected view of the Old Testament Scriptures. The second gave a connected view of the New Testament. The third chapter presented a somewhat consecutive view of the leading events in church history from the establishing of the Church of Christ to the present time. The fourth chapter was strictly devoted to a consideration of the Bible as a whole, and remarks concerning its different parts and features. Has not sufficient been presented in those chapters to encourage the reader in the mental effort necessary to examine this little volume to the close? Has the writer promised anything that he has not fulfilled as far as time and space have permitted? Cannot the reader believe that the remainder of this book will richly reward those who will give due attention there unto? Have not the previous chapters made the Bible clearer to the mind than it ever was before? If so, then the writer earnestly entreats the reader to have diligence and patience to peruse each chapter of this volume from beginning to end, remembering that we shall meet at the judgment seat of Christ.

SIXTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

The reader's mind has doubtless been prepared by the preceding chapters to appreciate a few suggestions concerning the method and spirit necessary in studying the Bible to secure its precious meaning. But before presenting suggestions with reference to the method and spirit with which the Bible should be read and studied it is regarded important by the writer to submit several precautions against wrong methods and motives in reading and searching the Sacred Volume.

FIRST PRECAUTION.

The Bible should not be read as a book of curiosities. This has been done by many persons who have gained an unmerited reputation for being "posted" in the Divine Record, simply because they have read it as seekers of curiosities. The marvelous features of the Old Testament have specially interested that class of readers. They search the Bible for the wonders that are therein found, but disregard its doctrinal and practical features, and for that reason often view its wonders in a wrong light. Such searching of the Scriptures is generally unprofitable and even dangerous.

SECOND PRECAUTION,

The Bible should not be read to prove a previously accepted notion. Yet such a motive for reading the Holy

Volume is very common. As a result the context, and the subject matter of any particular text, are both ignored, and the text is pressed to prove what is unauthorized of heaven. This has been the fault of the makers and advocates of human creeds in all generations. They have conceived the notion or arranged the doctrine, and then have gone to the Scriptures for proof-texts thereof. In so doing they have misused a multitude of texts. Proceeding on this principle a preacher of considerable ability discoursed several years ago on the words, "There is no difference," which are found in Rom. 3:22. "With such words for a text he tried to prove that all the leading denominations of the Protestant world were alike. But suppose he had ventured to read the next verse which says, "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," what would have been the result? Certainly he would have been thrown into confusion. Paul in that text was not speaking of denominations, but was setting forth the fact that both Jews and Gentiles had been included under sin because all had sinned and come short of the glory of God. But that preacher would have spoiled his sermon if he had only read the statement which thus declared.

THIRD PRECAUTION.

The Holy Volume should not be read from a mathematical point of view. "Which is the longest verse?" "Which is the shortest verse?" "Which is the middle verse?" "How often is the word 'boy' found in the Bible?" "How often is the word 'girl' found therein?" Such and such like questions may occupy the minds of Bible searchers all their time with little or no profit.

FOURTH PRECAUTION.

It is in vain and often damaging to search the Bible simply to use it in discussion or debate either publicly or privately, if there be no disposition to obey its teachings.

"But unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth? Seeing thou hatest instruction and castest my words behind thee." Psa. 50:16, 17. This language shows that God is not pleased when wicked people use his Book with no intention to learn his will nor render obedience thereunto. Besides, for the disobedient to read, and repeat, and urge the teaching of God's word when they feel no personal interest therein is likely to cultivate irreverence in them, and thus do them damage. Now, reader, it is proper to suggest what the one who addresses you in this chapter regards as the right method and spirit of reading the Bible.

FIRST SUGGESTION.

The Sacred Text should always be read with a careful regard for its outlines or divisions. The Old Testament must be read as a book of divine history, but not as containing the authority by which we are now addressed. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10:4. There was a period when the law given through Moses on Mt. Sinai in Arabia was in force, but that time has passed. The third chapter of the second letter to the Corinthians clearly shows that the law written on tables of stone fulfilled the purpose for which it was given and then passed away. This should always be kept in mind while reading the Old Testament. Yet no one should on that account conclude that the Old Testament is of no value. "For whatsoever things were written afore-time were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15:4. "Now, all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world [age] are come." 1 Cor. 10:11. Such statements as these clearly show the value of the Old Testament. In

course of the period covered by the Old Testament history God revealed himself to man, and revealed man unto himself. Such revelations were recorded and preserved in order that all who read them under the gospel dispensation might be forewarned against disobedience. Thus the swift and severe judgments of God against sinners in Old Testament times clearly show what the divine decision now is concerning sinners. "Though hand join in hand, yet shall not the wicked go unpunished." Prov. 11:21. This statement is abundantly verified by the facts of the Old Testament. Therefore the Old Testament records should be read in order to understand God's disapprobation of sin ; also for the purpose of learning his approval of righteousness. Yet those records should always be read with the distinct understanding that the authority with which they were formerly binding on those to whom they were given has passed away. At the same time it should be kept in mind that all the authority "by which we are now addressed is of the Lord Jesus Christ. In the course of his personal ministry, as recorded in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, Christ said much that referred back to the law which was still in force at that time (Matt. 8:4; 23:1-3), and he said much in course of that same period which referred strictly to his personal ministry (Matt. 10:5, 6), yet he also said much that referred forward to the gospel dispensation, as when he had his interview with Nicodemus concerning the new birth. (John 3:1-12.) All that falls under this last heading, or belongs to this third feature of his teaching comes to us as binding. Likewise all that Christ has said to us through the apostles in Acts, in the Epistles, and in John's vision called the Revelation is binding on us, and it is at our peril that we treat any part thereof with indifference, or call it a non-essential. In the light of these scripture quotations and suggestions based thereon the Bible should always be read.

SECOND SUGGESTION.

It is proper now to state that in order for the Bible to be read understandingly there must be careful attention given to the three religious dispensations or ages which are revealed in the Bible, The first of those ages was the Patriarchal age, which began with the first religious instructions given to man and continued till the Jewish Law was fully introduced. Then the second was the Jewish age, which began with the law given through Moses on Mt. Sinai in Arabia, and which continued until the gospel was fully introduced on Mt. Zion in Jerusalem of Palestine. The third or Gospel age is the one under which we are now living. All these outlines must "be kept in mind by every one who would understand the Bible. Many persons, and even preachers, read the Bible without observing these divisions, and so they are continually in confusion. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10:4. With this statement of Paul they seem to have no acquaintance. The difference between the Old Covenant or agreement which God made with the Jews, and the New Covenant or agreement which he made with reference to us they seem to have entirely overlooked. But in Jeremiah thirty-first chapter the New Covenant is clearly spoken of, and in Hebrews eighth chapter it is recorded and applied to the gospel. Here is what Hebrews eighth says: "For if the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second: For finding fault with them he said, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." Heb. 8:7-9. This lan-

guage is sufficient to show the difference between the two covenants, and if further evidence be necessary it is found in the remainder of the same chapter, to which the reader is kindly referred.

THIRD SUGGESTION.

Those who read the Bible wishing to understand it must always bear in mind that it is a revelation from a Being who is infinite in all his attributes. In other words, to understand the Bible it is necessary to think of God as knowing all things, and having the power to do everything that it would be right for him to do. Then all records of miracles will be easy to accept. Believing that infinite or unlimited power belongs to God it will not be difficult to believe that he brought the flood upon the earth in the days of Noah, nor that he brought ten plagues upon the Egyptians in order to make their king willing to release his people, nor that he divided the waters of the Red Sea to let his people pass through, nor that the earth was checked in her revolutions in the days of Joshua so that the sun continued to shine longer than usual and apparently stood still, nor will it be difficult to believe the record of any other miracle found in the Old Testament. When the New Testament is thus read there will be no doubt concerning any of the miracles therein recorded, neither will there be any disposition to trim them down to suit modern notions. On the contrary, believing that Christ was possessed of divine power there will be no question concerning his ability to work any miracle ascribed to him in the New Testament. In view of the power he possessed it was as easy for him to create bread as it is for a person in perfect possession of all his forces to walk. The only reason why any one finds difficulty in believing the records of miracles recorded in the Bible is because of weakness of faith in God's infinity. But such lack of faith is unreasonable. Man is the highest of

earth's powers and intelligence. Yet man has no power to create a single atom of matter. Then whence came this material world? There is no reasonable answer except that found in the Bible. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," Gen. 1:1. "With this statement before our minds all records of miracles should be easy of acceptance. If man cannot create even one atom of matter, and if God created both the heaven and the earth, then we should be willing to accept any statement that may be made in the Bible concerning God's power to do whatever it was right for him to perform.

FOURTH SUGGESTION.

The Bible should be read with the idea that it is a plain book to those who read it aright. In Isaiah thirty-fifth chapter prophetic language spoke of a "highway" in which "wayfaring men though fools shall not err." The connection in which that language is found shows that the prophet was referring to the gospel dispensation, and in the gospel is plain instruction. Had it been otherwise three thousand could not have been converted at Jerusalem by a single discourse. (See Acts 3d chapter.) Some say that the Holy Spirit did the work by operating directly on the hearts of those who heard the truth. But that is all assumed. The Spirit filled the apostles, but not the multitude, for the Spirit descended before the multitude assembled. Besides, Christ had said in John 14:17 that he would send the Spirit, "whom the world cannot receive." If the world cannot receive the Spirit how could he enter the unconverted who belonged to the world and operate directly on their hearts? The Spirit was promised to those who as believers repented and were baptized (see Acts 2:38), and not to any one who was living in disobedience. But this subject will be more fully discussed in another chapter, and therein the teaching of the apostles with reference thereto will be carefully

considered. In conclusion on this subject it should be mentioned that according to the record of conversions found in Acts of Apostles no one, either Jew or Gentile, ever had any difficulty in understanding what was meant by the requirements to *believe*, to *repent*, to *confess*, and to *be baptized*. It seems to have been very plain then, and the record makes the cases of conversion very plain now to all who will read them honestly for the purpose of learning the Lord's will concerning themselves.

FIFTH SUGGESTION.

Those who wish to read the Bible aright must permit it to be its own interpreter or explainer. Therefore it is necessary to read it in the light of its own divine teachings. The Bible must be permitted to explain itself. For instance, when Rom. 9:21 is read the reader must go back, to Jeremiah eighteenth chapter and examine what is there said concerning the same subject. By so doing he will be enabled to understand that God has always given mankind a trial before he condemned them, just as the potter tried the clay in his hand for one vessel, and when it would not make that vessel he then made it into another vessel as it pleased the potter. But if the old doctrine of fatalism were true, which says that some men are condemned before they are born, then that clay should have "been condemned before it was dug out of the bank. Such, however, was not the case. It was tried before it was condemned, and the after teaching in the same chapter shows that God gives nations a trial before he passes sentence on them. If they do well he pronounces one sentence, and if they do not well he pronounces another sentence. On the same principle God deals with mankind individually. He condemns no one without a trial.

As a further illustration of what is meant by saying that the Bible should be permitted to explain its own teachings let reference be made to Romans fourth chapter.

In the early part thereof Abraham is mentioned as having been Justified by faith without works. When such language is read the reader should pause on the fourth verse which speaks of "debt" and thus shows that Paul referred to works of merit. Abraham did none of that kind, neither can any other human being do works of merit before God. Still this does not exclude works of obedience to God's commands. On the contrary, when we go back to Genesis twelfth, fifteenth, seventeenth, and twenty-second chapters and examine what is there said concerning Abraham we find that he obeyed God in every particular that God commanded him, except in offering his son Isaac as a burnt offering, and the only reason he did not obey fully that command was because God did not permit him. By such a record of obedience as is found in Abraham's history it is very evident that though he did no works of merit before God, yet he did works of obedience to the fullest extent that God required and permitted. Such a history of obedience shows that if we would be acceptable to God, and be regarded as children of Abraham by faith we must follow the example of that old patriarch in his submission to all that God commanded.

SIXTH SUGGESTION.

Whoever would read the Bible so as to become wise unto salvation must bear in mind that without faith it is impossible to please God (Heb. 11:6), also that whatsoever is not of faith is sin (Rom, 14:23). They must also accept Rom. 10:17, wherein it is declared that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. This shows that faith is produced by the divine testimony. But that testimony may be read as well as heard. "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." John 20:30, 31. When the divine testimony is heard then the ear is the inlet to the mind, when the testimony is read then the eye is the inlet thereof to the mind. With this much understood it should not be difficult for the reader to grasp the truth that everything which is clearly recorded in the divine testimony it is possible to believe, and was intended to be believed; but what is not therein recorded was not divinely intended to be a matter of belief or faith. In other words, all that the Sacred Text declares to mankind was intended to be accepted by them on the principle of faith. On the other hand, all that is not set forth in the Sacred Text was not intended to be a matter of faith. That is to say, it is impossible to believe that anything ever was the will of God in regard to religion which is not mentioned with approbation in the Book of God. On the same principle it is impossible to believe any thing in religion to be the will of Christ concerning us which is not mentioned with approbation in the gospel of Christ. This is certainly true because it is impossible to believe any statement without testimony to cover that statement. No jury can believe a man guilty of any crime without sufficient testimony to make that crime evident, or cover the crime which is charged or alleged. Thus it is in religion. Christ is the one who gave the conditions by which it is possible for sinners to become Christians, and the conditions by which it is possible for Christians to remain steadfast and finally reach heaven. Those conditions are briefly set forth in the gospel as given in the last speech that Christ made to his disciples before ascending to heaven, (See Matt, 28:19, 20; Mark 16:15, 16; Luke 24:46, 47.) Those conditions are more fully set forth in the book that is called Acts of Apostles, and the Letters addressed to the churches. Whatever is practiced in the religious world which is not found recorded with appro-

bation in the gospel cannot be practiced by faith, but is a matter of opinion or supposition, and thus is a matter of doubt unless it be of pure presumption.. But the gospel teaches that nothing is acceptable to Christ in religion unless it be performed in faith. Even eating food in doubt brings condemnation. "And he that doubteth is damned [condemned] if he eat because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23.

SEVENTH SUGGESTION.

The Bible should be studied, to say the least, with as much honesty and earnestness as the student of grammar, arithmetic, geography, or any other common branch of learning must study in order to make a success therein. The notion that close and protracted attention must be given to books shaped by uninspired men, while the Bible should be understood at the first glance or glimpse of thought concerning any subject therein set forth—this notion has its foundation in carelessness and ignorance altogether inexcusable. The lofty themes which constitute the subject matter of the Bible cannot be understood by a casual, incidental, or careless reading. The most precious pearls are not those which lie in profusion along the shore, and the most excellent gems of human thought are not those which are most easily grasped. Therefore it is not reasonable to suppose that the most lofty themes which can possibly engage the human mind are to be understood without honest and earnest thought. Life, death, and immortality are the leading themes of the Sacred Text, and though discussed in the simplest of human language with divine precision chosen, yet honest and earnest thinking is necessary to understand what is thereby set forth. Man as he was, man as he is, and man as he shall hereafter be are grand and lofty subjects for consideration. Therefore these subjects should be considered with the highest and best thought of which man is capable,

EIGHTH SUGGESTION

The word of God should be read consecutively—chapter after chapter—from beginning to end in order to be understood. This needs only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted. Common sense even of the most ordinary kind teaches that what is called the "hop, skip, and jump" method of reading a book of any sort is not the proper procedure, if the end in view be to understand what the book declares. School teachers of all grades instruct pupils to begin with the first lessons in every department of learning and then proceed taking each lesson in its order. They well understand that confusion would certainly result from any other method of procedure in grammar, arithmetic, geography, history, or any other department which pertains to common branches of learning. The same is true in higher education. Every science must be studied in an orderly manner to be understood. Each step constitutes a preparation for each advancement that is made. Thus it is in the study of the Scriptures. Many years ago in one of the southern states a young man thought to puzzle a negro preacher by asking him concerning the subject of predestination as found in the eighth and ninth chapters of Romans. The old preacher said to him, "Young massa, you got to dea chapters too soon. You ought to go back to de fust book ob de Bible and read dat till you un'stan it. Den read de next and de next till you un'stan dem. Go on dat way till you git ober de ole part ob de Bible. Dea take up de new part of de Bible and go ober dat till you unstan it all up to de place whar de subjic ob 'destination is, and den you will un'stan dat." Who questions that the negro preacher was correct? Not that it is necessary to understand all the details of the Old Testament in order to learn what the gospel requires of sinners to make them Christians, but it is certainly necessary to know the

history of God's dealings with his ancient people in order to know what is meant by certain statements in the New Testament which do not directly pertain to duty. The question of duty is plainly set forth in the New Testament.

NINTH SUGGESTION.

In order for any subject that is mentioned in the Bible to be understood all the testimony bearing thereon must be considered. For instance, *if* faith, repentance, confession, baptism, prayer, good works, or any other subject be presented to the mind for consideration then all of the statements of the Sacred Text bearing thereon should be examined. This must be done if the subject is to be properly considered. It is not right to take one or two texts on any subject and ignore all the others that were written thereon. Because several passages of scripture declare that mankind may be justified by faith it is wrong to say that such declaration means faith only or faith alone. Other scripture statements teach that mankind are justified "by the grace of God, by the blood of Christ, by works of obedience, in the name of Christ and by or through the Holy Spirit. (See Rom. 3:24; 5:9; James 2:14-26; 1 Cor. 6:11.) Moreover, because mankind are said to be saved by the grace or favor of God it is not fair to conclude that we are saved by grace only. By research we find that we are said to be saved by many other considerations or conditions. In Titus 3:5 Christians are said to be saved by "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit," while in 1 Peter 3:20, 21 it is clearly taught that persons are saved by what is commonly called "water baptism." But no one should suppose that "water baptism" alone will save. That would be as absurd as to say that persons can be saved by faith alone, grace alone, or works alone. Salvation is to be secured by doing all that Christ requires. Faith, repentance, confession, water

baptism, prayer, good works, a godly life — every thing which is authorized by the apostles of Christ is necessary.

TENTH SUGGESTION.

Reading the Bible can only be of the greatest benefit when it is read with a personal interest. Multitudes read the Holy Book to see how it applies to others. They should read to learn how it applies to themselves. When we learn the application of the Sacred Test to ourselves personally, then we shall understand its application to all others. "How does the Bible strike me?" This is the all-important question. "What does the Bible require at my hands? Here is the inquiry which should be always considered. "What must I do to be saved?" Such was the question asked by the Philippian jailer and such is the question which should everywhere be asked and pressed by those of mankind unto whom the Bible has come.

CONCLUSION.

The foregoing "suggestions," and the "precautions" by which they are preceded, enable the reader to understand that the writer's purpose is to make the Bible plain, or show that the Bible is a plain book to those who read it aright. Certainly it is not a book of confusion, as many seem to suppose. On the contrary, it is a well ordered volume from beginning to end. It reveals God to man and reveals man unto himself. But its treasures of revelation are only to be secured by diligent research. Those who are not sufficiently interested in the Bible to be diligent in searching its holy pages are certainly not interested in their eternal welfare. Those who are diligent in their researches for the divine treasures revealed in the Bible will be richly rewarded in time, and by obedience will be saved in eternity.

SEVENTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

The preceding chapters concerning the Bible should have prepared the mind for an application of those remedies which have a direct bearing on spiritual Hydrophobia. The reader may not yet understand the prevalence of that ailment, nor who is afflicted therewith. But the chapter on the subject of faith which is hereby introduced will begin to apply the most important remedy thereunto. This, however, must be done with caution, as the character of the ailment is such that those who are the most serious victims thereof are generally the least disposed to adopt the treatment which will deliver therefrom. "With these statements clearly understood the reader is doubtless prepared to peruse a chapter ON the most important subject which can possibly engage the human mind.

FAITH SCRIPTURALLY DEFINED.

"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Heb. 11:1. The word "substance" in the sentence just quoted is otherwise given as "ground or confidence.". The Greek word in that sentence which is thus translated means literally, "a something set under; a substructure, basis, or bottom." So then it is right to say that faith is the foundation of things hoped for. The word "hope" looks forward into the future, and if we have no faith we certainly shall

have no hope. Mankind cannot really see into the future, and they have no knowledge of the future. But by faith or confidence, in the testimony which is given concerning what is yet to come it is possible to hope for those things in the future which we desire. For instance, mankind while here on earth have no knowledge concerning a future state of happiness, yet by reason of their confidence in the testimony furnished with reference to such a state multitudes believe in the reality thereof and hope to attain thereunto.

But faith is only partially defined when delineated with reference to the future. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. 11:3, This statement informs us that faith reaches backward as well as forward. By means of divinely given testimony the mind of man is enabled to have faith or confidence concerning the beginning and end of time. By faith it is possible to lay hold on the thought of eternity, though the extent of eternity can never be understood by the finite mind.

Faith grasps the hour when time began, The hour when time shall cease to be the first and last of mortal man and reaches to eternity.

With these statements clearly understood it is evident beyond question that the capability of believing upon testimony is a wonderful power of the mind. Man's personal knowledge is generally meager. He has personally seen, heard, and experienced but little, and if incapable of believing he would be incapable of living. The reader may regard this as a rash statement, but upon examination it will be found altogether correct. Without the power of faith man could not have confidence in the sea-

sons of the year, and thus would not cultivate the earth so as to provide for his needs.

FAITH SCRIPTURALLY ILLUSTRATED.

The apostle Paul, as an inspired writer, well knew that definitions are not, readily grasped by every mind. Therefore, after defining faith he gave numerous illustrations thereof in the eleventh chapter of his letter to the Hebrew Christians, He mentioned Abel, Enoch, and Noah of the world before the flood. Then he named Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephtha, David and Samuel of the world since the flood. Besides these he referred to a host of others, whom he did not name, who accomplished wonders by the power of faith. So then the power and the importance of faith are evident beyond question. It is also evident that faith is an active principle which in its fulness pervades man's entire being. Faith in God caused many of the Old Testament characters to rely whole-heartedly on the divine goodness and power. By so doing and acting in harmony with the divine directions God's power was manifested in their behalf and wonders were accomplished.

FAITH AND BELIEF.

Some persons suppose that faith and belief are different, and they endeavor to draw a discrimination between the meanings of these two words. That cannot be justly done. Wherever the word "faith" is found in the Sacred Text the word "belief" may be used Besides, just as much is ascribed by inspired writers to *believing* as is ascribed by them to *having faith* and so there is no difference between the meanings of the two words. They are not even used together in the same sentence as though they have even different shades of meaning. New Testament writers do not say "faith and belief" nor "belief and faith" as though both words are necessary to express the full confidence that is required in order to salvation. But the

apostle Paul says, "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. 11:6. This declaration settles the equality of having faith and believing. It teaches that unless we have faith we cannot please God, and that by believing we can please him. This should be the end of all controversy on the subject of possible difference between "faith" and "belief."

HOW FAITH IS PRODUCED.

In all other departments except religion it is readily admitted that faith or belief is produced by testimony brought in contact with the mind. Why faith or belief should not be produced by the same process in religion no one has ever been able to give a respectable reason. Yet there are those who hold that faith in God and Christ, especially the faith that saves, is a direct gift of God sent down from heaven into the human mind. But this would make all absence of the faith that saves chargeable to God. If the faith that saves be a direct gift of God, then all responsibility for lack of that faith is certainly with God.

But some one may ask, "Is not faith mentioned in scripture as a gift of the Holy Spirit?" The answer to this question is affirmative. In the first letter to the Corinthian brethren, twelfth chapter, eighth and ninth verses, this language is found: "For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit." But the gift of faith here mentioned was not the faith which every sinner must have in order to become a Christian, nor the faith which every Christian must have in order to worship and work so as to "be finally saved. But it was a special gift bestowed by the Holy Spirit on

certain individuals in the Church, by reason of which they were enabled to work certain kinds of miracles. Paul referred to such a gift when in the thirteenth chapter and 2nd verse of the same letter he said, "Though I have all faith so that I could remove mountains and have not charity [love] I am nothing." In both the twelfth and thirteenth chapters to which reference has just been made the context or connection clearly shows that the apostle was writing concerning the special gifts that were distributed among Christians for their special work, and not concerning the belief or faith necessary to salvation.

Having understood what the foregoing statements declare the reader is now prepared to consider how the faith which saves is produced. In so doing direct appeal should be made to the Sacred Text. "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." John 20:30, 31. "And it came to pass in Iconium that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed." Acts 14:1. "These [the Jews of Berea] were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so: Therefore many of them believed; also of honorable women who were Greeks, and of men, not a few." Acts 17:11, 12. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10:17.

Such statements of the Inspired Record are only samples of those that are therein found. But taken together they are sufficient to show that the belief or faith which

saves is doubtless the effect of divine testimony on the mind. In order that such an effect may be produced it is necessary for the testimony to be heard or read, When it is heard, then the ear becomes the inlet of the divine testimony to the mind. "When the testimony which has been written by an inspired penman is read, then the eye becomes the inlet of that testimony to the mind. In either case when belief or faith is produced then the foundation or underlying principle is established which is necessary to the obedience required in order to salvation. In other words, when people become convinced, either by hearing or reading the divine testimony, that Christ is the Son of God, then the essential condition of acceptable obedience is established. In all other departments this is well understood and easily accepted. A man hears of a physician until he believes in his existence and in his skill so that he sends for him or goes to see him, When that physician, prescribes for that man when he is sick the prescription is accepted and the medicine taken with confidence. If the testimony concerning a physician be in the form of a document and be read until belief or faith is produced the result is the same. Thus it is in all departments of life which pertain simply to this world, and thus it is in religion. Such a conclusion will not be questioned if right reason or divine revelation be permitted to testify. The high confidence which is justly called belief or faith is always and in all departments the effect of testimony on the mind. When the judgment or mind is convinced then the emotions or feelings are to a greater or less extent enlisted, and thus the expression "believing with the heart" is sometimes used. The word "heart" in the Sacred Writings is generally used in the sense of the affections, and thus the word "heart" embraces the emotions or feelings. With such explanation it is easy to understand why Paul said, "With the heart

man believeth unto righteousness." Rom. 10:10. When the Scriptures are understood their clearness and consistency will always be admitted.

FAITH AS A PRINCIPLE.

The difference between a principle and a special command based on principle is not always understood. *Faith* is a principle which is always necessary in order to acceptable obedience, and so is *love*. Thus in Galatians fifth chapter and sixth verse Paul speaks of "faith which worketh by love." Fear may be spoken of as a principle, but fear may be the outgrowth of faith. Thus we read, "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith," Heb. 11:7. In truth it may be said that fear and love in religion are both the outgrowth of faith, for unless we believe in God and Christ we certainly cannot fear them nor love them.

Just here it is important to mention that some people suppose that love and fear are in a certain sense opposed to each other, since the Sacred Text declares, "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment: he that feareth is not made perfect in love." 1 John 4:18. Yet in Peter's first letter second chapter and seventeenth verse we find this command addressed to Christians: "Fear God." Do Peter and John conflict? Certainly not in reality, though their language conflicts in form or appearance. But on a closer examination it is evident that Peter was speaking of fear in the exalted sense of reverence, as the fifteenth verse of the third chapter of his first letter indicates, while John was speaking of fear in the sense of "torment" or dread. Thus these two writers are found to be in harmony when their meanings are considered. Moreover, it is in the fullest

sense true that perfect love for God does cast out all man-ward fear or fear toward mankind.

Returning from this digression the reader's attention is again invited to consider faith as a principle of obedience, and as a principle which underlies all acceptable obedience to God and Christ. Repentance, confession, baptism, prayer, good works may all be separately considered and in a measure acceptably performed separate from each other. But not one of them can be correctly considered nor acceptably performed separated from faith. "Whatever act of obedience to God and Christ is separated from faith always does, by reason of such separation, become null, void, empty, vain, sinful. This is evident in the light of the following scriptures: "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 diligently seek him." Heb. 11:6. "And he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." Rom. 14:23. Such statements of inspiration show beyond all question that every act of obedience to God and Christ, in order to be acceptable, must be actuated by faith in God and Christ. Even eating meat in a doubtful frame of mind was not acceptable to God when that was done by the primitive Christians. Worse than that, such eating was positively sinful, "for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Thus it is evident that *by faith* sinners must repent, *by faith* they must confess Christ, *by faith* they must be baptized, *by faith* they must call on God, *by faith* those who have thus obeyed must pray, give thanks, worship publicly on the Lord's day, live a life of godliness, and abound in good works. In other words, the alien sinner must *by faith* begin and continue and end the obedience necessary to become a Christian. Then *by faith* the Christian must begin and continue and end the obedience necessary to

remain a Christian and finally to reach the Christian's home in glory. Faith may be justly called the pathway that leads from earth to heaven. Every deed done, every prayer offered, every thanksgiving expressed must be actuated by faith as its underlying principle in order to be acceptable to God and Christ. With all this clearly stated the reader can easily understand why Christ and his apostles so often mention salvation as dependent upon faith without mentioning obedience in repentance, confession, baptism, prayer, nor in anything else that is divinely required. This is not because such acts of obedience are not required, but because they could not be acceptably performed without faith, even a whole-hearted faith in God and Christ. As in every act of acceptable obedience faith must be present it is evident that where no faith is there can be no obedience that is acceptable.

FAITH ONLY OR FAITH ALONE.

No greater mistake was ever made by intelligent people than when the conclusion was reached in the sixteenth century that the alien sinner could be justified by faith only or by faith alone. No doctrine has ever wrought greater mischief than that conclusion, as it has been adopted by the Protestant world generally. Multitudes have become so engrossed with the doctrine of "justification by faith *only*" that they will not even read with care those portions of the Sacred Text which mention the importance of obedience. "Faith only" or "faith alone" means faith, without repentance, without confession of faith in Christ, without baptism, and without calling on God even in such a petition as "God be merciful to me a sinner." That such a doctrine is wrong ought to be understood and admitted as soon as stated. But those who hold that doctrine are not consistent therewith. In a considerable number of man-made creeds this statement is found: "That we are justified by faith only is a most

wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." Yet all who hold this doctrine as thus stated insist that repentance, and prayer are also necessary in order to the alien sinner's justification. But they are not willing to admit that water baptism is necessary. No. They say that baptism is a non-essential. You ask them for the chapter and verse which so declares, and they are silent. They sometimes state that faith implies repentance and prayer, but they will not admit that it implies baptism. A common objection by those who claim justification by faith only is that if baptism be essential to the alien sinners justification then salvation from sin is made dependent on the presence of a third person or third party to do the baptizing. This, they say, would prevent Christ from saving sinners without the help of men. In reply you ask them if *they* can point out a case of salvation in the entire book of Acts of Apostles without the presence of a third party, and again they are silent. Next the case of the thief on the cross is mentioned as giving evidence of salvation without water baptism. You answer that when the promise which implied salvation was made to that thief Christ had not yet died for the sins of the world. You then show that the promise to that thief was made on the other side of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; on the other side of the great commission, of Christ's ascension to heaven, being enthroned as King, and sending the Holy Spirit down on the day of Pentecost. You then show that we are now *on this side* of all those grand events, and you thus show that the thief lived and died under the Jewish law while we are living under the gospel. But with all this your opponent is not vanquished. He is silenced on that point and probably looks confused, yet he comes again. His next objection is that several cases of conversion are mentioned in Acts of Apostles without a word about water baptism. You show him that his ob-

jection is worthless since several cases are recorded without a word concerning repentance, and yet he would not claim that repentance is a non-essential. Still he is not convinced and you begin to conclude that he is afflicted with a fear or dread of water that may be justly called spiritual Hydrophobia. If the one thus afflicted becomes angry and turns away, refusing to listen to one who "don't know any better than to think that water has something to do with salvation," you may conclude that the ease is fatal. But if that one pauses and says, "It is possible that I have been wrongly taught on this question, and I shall examine it for myself in order to learn what the word of God certainly sets forth on this subject," then you may have hope that the case *is* curable.

FAITH AND OPINION.

Multitudes have no clear understanding of the difference between *faith* and *opinion*. Many religious people speak as if opinions are about the best and highest confidence which it is possible to have in religion. Thus they say, "You have *your* opinions and I have *mine*," or, "You follow *your* opinions and I will follow *mine*" Such people may be surprised to learn that the word "opinion" is not found in the entire New Testament, and only a very few times in the Old Testament. Christ did not command the apostles to go into all the world and preach their opinions to the people, and neither is salvation promised on obedience to opinions. But the apostles were commanded to preach the gospel to every creature, and concerning those who would hear the gospel Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." Mark 16:15, 16. Belief and baptism mention the beginning and ending of the sinner's obedience in order to become a Christian. Unbelief settles his condemnation without anything else. Those who do not believe cannot obey with acceptance.

But what is the difference between *faith* and *opinion*? Possibly an illustration may set forth that difference. John, third chapter, first and second verses, will serve as well as any other portion of the Bible. "There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. 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 these miracles that thou doest except God be with him."

Now, concerning the facts declared in such statements there is no doubt nor difference. All who believe the 'New Testament records believe or have faith in what the apostle John states in the language just quoted. But suppose we ask, Why did Nicodemus go to Jesus by night? The answer to this question is not given in the text of John third chapter nor anywhere else in the New Testament. Therefore we have no divine testimony on the subject, and consequently we can have no faith on the subject. But we can have opinions based on suppositions. One man may suppose that Nicodemus went to Jesus by night because his official duties occupied him too much in course of the day; another may suppose that Nicodemus wished to escape the censure of the Jews and thus went to see Jesus under the cover of darkness; another may suppose that Nicodemus knew that Christ was generally crowded with work during the day, and on that account he went to see him at night. Here are three distinct suppositions, each one reasonable, and each one sufficient to form a basis for an opinion. Either or neither of the three may "be entirely correct, yet each of the three may state some fragment of the truth. Thus the reader can see the difference between "faith" and "opinion." *Faith* is that high and grand confidence which is produced by unquestionable testimony, but *opinion* begins where testimony ends, and is based on supposition. Therefore opinions

have nothing to do with the salvation of mankind, except that multitudes by clinging to wrong opinions reject the divine testimony on various questions, and are thus in danger of being eternally lost.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Faith has been "scripturally defined" and "scripturally illustrated," the oneness or identity of "faith and belief," "how faith is produced," "faith as a principle," the doctrine of "faith only or faith alone," and "the difference between faith and opinion"—all these important features of the great subject of faith have been set forth and considered in the foregoing parts of this chapter. If my readers have been careful in perusing what has been submitted for consideration on this theme no doubt it is now settled in their minds that faith, is certainly the most important subject which can possibly engage the attention of mankind. At any time in life that may be mentioned we know very little by personal contact with what exists, even in our own generation. Concerning the past and future beyond our own day or lifetime we can have no assurance except by the power to believe testimony. Therefore the power to have confidence upon evidence, or faith upon testimony, is a wonderful gift for which mankind should continually feel grateful to the Giver of all good. Therefore, the proposition that the Redeemer of mankind proposes to save us by faith—by faith which works by love—by faith and the obedience of faith, should not be regarded as marvelous, nor be rejected as absurd. Neither should any suppose that because faith is such a great power that it is sufficient to take hold of the divine promises unless it be sufficient to humble the believer in obedience to what is divinely required by way of obeying commands. *No* command that is addressed to the alien sinner can be ignored by sinners without showing a defect in their faith. The same is true in regard to the faith of

Christians. Their faith is only acknowledged by the Most High as being the faith that saves in proportion as it is manifested or shown by obedience. This is evident to all who will read with care the eleventh chapter of Paul's letter to the Hebrews. Therein faith is set forth as a living, active principle which caused the ancient worthies to have such confidence in God that they obeyed in all things what he enjoined upon them. As a principle faith has never changed, and thus it becomes us who live in the gospel age of the world not to flatter ourselves that we possess the faith that will save while we draw back from a single command that is divinely given for us to obey. "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Heb. 10:38. What is true of drawing back from a command is equally true of belittling or underestimating a command, or speaking thereof as a non-essential, since the Sacred Text never once intimates to that effect. Therefore all those who are accustomed to speak of water baptism as unnecessary to the sinner's salvation from the sins committed by him while an alien from the Church of Christ—all such would do well to inquire if there be not something wrong or something defective in their faith. If they find themselves disposed to adopt every frivolous objection which sophistry can conceive in order to avoid admitting that water baptism is necessary to the alien sinner's salvation from his offenses, then they would do well to inquire if they be not afflicted" with that dreadful and destructive disease called spiritual Hydrophobia. When the writer was afflicted with physical Hydrophobia he would have rushed into fire rather than to have gone into water. Many preachers of modern times, and multitudes who are under their influence, seem disposed to risk going into eternal fire rather than go into water in obedience to Christ. But faith—a whole-hearted faith in

Christ as the Son of God, and in his words as the words of God, and in his works as the works of God—such faith will purge the mind from the last vestige of spiritual Hydrophobia, and will cause a humble, loving obedience to all that Christ requires.

EIGHTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

In delineating the subject now about to be introduced spiritual Hydrophobia will receive further consideration. It is an insidious ailment, very prevalent, and difficult to cure. But the chief difficulty connected therewith consists in the general aversion which those who are victims thereof feel toward all treatment by which they may be delivered therefrom. An intimation that they are not in perfect spiritual health not unfrequently offends those who are afflicted with spiritual Hydrophobia so that they will regard those making such intimation as their enemies. No diseases are more insidious and dangerous than those which cause all who are victims thereof to regard themselves in at least tolerable health. To convince them of their need of treatment is the physician's first difficult task. Such is the task which confronts those who would successfully treat spiritual Hydrophobia. Yet thousands of cases have been treated and permanently cured. A second attack of spiritual Hydrophobia is exceedingly rare, though in modern days of spiritual degeneracy certain ones who were supposed to be permanently cured show symptoms of their former ailment by denying its dangerous character in others who are afflicted therewith. Possibly all who manifest such symptoms were not treated with a remedy called *repentance*, to which the reader's

attention is now invited. A whole-hearted repentance of all ungodliness as well as of worldly lusts will cure spiritual Hydrophobia permanently.

WHAT IS REPENTANCE?

There are two words in the Greek New Testament which are translated "by the term "repentance" in the Common Version of the Sacred Text. One of those words means a change of mind, concerning the past and purpose concerning the future, but does not embrace the idea of a practical change of conduct. The other word means such a change of thought and feeling as will result in a change of life. The latter word was generally, if not always, used by the Holy Spirit in expressing the change which the gospel requires of those who have sinned. Therefore the command to repent in Acts 2:38 means not only a change of thought and feeling, but a practical reformation. The actuality of a change of conduct is embraced in the word used to express what is regarded as genuine repentance. Therefore the word repentance which is used in referring to the change necessary to be saved from sin is a very strong term. It means a *change of thought*, a *change of feeling or emotion*, and a *change of life*. In other words, it means a change *internally* and a change *externally*. A simple regret or change of thought is not the repentance which the gospel requires, neither is a formal change of conduct such repentance unless actuated by the proper change of thought and feeling. Therefore whenever repentance—gospel repentance—is accomplished in the mind, heart, and life of a sinner, that is the end of all trifling, and it banishes the last vestige of spiritual Hydrophobia, or dread, or fear, or dislike of water, however cold it may be. Gospel repentance never permits those who are possessed thereof to disparage or belittle water baptism. If those who are truly penitent according to the gospel ever speak of water baptism as a non-essential

such language is the result of erroneous teaching imposed by sectarian instructors. If truly penitent ones object to immersion even in cold weather it is because they have "been misled by wrong teachings. Gospel repentance means a change of mind and feeling, followed by a reformation of life. Such a change means a turning from all worldly lusts and all ungodliness'. Turning from ungodliness certainly means that all trifling with the divine appointments shall cease. The so-called Doctors of Divinity, and denominational preachers generally, may say what they please against the importance of water baptism, and against immersion as the only gospel baptism, yet all such talk is an exhibition of irreverence and trifling, If the same methods of reasoning that are adopted against the importance of immersion of penitent sinners in water were adopted against faith, repentance, and confession of faith they could all be explained away so as to mean very little if not absolutely nothing. For instance, because several cases of conversion are mentioned in Acts of Apostles without the direct mention of water baptism, in so many words, multitudes of religious teachers are disposed to deny that water baptism had anything to do with their conversion or salvation. But we also find several cases of conversion recorded in Acts of Apostles in which faith is not directly mentioned, and others in which nothing is directly said about either repentance or confession. But is it right to conclude that because faith, repentance, and confession are not always mentioned that therefore they were not always present when sinners were converted? *No*, every one says "*No*." "Who then will declare that it is right to conclude that 'because water baptism is not mentioned in connection with each case of conversion that therefore it was not present in each case? "Doctors of Divinity" and other denominational preachers will thus declare, but such dec-

larations are the most evident irreverence and trilling. Those guilty thereof are afflicted with spiritual Hydrophobia and they endeavor to transmit that ailment to other minds. Many of them labor most diligently in trying to show that water baptism is a non-essential to salvation. Some of them readily admit and earnestly contend that immersion is the only gospel baptism, yet they dread to say that it is necessary to the sinner's salvation. They hold that it is necessary for the saint's salvation, for they insist that after each sinner has been pardoned, and thus? has become a Christian or saint, then that one should be immersed as a door into a church not mentioned in the Bible! This is a phase of Hydrophobia, since it causes those afflicted therewith to dread admitting the divinely appointed place and importance of water baptism.

"John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance." Mark 1:4. According to such language it is evident beyond all question that the water baptism preached and practiced by John the Baptist was a part of the repentance which by divine authority he required of the people. It was called "the baptism of repentance," which could mean nothing less than the baptism which belonged to repentance as a part thereof. In other words, the repentance which John preached was a change of thought, feeling, and life. It was both an internal and an external reformation, and a part of such reformation consisted of water baptism. By reason thereof it was justly called "the baptism of repentance." This fact should sink deep into the minds of those who magnify the work of John the Baptist, and yet declare that water baptism is a non-essential to the sinner's salvation. They hold that repentance is necessary, yet deny the necessity of the baptism which is divinely declared to be a part of repentance or inseparably connected with com-

plete repentance. All such will do well to reflect that their dread of admitting the value of water baptism in the alien sinner's conversion to Christ is inconsistent with what they hold concerning repentance, and is in opposition to what the Sacred Text declares. Luke says of John the Baptist, "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." Luke 7:30. Could those men be acceptable to God while rejecting the counsel of God? To ask this question is to answer it in the negative. "What was the evidence that they rejected God's counsel? "Being not baptized" of John, is the answer.

But what was the purpose or design of God in commanding baptism, or what was the end to be accomplished thereby? The answer is given in these words, "for the remission of sins." See Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3. So then the water baptism which John the Baptist preached and practiced was *a part of the repentance that he commanded*, and was *for the remission of sins*. Whoever denies this stands on this subject in opposition to God, is afflicted with spiritual Hydrophobia, and is in danger of eternal ruin.

But some man may say that the Greek preposition translated by the English preposition "for," in the expression "for the remission of sins," may be justly translated by "unto," "into," "in order to," "because of." All this is admitted, except the last expression, unless "because of" be considered in a future bearing like the expression "in view of." To say that John the Baptist in the course of his ministry commanded people to repent and be baptized, or submit to the baptism of repentance "because their sins were already remitted or pardoned is an evident absurdity and indicates spiritual Hydrophobia. Did the apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost command heart-pierced sinners to repent and he baptized for the

remission of sins because their sins had already been pardoned? (Acts 2; 38.) Repentance and baptism are united in this verse by the simplest connective, so that the end for which repentance was commanded is the end for which baptism was commanded. Therefore if baptism was required because sins had already been pardoned then repentance was required for the same reason, and to repent of sins because they are already forgiven is an absurdity now, always has been an absurdity, and always will be an absurdity. Yet such is the absurd position of those who permit their dread of admitting the importance of water baptism to deny unto such baptism its proper place.

Whether Acts 2:38 be translated "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins," "into remission," "unto remission," or "in order to remission" the position of the commands is not changed. In either case baptism, even as repentance, comes before the promise of "remission of sins." Therefore in either case the requirements of both repentance and baptism must be met before remission of sins can be certainly reached according to the gospel. Moreover, it is a serious question whether gospel repentance is ever complete independent of gospel baptism. Water baptism when first preached was spoken of by sacred writers as a part of repentance, and when repentance is fully defined it evidently means an outward as well as an inward change from wrong to right, from darkness to light, from Satan to Christ. Is the required change complete before the entire body has been surrendered to Christ by a burial with him in baptism and a resurrection to newness of life? See Romans sixth chapter and fourth verse together with twelfth verse of Colossians second chapter. Those who say that such a change is complete without the mentioned burial in baptism assume a responsibility which is dreadful to contemplate. Should

Christ confront them and ask, "Who authorized you to say that the baptism that I command is a non-essential to the sinner's salvation?" they would be as silent as the grave. They would then be like the man who had left off the wedding garment. (Matt. 22:12.)

HOW IS GOSPEL REPENTANCE PRODUCED?

"For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of [not to be regretted], but the sorrow of the world worketh death." 2 Cor. 7:10. The expression translated "godly sorrow" in this passage literally means "sorrow toward God," and thus means sorrow produced by the word of God. Such sorrow Paul declares works repentance to salvation, and thus works a change of mind, feeling, life—a change internally and externally. Such a repentance no one needs ever to regret having made. It requires a whole-hearted turning away from all sins both in theory and practice. This doubtless implies the end of all trifling with the word of God, such as belittling a divine appointment, misplacing such an appointment, or pronouncing it a non-essential. It may be seriously questioned whether any one who shows irreverence for any part of the word of God, or endeavors to set aside any part of the gospel of Christ, or who dreads obeying any feature of the gospel has fully repented. There are thousands of witnesses now living who are ready to testify that when their repentance was genuine in mind and heart they felt ready to do all that Christ required. In other words, genuine sorrow toward God works a change within which is never satisfied with anything less than a complete outward change. Thus it may be seriously questioned whether a truly penitent spirit ever did draw back from immersion even in cold weather, or pronounce immersion a non-essential to the alien sinner's salvation. Why would those who are filled with sorrow toward God for all their past sins dispute with God's Son concerning

the conditions of remission of sins? Is it not evident that those who are not satisfied with the gospel conditions of pardon have not in its fulness the internal change which gospel repentance requires? As well might one imagine that the prodigal son, whose case is recorded in Luke fifteenth chapter, objected to the ring which his father ordered to be placed on his hand, or objected to the shoes which were commanded to be put on his feet, as to suppose that sinners who are truly penitent will object to the water baptism which is a line of demarcation between their former life in sin and their after life in righteousness. In a former chapter it was shown that genuine faith forbids all trifling concerning baptism, and it is equally true that genuine repentance, forbids all trifling on that subject.

THE SORROW OF THE WORLD.

"But the sorrow of the world worketh death," says Paul in 2 Cor. 7:10. What does this mean? The best answer to this inquiry can probably be found in the case of Judas Iscariot. "Then Judas, who had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood: And they said, what is that to us? See thou to that. And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself." Matt. 27:3-5.

Such language as the foregoing clearly shows that Judas was disappointed in the result of Christ's betrayal. When he saw that the Savior was condemned he recognized that he had gone too far, and that which he had done would likely result in his Master's death. From this it may be justly inferred that Judas did not think that Christ would suffer himself to be held by his enemies even if he should fall into their hands. It is probable that he

intended to get their money without doing his Master any harm. If he would deliver Christ into their hands for a certain sum and they could not hold him as a prisoner then Judas probably thought that he would have that much as clear gain. From one point of view the language, "Hold him fast" (Matt. 26:48) implies that Judas was intending to play a shrewd game with the chief priests, for he well knew that the company with him could have no power to hold Christ if he would endeavor to deliver himself from their hands. But whether such inferences be correct or not, yet it is evident beyond question that Judas was disappointed in results when sentence of condemnation was pronounced upon his Master. Judas saw that he had ventured too far in his greed for gain, and thus saw that he was caught in his iniquity. As a result he sorrowed, but not unto repentance. It seems rather to have been, a sorrow unto despair because he had made a fatal mistake. Such is the sorrow of the world. People of the world are generally sorry for their iniquities when they are caught. Thus the murderer, the thief, the incendiary, the seducer—all these and all other vile characters are sorry for their villainy when discovered, or they are "brought to justice. Such is "the sorrow of the world" and it "worketh death." It wrought death in the case of Judas because it drove him to despair and caused him to commit suicide. Thus it has been with many others. The cashier of a bank who has purloined money for gambling, or any other purpose, not unfrequently commits suicide when he learns that he is caught. But even if the one who thus sorrows commits no personal violence upon himself, yet if he simply sorrows because his wrong has been discovered it certainly does not produce repentance unto salvation, and will finally result in death to the moral and spirit man. This does not mean that the ones who thus sorrow will be morally or spiritually blotted

out, but that those who only sorrow after the manner of the world will doubtless be partakers of the second death, (Rev. 20:6, 14.)

The reader now understands the two kinds of sorrow and the two kinds of results. The sorrow which is toward God, and thus is produced by the word of God, works repentance unto salvation, and this is something that no one in whom it is wrought ever has cause to regret. It is like a charitable deed done to a needy person who is worthy. Such a deed will never be regretted. Therefore all classes and conditions of mankind that have not yet thus repented should read and study the gospel until their minds and hearts are filled with sorrow toward God in order that they *may* repent unto salvation. God now commands "all men everywhere to repent." (Acts 17:30.) Thus the obligation to repent is universal, or at least all those should repent who are occupying the position of sinners. Whenever Christians err from the truth, or in any wise do wrong, it becomes them likewise to repent. "Repent and be baptized" is required of alien sinners, Acts 2:38. "Repent and pray" is required of erring Christians, Acts 8:22.

OF WHAT SHOULD PEOPLE REPENT?

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of the which I tell you before as I have told you in time past, that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5:19-21. Here are seventeen manifestations or outworkings of the flesh which will shut people out of the kingdom of God, and thus will prevent them from entering heaven. Therefore of such works of the flesh all who have been guilty must repent, "Revelings and such like" are included in.

the list. This certainly embraces the modern dance. In ancient times God's people danced unto the Lord, but in modern times the dancing that is done is generally, if not always, as a gratification of the flesh. Perhaps nothing is more widely separated from the words and works of Christ and his apostles than is the modern social dance. Multitudes, even of church members, now engage therein. Still it is a worldly amusement and a sensual gratification. It is utterly destitute of the gospel, and only tends in the direction of worldliness. Therefore all those who have been engaged in dancing should repent thereof and resolve that by the help of God they will ever keep themselves free therefrom. Card-playing, theater-going, attending horse races, shows, and visiting ungodly places and institutions of all kinds should be repented of by all who have been guilty of so doing. "Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good." Rom. 12:9. "Abstain from all appearance of evil." 1 These. 5:22. Such declarations of the Holy Spirit should be the watchwords of Christians, and of all who ever intend to become Christians,

DOCTRINAL SINS SHOULD BE REPENTED OF.

"Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage: Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Gal. 5:1-4.

In the foregoing quotation is mentioned one of the mildest doctrinal sins. It consisted simply of misapplying Jewish circumcision. Christians, especially those converted from among the Gentiles, had no claim on circumcision and circumcision had no claim on them. Yet it

consisted simply of a mark made in the flesh and so far as any earthly eye could see would do no one any spiritual harm. Yet the fact that it was given only to the Jews, and not required by the Savior made it sinful for Christians who had been converted from among the Gentiles to apply it to themselves. Not only so, but it was sinful in a fatal degree if those guilty thereof did not repent. It was so serious that Christ became of no effect to those who submitted thereunto, and they were even spoken of as classed with such as had "fallen from grace." This shows that doctrinal errors are certainly very dangerous. The Old Testament and the New unite in this testimony. Cain's sin in offering a cabbage, turnip or some other fruit of the earth instead of a lamb Was strictly doctrinal, and very serious were the results. The sin of Nadab and Abihu, recorded in Leviticus tenth chapter, was strictly doctrinal, but it had fatal results. So was the sin of Moses and Aaron of a doctrinal character when they failed to sanctify God before Israel at the waters of strife. (Num. 20th chap.) The same was true of David's sin in numbering Israel, of which a record is found in 1 Chronicles twenty-first chapter, yet that one sin cost David and the Kingdom of Israel seventy thousand men. "When the New Testament is examined on this subject it will be found to contain abundant testimony in the same direction. The Jews sinned doctrinally when they taught so as to prevent children from being bound to honor their parents. (Matt, 10th chap.) The same was true when they paid tithes of mint, anise, and cummin, and omitted the weightier matters of the law. (Matt. 23:23.) God was so careful and jealous on the doctrinal question that he would not permit his ancient people to build an altar of hewn stone, nor even, to lift the workman's tool on a stone which, was to be placed in an altar. (Ex. 20:25.) On the same principle the Lord Jesus Christ is so jealous

for the purity of his gospel that for Christians converted from among Gentiles to practice circumcision would be their ruin. God said through Moses, "But the prophet who shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die." Deut, 18:20. Christ said through the apostle John, "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in. this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. 22:18, 19.

Such is the testimony of God's word against doctrinal sins, and such testimony should be sufficient to convince all that doctrinal sins are dangerous. If those who are guilty of such sins will not repent thereof when they are clearly exposed then hopes of salvation are vain. Multitudes pride themselves on their consistency, and because they have once taken a religious position they resolve to maintain it to the end. By reason of such resolution they refuse to investigate the position they have taken or listen to anything which may be said in opposition thereunto. Such, people seldom repent of the doctrinal sins which they may have committed. They seem to think it a disgrace to change in their religious convictions forgetting that the apostle Paul changed, Martin Luther changed, John Calvin changed, and the Reformers of the sixteenth century almost, if not altogether, without exception changed. As they had been reared Roman Catholics it was necessary for them to change in religious convictions in order to be Protestant Reformers. If it was not a disgrace for such men to change in religion from wrong to

right, is it a disgrace for any one else thus to change? But it is not only disgraceful but ruinous perverseness to close the eyes and the ears of the understanding against the truth which would save us from doctrinal sins. Christ will finally condemn a man for persisting in holding a wrong doctrine just as certainly as he will finally condemn a man for persisting in an immoral life. Let this thought sink deep into the reader's mind. The question which all should ask themselves individually is this: *Do I hold any wrong doctrine?* All who ask themselves this question will do well to investigate what is called "original sin or transmitted guilt," likewise "infant church membership," including "infant baptism," "sprinkling and pouring for baptism," "getting religion," "the mourner's bench" and "anxious seat," "instantaneous conversion," "confirmation as an ordinance," "monthly," "quarterly" and "annual communion," and the propriety of those who claim to be Christians having "human creeds," and wearing "humanly given names." Concerning all these doctrines the reader should examine the New Testament carefully and prayerfully. If any or all of them be found wanting in divine authority they should certainly be discarded as dangerous and even ruinous. In other words, all who would make sure work for eternity should be as diligent to repent of doctrinal sins as to repent of immorality or sins of the flesh.

Should the reader inquire for the scriptural definitions of sin they will be found recorded in 1 John 3:4; 5:17; Jas. 4:17; Rom. 14:23. Their exact language as found in the Common Version of the Sacred Text is as follows: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law, for sin is the transgression of the law." "All unrighteousness is sin." "Therefore to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not to him it is sin." "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." With these definitions be-

fore the mind it is not very difficult to determine what deeds and what features of doctrine are sinful. All that upon examination is found to be sinful must be repented of in order to be forgiven. There will be no compromise because of good works, or even charity. This is abundantly evident by what is found in Revelation second chapter. The churches at Ephesus, Pergamos, and Thyatira were all required to repent of their evil deeds and doctrines, notwithstanding the good for which they were commended. After mentioning the good in the church at Ephesus, Christ, said, "Nevertheless I have somewhat, against thee." The church at Pergamos was commended for its good and then Christ said, "But I have a few things against thee." When that which was commendable in the church at Thyatira had been mentioned Christ said, "Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee."

Reader, what do you suppose the Lord Jesus Christ has against you? Bear in mind that it is dangerous for you to live or die while he holds anything against you either doctrinally or practically—either in regard to doctrinal mistakes or sins of the flesh. Therefore read, examine, search the gospel in all its teachings so as to learn what is wrong as well as what is right in heaven's sight. Then repent of the wrong and cling to the right with all earnestness of mind and heart. By so doing you will secure and retain God's good pleasure, and thus will be finally and eternally saved. Glorious thought! How joyous it will be for the redeemed to be approved in the last great day and invited into the rest which remains for the people of God! Is not such an end worth the most constant and whole-hearted struggles of which mankind are capable? Those who so live as to be finally and thus eternally saved will forever rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. In order to be thus saved there must be no

carelessness concerning sins of any kind or character. "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23.

NINTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

When the writer of this volume was afflicted with Hydrophobia it was important for him to have sufficient confidence in the physicians who were treating his case to obey their instructions implicitly. All who are afflicted with a spiritual ailment which may be justly called Hydrophobia will find it necessary to have implicit confidence in the great Physician of souls, the Lord Jesus Christ, and obey his requirements without reservation. The chapter now to be introduced will be chiefly devoted to setting forth one feature of the required obedience. This feature, like all others, is all-important in its place. Nothing that the authority of heaven certainly requires can be justly pronounced unimportant or a non-essential. As well may the finite creature called man declare the sun, moon, or stars to be unimportant or unnecessary as thus to declare concerning any requirement of the glorious gospel of the Son of God. Between the wisdom and goodness of Christ and the folly and frailty of mankind there is the distance of infinity. With such convictions the writer now proceeds, and invites the reader to accompany him in so doing.

CONFESSION OF FAITH IN CHRIST.

"Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." Such was the confession of Simon Peter as recorded in the six-

teenth chapter and sixteenth verse of Matthew's account of the gospel. That confession was the grandest and most important that had ever been made by man until that time. Since that time it has been repeated by millions, and it yet remains as the most exalted and comprehensive confession that mankind have ever been permitted to pronounce. "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." This sentence at once makes acknowledgment of the only true and living God, and of Jesus Christ as his Son. The God of heaven and earth is the Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor of mankind, while Jesus Christ as the Son of God, is the Savior of mankind. All this is embraced in Simon Peter's confession which said to Christ, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God"

In the early part of his personal ministry Christ said, "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father who is in heaven: But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven." Matt. 10:32, 33. According to Mark 8:38 he further said, "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."

Such statements of the adorable Redeemer clearly indicate that when he was on earth he desired those who believed in him to make confession of their faith before mankind. He had come from heaven to earth in behalf of mankind, had come to endure shame, suffering, and death in man's stead, and he proposed that mankind should not be ashamed of him. Moreover, those who would have the courage to confess him in the midst of a perverse generation he proposed to confess before Ms Father and the holy angels. On the other hand, those who would deny or be ashamed of him before mankind he

proposed to deny and be ashamed of when he would come in the glory of his Father and holy angels. Such was the teaching of Christ with, reference to the great subject of confessing faith in him soon after he began his public ministry. At a later date the Inspired Record gives the following: "When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets: He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God: And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven: And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell [*hades*—unseen world] shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:13-18. This language clearly shows that it was Christ's purpose to establish the Church which should stand forever on his divinity, and on the confession thereof by those who, upon divine testimony, would become believers in him. Add to this the statement of Paul, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation," as found in Rom. 10:10, and the evidence in favor of publicly confessing faith in Christ as the Son of God before the world is complete.

WHAT IS EMBRACED IN SUCH CONFESSION?

"The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ, (he is Lord of all): That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost [Spirit] and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were

oppressed of the devil; for God was with him." Acts 10.:36-38. "For even hereunto were ye called because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth: Who when he was reviled reviled not again; when he suffered he threatened not, but committed himself unto him that judgeth righteously." 1 Peter 2:21-23.

These two passages just cited clearly set forth that Christ was possessed of a beautiful and perfect personal character. He "went about doing good," he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." In Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John the facts are recorded which show that Christ was possessed of such a character. In other words, Christ's perfect personal character is inseparably, connected with his divinity. Indeed, it was in the course of his personal ministry that he gave the evidence in favor of his divinity, which evidence was consummated by his resurrection from the dead. On this very question the following testimony is given just after an account of the resurrection is presented: "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." John 20:30, 31. With all this before the mind it is evident beyond doubt that belief in Christ's divinity embraces belief in the four gospel records which were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, Consequently a confession of faith in Christ's divinity embraces or implies faith in all the testimony which proves his divinity. Then whoever believes and confesses Christ as the Son of God in so doing believes and confesses belief in the , records which show that Christ is the Son of God. The gospel records and Christ's divinity are inseparably connected.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.

But the foregoing statements do not present all that is embraced in the confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Christ is revealed to us in the New Testament as Fulfiller and Endorser of the Old Testament. He fulfilled the direct and verbal prophecies concerning himself, and fulfilled what was typified by the offerings made on Patriarchal and Jewish altars according to God's directions, and fulfilled what was foreshadowed by the high priest of the Jewish dispensation.

On the question of Christ fulfilling the direct, verbal prophecy let the apostle Peter be permitted to testify: "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." Acts 3:22. This language is first found in Deuteronomy eighteenth chapter, and the connection in which it is repeated in the New Testament clearly shows that it had reference to Christ.

On the question of the offerings made under former dispensations and Christ's relation to them permit Paul to testify: "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. 5:7. And again: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." Col. 2:14. In such statements Christ is clearly declared to be the sacrifice for mankind and as such he is the one on account of whom, and obedience to whom, God will pass over the offenses committed against him. Other parts of the record teach that God will pass over or forgive mankind when they believe in Christ. The language just quoted further declares that Christ nailed to his cross the ordinances of the Old Testament. When he was on the cross and near the moment of death he said, "It is finished." John 19:30. By his death he

finished the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament dispensations. They were fulfilled in him, and in his death their value was found, Of themselves they could not take away sins. (See Heb. 10:4.) But by reason of the relation of such offerings to Christ's death they were of value and when offered according to divine directions they were acceptable to God.

With reference to the high priest under the Jewish dispensation let the apostle Paul bear testimony: "But into the second [the holy place in the tabernacle and temple] went the high priest alone, once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of , the people," "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." Heb. 9:7, 24. Here the reader is informed that what was foreshadowed under the Jewish dispensation of religion by the high priest entering the holy place of the tabernacle and temple was fulfilled by Christ entering heaven. The Jewish high priest was a mediator between God and the Jewish people, and Christ is the great high priest, and thus the great Mediator between God and all Christians. "And they [the Jewish priests] truly were many priests because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this man [Christ] because he continueth ever hath an unchangeable priesthood: "Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. 7:23-25. With all this before the mind it is certainly evident beyond all question that Christ is revealed in the New Testament as the Fulfiller of the Old Testament. The prophet, the priest, the sacrifice of the former dispensations all referred to Christ, found their fulfillment, and thus found their value in him. Having come as the Fulfiller of the Old Testament

he became the Endorser thereof, in that he frequently quoted therefrom, spoke of the Sacred Text as it then existed in the Hebrew language, and never offered a criticism thereon. Not that he endorsed all the facts recorded in the Old Testament, but he endorsed it as a record of God's revelation of his will to man, and a revelation of man unto himself. Therefore, as certainly as that Christ is the Son of God the Old Testament record is all true. For if any part of it had not been true, as it then existed and now exists in the Hebrew language, Christ, as the Son of God, would have been aware thereof, and as the Son of God he would not have given his endorsement thereunto. In other words, had there been an error in the Hebrew text Christ's divinity would have enabled him to know it, and would have caused him to make an exposition thereof. This unavoidable conclusion shows the folly of those who claim to believe that Christ is the Son of God and yet reject as untrue a considerable proportion of the Old Testament Scriptures, Those who make such claim, and yet are disposed to reject certain features of the Old Testament, certainly do not understand what is embraced in the proposition that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. Christ is the Fulfiller and Endorser of the Old Testament, and he is the Author of the New Testament. The four records of his earth life do not end the revelation that he gave. But Acts of Apostles, the Epistolary Writings, and John's Vision on the Island Patmos are all revelations of Christ. By and through the Holy Spirit he has given us everything in the New Testament for which inspiration is claimed. Paul wrote a few statements by permission and not by commandment." With such statements excepted, the New Testament is doubtless an inspired volume of which Christ is the divine Author. The Lord Jesus Christ is therefore the central figure between the Old Testament and the New. The Old

referred forward, to him and was fulfilled in him, while the New issued, from him. Therefore all who believe with the whole heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God doubtless believe the entire Bible to be true. They may not understand it in all its details, any more than they understand the material world in all its wonders. Yet because God is the author of this world it may be justly regarded all right as it came from his hand. On the same principle the entire Bible may be justly regarded as all right because Christ fulfilled and endorsed the Old Testament, and because he is the Author of the New Testament.

ERRORS IN CREEDS CONCERNING CONCESSION.

The unavoidable conclusions just reached expose certain errors in modern creeds on this subject. Persons who wish to obey Christ in baptism are questioned by several denominations in modern times after the following manner:

"Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?"

"Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ his only begotten Son our Lord; and that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; that he rose again the third day; that he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; and from thence shall come again at the end of the world, to judge the quick and the dead?"

"And dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church (the one universal Church of Christ); the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and everlasting life after death?"

"Wilt thou be baptized into this faith? ""Wilt thou then obediently keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of thy life?"

Such are the questions which the preacher is required to ask each one intending to submit to what is called "water "baptism," as they are recorded in the man-made creed of one of the most prominent denominations in. Protestantism. To each of those questions the candidate for baptism is required to give an affirmative answer. How very different from this was the confession made by the Ethiopian officer whose conversion to Christ is recorded in the latter part of Acts eighth chapter, "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus: And as they went on their way they came unto a certain, water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest: And he answered and said, I "believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God: And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him: And when they were come up out of the water the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip that the eunuch saw him no more, and he went on his way rejoicing." Such is the record which the reader will find by reference to the latter part of the eighth chapter of Acts of Apostles. How simple all this is, and thus how easily understood. Philip as an evangelist preached Jesus to the man of Ethiopia. That man heard and believed. He then inquired what would hinder him from being baptized just then as they came to a certain water. Philip told him that he might be baptized if he believed with all his heart. He answered, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." This confession in acknowledging faith in Christ,

also acknowledged faith in God and thus by implication confessed faith in the entire Bible. Christ taught concerning the Holy Spirit, the forgiveness of sins, the communion of saints, the resurrection of the dead, and life everlasting, together with a multitude of other truths. Then why ask concerning these and omit or ignore the others? Why not ask concerning the perfectness of Christ's personal character as Jesus of Nazareth, and the glory of his official character as prophet, priest, and king? "Why not inquire concerning the immortality of man's spirit, and the final punishment of the wicked? These are important subjects. But there is no need to inquire concerning them since they are all centered or brought together in the proposition that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Those who believe that proposition with all the heart believe without doubt all that Christ fulfilled, all that he endorsed, all that he commanded, promised, threatened, said. In other words, those who believe with the whole heart in Christ's divinity as declared in., the New Testament certainly believe without doubt the entire Bible,

CRITICISM EXPOSED.

Several late versions of the New Testament have omitted the eunuch's confession because it is not found in several of the oldest manuscripts of the Greek text. But all these versions unite in giving the eunuch's question, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" This much being given it must be admitted that Philip answered that question, and that *his* answer was in harmony with other parts of the Sacred Text. Rom, 10:10 says, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Now, then, just as certainly as that Philip answered the eunuch's question according to the statement of Paul in Rom. 10:10, so certain is it that the very answer was

given which we find in Acts 8:37. Such an answer doubtless brought forth from the eunuch the very confession which is attributed to him. In other words, Philip, as an inspired man, doubtless answered the eunuch's question, and no doubt the eunuch gave such an answer to Philip as is accredited to the eunuch by the Common Version, namely, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Such reflections justify holding to the eunuch's confession just as it is recorded in the Common Version of the Sacred Text, even if there was no other evidence in favor thereof. But there is other evidence on the subject. That confession is quoted in the writings of Irenaeus, and those writings are older than the oldest manuscripts now in existence. This should settle the question beyond all controversy. Irenaeus could not have quoted that confession if it had not been in existence, and the fact that he gave it as a quotation from the Sacred Text shows, that those manuscripts which retain the eunuch's confession are correct. Hence there is no just reason to question the genuineness of the confession that is recorded in Acts 8:37, and no just reason for not accepting it as a model.

ALL DISCOUNTING OF CHRIST'S LANGUAGE PRECLUDED.

Multitudes who make profession of faith in Christ as God's Son do not seem to understand that such profession precludes or shuts off all discounting of Christ's language. They claim to believe with the whole heart that Christ is God's Son, yet they discount, disparage, and even discard much that Christ has said and caused to be recorded in the New Testament. For instance, one man who claims to believe wholeheartedly in Christ's divinity denies that there is a personal devil, and that there is or will be a place of future and everlasting punishment. In reply to this it may be safely said that Christ spoke as definitely concerning a personal devil as he did concerning a personal

God. His language is also as definite concerning everlasting punishment as it is with reference to everlasting life. As an illustration of what Christ said about a personal devil take the following: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him: When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar and the father of it." John 8:44. As an illustration of what Christ said about future punishment let this be considered: "Then shall he say unto them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Matt. 25:41, 46.

But such definite language as that just quoted is discounted, disparaged, discarded, explained away and ignored by certain persons who claim to believe with all the heart that Christ is God's Son, and their Savior. But if Christ did not mean what he said when speaking of a personal devil and future punishment, how can they believe that he meant what he said when speaking of a personal God and future rewards? To confess faith in Christ as the Son of God is to confess faith in his words as the words of God. This means that his words shall be regarded just as reliable on the unpleasant side as on the pleasant side of his revelation. Therefore it is evident beyond question that there is a defect in the faith of those who ignore or explain away what Christ said concerning a personal devil, and everlasting punishment. They seem to think that Christ trifled with, language when he spoke on those subjects, and for them thus to think is an impeachment of his divinity. In other words, those who deny the personality of the devil and the reality of the doctrine of everlasting punishment for those *who*

die in disobedience do not without a defect in their faith believe with the whole heart that Christ is the Son of God. For, a whole-hearted belief in him as God's Son would cause them to accept all that he said without discount or disparagement.

But this is not all. Very many excellent people who admit the personality of the devil and the truth of the doctrine which threatens everlasting punishment seem disposed to deny that water baptism is in any respect necessary to salvation. Holy Spirit baptism was a promise to be received by those for whom it was intended. (See Mark 1:8.) Water baptism, on the other hand, is a command to be obeyed by all those who would be saved. (See Mark 16:16.) All can readily understand the difference between a command and a promise. The former is intended to be obeyed, while the latter is intended to be received. Thus wherever the connection shows that the word "baptism" refers to a command then that word can not in such connection refer to anything else than water baptism. This much being understood the reader is requested to consider the following: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in [into] the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," or Holy Spirit. Matt. 28:18, 19. "And he said unto them, Go ye 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 condemned." Mark 16:15,16. "And he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem." Luke 24:46, 47.

When such records of the great world-wide commission

of Christ are taken together it is evident that belief, repentance, and baptism are by divine authority given as conditions of salvation. "With this much clear before the mind it is appropriate to ask, Can any one who believe a with the whole heart that Christ is the Son of God sincerely say that baptism is a non-essential to the sinner's salvation? Did Christ by "all authority" "in heaven and in earth" command his apostles to preach, and practice in the glorious name of the Godhead a non-essential? Can any one thus conclude who believes whole-heartedly that Christ is the Son of God? Here are two statements:

1. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." —*Jesus Christ*,
2. "He that believeth and is" *not* "baptized shall be saved,"—*Uninspired Men*.

Now, which of these two statements will the reader accept? The former is the language of Christ and teaches that water baptism is necessary to the sinner's salvation; the latter is a fair statement of the position of multitudes of the uninspired concerning water baptism, and it clearly contradicts Christ. Can any doctrine be correct which contradicts the Savior of men? This reminds the writer that God said to Adam of the tree of knowledge, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:17. Another personage in form of a serpent spoke to Adam's wife and said, "Ye shall not surely die," Gen, 3:4. Then and there a contradiction of God was introduced. An after part of the Inspired Record implies that the mentioned contradiction was made by the devil speaking through the serpent. Thus the devil contradicted God in the Garden of Eden, and he is the one who has been contradicting God ever since. He is engaged in the same business in the sentence which says, "He that believeth and is" *not* "baptized shall be saved." Yet this sentence briefly and justly states the position of all those

who hold that baptism is not necessary to salvation. By an indirect and lengthy argument they cover up their contradiction of Christ, but when it is briefly stated every eye can see it and every mind can be impressed therewith. But who can believe with the whole heart that Christ is the Son of God, and yet contradict Christ on the subject of baptism? In other words, who that believes wholeheartedly that Christ is the Son of God will speak of baptism as a non-essential?

FURTHER SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE.

Suppose the case of a sick man who sends for a physician. When the man of medicine arrives the sick man says, "Doctor, I am very glad you have come, for I am very sick, and I have, unbounded confidence in you." The doctor examines the case and decides thereon. He then proceeds to prescribe. The sick man inquires what a certain prescribed medicine is, and when told he says, "Now, Doctor, there is no use giving me that remedy, for I am sure that I don't need it, and it will do me no good." The physician asks him, "Did you not send for me because you had confidence in me, and did you not say that you had unbounded confidence in me?" "Oh yes, Doctor, don't misunderstand me. I have unbounded confidence in you, but not in that part of your prescription to which I have objected!"

The absurdity of such profession of "unbounded confidence" as that mentioned in the foregoing illustration is equaled and even excelled by those persons who profess to believe whole-heartedly in Christ as the Son of God and their Savior, yet positively declare that when Christ by the Spirit through the apostle Peter commanded baptism it was a non-essential. "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. The one who authorized this pre-

scription for heart-pierced ones was and is the Great Physician of souls. With this much clearly understood it is evident that for sin-sick souls or spirits to make the statement that the "baptism commanded in Acts 2:38 is not necessary, and thus that a part of the prescription of the Great Physician is a non-essential, and can do no good. Such a statement is altogether contrary if not contradictory to a profession of whole-hearted faith in Christ as the Son of God. Consider the following:

"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 Apostle Peter*.

"Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ" *not* "for the remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—*Uninspired Men*.

The reader can make choice between the foregoing statements. To choose the former statement is to be with Christ and against uninspired multitudes. To choose the latter statement is to be with multitudes of uninspired ones and against the Lord Jesus Christ.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

This subject is not exhausted. But sufficient has been presented to make it clear that Christ is inseparably connected with the Bible from beginning to end. The first book and the last of the Sacred Volume speak of Christ, and all the intervening books are directly or indirectly connected with him. The same is true of every chapter, paragraph, and sentence of the entire Volume. As Fulfiller, Endorser, or Author, Christ is inseparably connected with every word in the Bible from its alpha to its omega. Therefore not even one word therein recorded can, by those who truly believe, and who understandingly profess whole-hearted faith in Christ's divinity, be ignored, explained away, disparaged or even discounted. All who

sincerely make a profession of whole-hearted faith in Christ and understand what such profession means cannot have the disposition to ignore nor even discount the words of Christ whether spoken while he was on earth or through the Spirit after he ascended to heaven. Even in translating the divinely given thought from the original text those who sincerely and understandingly profess whole-hearted faith in Christ will not be disposed to select remote and figurative meanings, that may be given to words in Hebrew and Greek lexicons; and thereby endeavor to justify human notions or escape obedience to the gospel of Christ either in its first requirements as found in Acts of Apostles, or its after teachings as recorded in the Epistolary "Writings. A whole-hearted profession of faith in Christ as the Son of God means nothing less than a whole-hearted acceptance of the entire Bible as God's revelation to mankind, and a whole-hearted obedience to all that the gospel requires of mankind.

TENTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

All preparations for the treatment of spiritual Hydrophobia have been considered, and the reader's attention is now invited to those facts, truths and arguments which pertain directly to that ailment. What has been presented in previous chapters is no doubt sufficient to serve as a preventative of that ailment with all who are not actually afflicted therewith. There is even sufficient in those chapters to cure many genuine cases of spiritual Hydrophobia. Such cases are found in those persons who are willing to be treated. But the chapter now to be introduced will deal with those cases of that dreadful ailment in which the persons afflicted therewith are inclined to become offended when told of their spiritual diseases and seem disposed to regard those as their enemies who would heal them thereof. The worst feature of spiritual Hydrophobia is found in this very fact. Those who are most certainly victims thereof are unwilling to be treated so as to be healed. Yet there are many whose prejudices have been overcome and they have been permanently cured. The cases considered in this chapter are samples of that number.

FIRST CASE STATED.

"I don't propose," said one afflicted with this ailment, "to hear any man who preaches a doctrine that will send my parents, my grand parents, and multitudes of other

good people to hell simply because they believed in baptism by sprinkling and pouring. More than that, I regard any man who holds that immersion of believers is the only right baptism as a bigot of the worst kind."

TREATMENT OF THIS CASE.

A preacher of Christ answered thus: "I have nothing, my dear friend, to do with sending any one to hell whom I never saw and to whom I never preached. All the people who have lived and died in former generations are beyond my reach, and I cannot do them either good or harm. But I suppose you mean that you don't propose to hear any man who advocates a doctrine which implies that your parents and many other good people have been lost. In reply to this I simply refer you to Christ's language in Luke 12:47, 48, which says, 'And that servant who knew his lord's, will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten, with many stripes: But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few stripes: For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more. Such language clearly shows that all mankind will be held accountable according to their light. Those who don't know what is right, and especially if they could not know what is right will be more gently punished for doing wrong than those wrong doers who do know, or at least have the privilege of knowing, what is right. Further teaching on this subject is found in Matt. 11:20-24, where the following language is recorded: 'Then began he [Christ] to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done because they repented not: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you 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 at the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven [because Christ had dwelt there] shalt be brought down to hell; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom it would have remained until this day: But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." By this language every intelligent person may learn that sinning against light and knowledge is a very serious offense, and those will receive the severest sentence in the day of judgment who would not learn when they had opportunity, or, having learned would not obey. Wicked ancient cities that lacked knowledge will be more mildly dealt with in the day of judgment than certain cities that existed when Christ was on earth and which had rejected Christ's teachings. On the same principle it is evident that good people and bad people of all generations will be finally judged. Concerning our parents and grand parents, together with all others who have lived and died, supposing that they were Christians, it may be safely said that the Lord Jesus Christ will be their judge, and he knows just how much light was within their reach. Therefore he knows to what extent they are responsible for not obeying the gospel in its fulness. Nothing that we can do or say will change their condition in the slightest degree. They are in the hands of Him who is infinitely wise and infinitely good. At the same time we who are yet living on the earth should hold ourselves free to learn all that the gospel requires, and render obedience thereunto. Whether I am regarded as a 'bigot of the worst kind' or not, yet what I have submitted is true."

"I must say," said that afflicted one, "that I have never before considered *this* question as you have just presented it. What you have said seems reasonable. But before I

accept it as certainly true I shall examine the New Testament on the subject."

The preacher answered after this manner: "That is the very kind of a speech, dear friend, that I desire to hear you make. Bead the New Testament from beginning to end and mark all the passages that even seem to indicate that sprinkling or pouring was taught or practiced for baptism by either Christ or the apostles. In the meantime endeavor to learn whether we should at any time refuse to learn and obey what the gospel requires because of others who may not have had opportunity for so doing."

Six months later these two friends met. The man who disliked baptism confessed his mistake in measuring by the practice of uninspired people who have lived and died, however good they may have been, likewise he acknowledged the mistake of supposing that sprinkling or pouring is baptism. So a cure was effected by a few sensible statements and a few months' honest reading. By the same method all others can be cured of their dread to admit that immersion in water is the only New Testament baptism that is required. If any reader of such a statement as that just submitted feels skeptical on the subject, and on account of skepticism will refuse to read the New Testament through with care, then that reader's case is, for the time, altogether incurable.

SECOND CASE STATED.

"Don't ask me," said a victim of spiritual Hydrophobia, "to hear you preach while you talk against infant baptism. I was "baptized when an infant. My parents believed in it, and they dedicated me to the Lord *in* baptism, while I was an infant. So you need not suppose that I have no more respect for myself and for my parents than to hear a man who preaches a doctrine which implies that my earnest, zealous parents were fools."

THE CASE TREATED.

"Allow me to read," replied the preacher, "a part of Romans tenth chapter. 'Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel [the Jews] is, that they might be saved: For I bear them record [witness] that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.' Here we find that Paul prayed for the Jews that they might be saved. This implies that they were not saved at that time. Yet they had a zeal. But their 'zeal' could not save them because it was 'not according to knowledge.' So then what is called 'zeal' must be 'according to knowledge' in order to be of value, But Paul wrote further in Romans tenth chapter. He said of the Jews, 'For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.' Thus it is with many good and zealous people even in this generation. They have for some reason remained unacquainted with God's righteousness in commanding only believers to be baptized, and they have gone about to establish their own righteousness in having infants sprinkled or poured upon instead of waiting until they come to the years of understanding and then teach them to be immersed or buried in baptism according to the Sacred Text." (See Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12.)

"I have thus shown you," continued the preacher, "that 'zeal' is not all that is required, but that we must have 'zeal' 'according to knowledge,' and thus have 'zeal' in doing what is divinely required. Now I wish to show you that there is no such a something as infant "baptism. You are well aware that what is called 'baptism' is a command that was, like all commands, given to be obeyed. You are likewise aware that obedience always implies submission of will. Where there is no *submission of will* there is nothing that may be justly called *obedience*. When chil-

dren *obey* their parents they *submit their wills* unto them. Thus it is with those who obey Christ. They do so by willingly conforming to his will. There is a great difference between *submission* and *subjection*. The former implies yielding of the will, while the latter does not. "When we obey Christ in baptism we submit or yield our wills to him, but if we should be taken by force and compelled to be immersed then we would be *subjugated*, but we would not obey. To illustrate I mention that many years ago a preacher of Christ in the forenoon of a certain day went to hear a man preach who was required to sprinkle water on one or more infants. One of the infants was old enough to know who were strangers to him, and he seemed to object to strangers taking him in hand. So when the preacher took him in hand to sprinkle water on him the little fellow screamed and resisted all that he could. But the preacher held to him and sprinkled water on him. "That same afternoon that same preacher of Christ had some immersing to do. As he was engaged therein the preacher who had done the sprinkling in the forenoon, stood on the bank of the stream. When through with immersing those who had just then willingly submitted to Christ in that institution the mentioned preacher of Christ took hold of the other preacher by the arm and said, 'Come on, sir.' 'What are you going to do?' 'I'm going to immerse you, sir.' 'Oh, but I don't want to be immersed, and "so it would do me no good.' 'Yes, but that little fellow didn't want to be sprinkled upon this morning, yet you didn't stop for that; so come on, sir.

"This incident, my friend, illustrates the thought which I wish to impress. That little fellow of whom I just informed you did not render obedience, but he was taken by force and sprinkled upon. Thus in his case there was *subjection*, but not *submission*. So it is in all cases where infants are taken in hand and sprinkled or poured upon,

or immersed, without their knowledge or consent.

They are subjected by force to what their parents, guardians and many others call 'baptism.' But that which the New Testament calls 'baptism' is an institution in which believers are required to obey Christ. 'But ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.' Rom. 6:17. Infants do not obey and cannot obey from the heart in baptism nor in anything else. Therefore infants cannot be baptized, because they cannot obey Christ in the institution called baptism. They may be sprinkled upon, poured upon, or even immersed, but they cannot be baptized in the New Testament sense, because they cannot obey. The command concerning baptism comes to each one who is to submit thereunto, but that command does not say for Christians to have somebody else baptized who don't wish to be, or who don't know what baptism is, nor what is its meaning. The idea of baptizing some one who don't wish to be baptized is as widely separated from the gospel of Christ as darkness is from light. Baptizing into Christ and into the name of the Godhead, when the person don't wish to be baptized, or don't know what is being done when that which is called baptism is being performed, is impossible. It is as reasonable to speak of an infant in years believing, or repenting, or confessing Christ, as to speak of such an infant being baptized. To speak of infant belief, infant repentance, infant confession, infant communion is not more unreasonable nor absurd than it is to speak of *infant baptism*. My dear friend, *there is no infant baptism*. If I should speak of infant repentance, and infant communion every one who could readily see the absurdity of such a speech. When all prejudice is laid aside every one can likewise see the absurdity of what is called *infant baptism*. That which is called 'infant baptism' ought to be called *infant subjection* or *infant compulsion*, since infants do not

obey by submitting their wills to Christ, but they are taken by force and subjected or by force are compelled to receive what many uninspired people call 'baptism' This ought to settle the question with all persons who desire to do right."

"But," said the one afflicted with spiritual Hydrophobia, "I have always regarded what is called 'infant baptism' as authorized by Christ and the apostles. The Savior took little children in his arms and blessed them, and the apostles baptized several entire households. I have also thought that it came in the place of circumcision. Besides, the great number of good people that practice it has caused me to feel satisfied that it is all right."

In reply to this the preacher of Christ spoke as follows: "It is my earnest desire that you shall not take my word for one single remark that I have made, or may hereafter make for your consideration. I have already stated to you that there is no such a something as *infant baptism* because there "is no *infant obedience*. I now state further that though the Savior took little children in his arms and blessed them, yet there is no evidence that he baptized them, nor that with his own hands he ever baptized any one. (See John 4:1, 2.) I next submit for your investigation that though the apostles baptized several households, yet there is no evidence that an infant was in either of them. On the contrary it is evident that no infants were in the household of Cornelius, nor in the company that he had gathered together, for he said to the apostle Peter, 'Now therefore are we all here present before God to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.' Acts 10:33. Such language could not have been correctly used concerning an audience partly composed of infants. In regard to the jailer's household the same is true, for it is definitely stated that the jailer believed in God with all his house. (Acts 16:34.) With reference

to the case of Lydia, mentioned in the former part of Acts sixteenth chapter, it may be justly stated that no one can show by the Sacred Text that she had a husband to say nothing of children of any age or size.

"Concerning the idea that what is called infant baptism came in the place of circumcision I only say that it is certainly a mistake, since circumcision was never ended, but is yet in force. God never gave circumcision to any people except the Jews, and all Jews, whether converted to Christ or not, still have the right to be circumcised. This is evident from the fact that the apostle Paul circumcised a certain disciple named Timothy who was only a half Jew. An account thereof is found in Acts sixteenth chapter. This was something that Paul would not have done if the fact that Timothy's mother was a Jewess had not given him a divine right to circumcision, which was a national mark for Jews, based on flesh and blood and not on character. The Gentile nations were never required to be circumcised, and when Gentiles who had been converted to Christ adopted circumcision they placed themselves by that one act among those who had fallen from grace, and to whom Christ had become of no effect. (See Gal. 5:1-4.) With this much before the mind it is evident beyond question that all talk about what is called 'infant baptism' coming 'in the room,' or 'in the place of circumcision' is a mistake. Jewish circumcision is yet in its own place as a national mark, based on fleshly considerations, and not on character. 'Christ is the end of the law [Jewish law given on Mt. Sinai] for righteousness to every one that believes.' Rom. 10:4. But circumcision was given several hundred years before the law. (See Gen. 17th chap., and Rom. 4th chap.) Let these facts be considered by honest people and they will cease to speak of what is called 'infant baptism' or anything else coming in the room of circumcision, for Jewish circumcision is

yet in its own divinely appointed room or place.

"Finally, I wish to say to you, my friend, that one of the most satisfactory arguments in favor of any institution not having originated with Christ and his apostles is to find the time and place in church history of its introduction. Take as an illustration the Roman Catholic confessional, cloister, celibacy or non-marriage of the clergy, together with the doctrine of transubstantiation. The best evidence that such institutions and doctrines were not authorized by Christ is that they were never mentioned in the New Testament except as being connected with the falling away from the gospel, and that we can find the records in church history where they were first introduced. It is absurd to suppose that church history would record that they were first introduced in the third, fourth, fifth or sixth century, or at a later date if they had been ordained by Christ and practiced by the apostles. The same is true in regard to what is called 'infant baptism,' Since the very chapter in church history where the propriety of baptizing infants was discussed and decided upon can be found we have evidence which common sense and common honesty will never question against that institution. It could not have been ordained of Christ and practiced by the apostles without being mentioned in church history until the third century and then be mentioned as a new something the propriety of which needed to be discussed. In the year 253 a council of sixty-six African Bishops met at Carthage, To that council was submitted this question: *Whether an infant before it was eight days old might be baptized, if need required.* This shows that though what was called infant baptism had been previously introduced, yet it was not settled that it should be performed before the infant had lived eight days. That African council gave an affirmative answer to the question submitted thereunto,, and this

is the beat authority that any one can find for baptising an infant under eight days old. A council of sixty-six bishops (negro bishops) at Carthage in the year 253 decided that it would be right to baptize infants under eight days old. But this authority is as good as any that can be found for baptizing infants at any age. Now it must be evident to you that if infant baptism had been required by Christ and the apostles certainly it could not have been afterwards in the third century introduced as a new institution."

"I must say," replied the man who contended for infant baptism, "that you have astonished me with facts and arguments. But I don't wish to be hasty in rendering a decision. So I shall not tell you what my ideas are, except to state that I intend to consider this subject in the light of scripture and church history."

The reader may judge what was the result. It repeats the old story—honest investigation and a change from wrong to right.

THIRD CASE STATED.

"It is all in vain," said a Hydrophobic patient, "to spend thy time trying to persuade me to be immersed while I regard water baptism a non-essential to salvation. Thee ought to know that the Friends or Quakers, as they are sometimes called, don't believe in any formal ceremonies as necessary to salvation. Since Christ ascended and the Holy Spirit was sent down we claim that water baptism is no longer needed. We believe in baptism of the Spirit, which is the higher baptism, and which was signified or typified by the water baptism which John, the forerunner of the messiah, preached and practiced."

TREATMENT OF THIS CASE.

To the foregoing statements from the lips of an excellent old Quaker, a preacher of Christ made the following reply:

1. "My Quaker friend, if I show you that the New Tes-

tament speaks as plainly concerning water baptism *after* Christ ascended and the Holy Spirit was sent down as it speaks concerning water baptism *before* Christ ascended and the Spirit came down will you admit that you are wrong? You say *yes*? All right then. Let us appeal directly to the text. 'Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus: And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest: And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God: And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him: And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip that the eunuch saw him no more, and he went on his way rejoicing.' Acts 8:35-39. Here is the word 'water' used four times in connection with the word 'baptism,' and this occurred some time after Christ had ascended and the Holy Spirit had descended. But this is not all. After the Spirit had come upon the household of Cornelius in a miraculous manner for a sign (1 Cor. 14:22) to those Jews who did not believe that the Gentiles were gospel subjects the apostle Peter said, 'Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' Acts 10:47. Here the word 'water' is again used in connection with the command to be baptized, and this was probably several years after Christ ascended and the Holy Spirit had been given on the day of Pentecost. Besides, wherever baptism is mentioned as a command or as something that man did or was required to do the reference is to water baptism, since Spirit baptism was not a command to be

obeyed, but was a promise to be received by those for whom it was intended.

2. "Permit me to say further, my Quaker friend, that to the extent that you discard a form of obedience to "what is divinely required you are certainly wrong. The apostle Paul wrote thus: 'But God be thanked that ye were [though 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,' Rom. 6:17, 18. Here it is evident beyond question that a divinely given form of doctrine is a very important something to obey. Human forms in religion are of no value. They are even worse than nothing. But any form of doctrine given by the Lord Jesus Christ should be carefully observed. So you see, my Quaker friend, that I am with you in regard to human forms and ceremonies in religion, and I trust that it is evident to your mind wherein you are wrong in regard to forms of doctrine that are divinely required. I suppose that you think the same about the Lord's supper or the communion that you have thought about baptism. But if you will read Acts 20:7, together with the tenth and eleventh chapters of 1 Corinthians on this subject then it will become altogether evident that "the Lord's supper, as well as water baptism, is now required."

"Thy speech," said the honest Quaker, "seemeth reasonable. But as I am not acquainted with all the passages of scripture to which thee has referred I shall refrain from further talk on this subject until I shall have time to search and see whether my teachers have misled me, or whether thee is trying to mislead me so that Quaker and preacher of Christ separated. When they met again they were warmer friends than at their first meeting. The word of God read and studied always tends to bring honest people together. Thus as

that honest Quaker grasped the hand of the gospel preacher at their next meeting he spoke after this manner: "Friend, thee told me the truth, and I am now convinced that thee was not trying to mislead me. I am no longer afflicted with Hydrophobia, for I am satisfied that the perfect Preacher and Exemplar intended that all who would live the new life should be buried in baptism and be raised to walk in newness of life as a preparation for so doing. I am astonished when I think of the mistakes that are made by good people because they do not read the Spirit's words as they are recorded. Verily it is a dangerous thing to be prejudiced, especially in favor of an error."

FOURTH CASE STATED.

"I believe in salvation by faith in the blood of Christ, and not by faith in water," said a man seriously afflicted with spiritual Hydrophobia. To this he added, "Salvation by water would have made the shedding of Christ's blood unnecessary, and I don't *believe* any such doctrine. More than that I don't wish to *hear* it. You couldn't get me to believe that water baptism is necessary to salvation if you would talk a hundred years."

TREATMENT OF THIS CASE.

The preacher of Christ said whence having heard the foregoing speech, "My friend, you believe the Bible to be true, don't you? All right then. This admission will serve as a basis or foundation on which, to proceed. Now permit me to read a portion of the Sacred Text. 'Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' John 3:5. If you did not believe the word of God to be true you might conclude that when Christ used the word 'water' he meant something else. But as you believe the Bible to be true you must acknowledge that Christ meant what he said when he used the

word 'water' just as he meant what he said when he Used the word 'Spirit.' For if he did not mean *water* when he said 'water,' how can any one believe that he meant *Spirit* when he said 'Spirit?' Therefore, to question whether Christ meant what he said in John 3:5 about a man being 'born of water' lays the foundation for questioning whether he meant what he said when he spoke on any other subject. Such questioning is nothing less than doubting Christ's divinity. But as you believe the Bible to be true and thus believe in Christ's divinity you certainly believe that when Christ said, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God' he meant just what he said.

"With this much before your mind, my dear prejudiced friend, permit me to ask you, What institution is found in the New Testament that has 'water' connected therewith? Do you know of any except baptism? You say *none*? That is candid. Now then, when Christ said 'Except a man be born of water,' could he have meant any thing else than, *Except a man be baptized*? Don't hesitate. Be candid. Though you have been misled, yet it is honorable to admit a truth when you see it. You say that some believe that the word 'water' in this passage means the ammonitic water? They may *think* so, but they cannot believe so. For, just think a moment. Christ said, 'Except a man be born,' not, Except an unborn infant be born. Besides, in John 3:3 Christ is represented as saying, 'Except a man be born again.' This shows that Christ was speaking of those who have been born once, for no one can be born *again* until he has been born *once*.

"Now let me read in your hearing additional testimony. Speaking of the ark the apostle Peter said, 'Wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water: The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us not the putting; away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a

good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.' 1 Peter 3:20, 21. You say you never knew that such language is in the New Testament? I can't help that, for it is here nevertheless. Having mentioned the water of the flood Peter said, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us.' This does not teach that water alone, nor that baptism alone will save, but it does teach that baptism has an important place in man's salvation. Because a man lives by eating that don't mean that he drinks nothing; neither does it mean that he don't, live by breathing. But man's physical life is sustained by eating, stinking, and breathing. On the same principle it is true that though salvation was purchased by the shedding of Christ's blood, yet salvation will not be bestowed unconditionally. The shedding of Christ's blood belongs to the divine side, while obedience in baptism belongs to the human side. The divine side of salvation does not exclude the human side, any more under the gospel dispensation, than when the Israelites were at the Red Sea terrified by the presence of their enemies. 'And Moses said unto the people, Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord, which he will show to you today; for the Egyptians whom ye have seen today, ye shall see them again no more forever: The Lord shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace: And the Lord said unto Moses, "Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward.' Ex. 14:13-15. Here it is evident that though the Lord told the people to 'stand still and see the salvation of the Lord,' yet that command did not make it unnecessary for them to 'go forward.' They were to 'stand still' and 'hold' their 'peace' in regard to fighting, yet they were to 'go forward' when God so commanded. The same is true in a certain sense concerning man's salvation from sin. Christ has purchased salvation for us by the merits

of his own precious blood, yet in order to become partakers "of that salvation it is necessary for us to be born of water, and of the Spirit.

"You say that you never considered this question for yourself, but thought that the learned men whom you had heard, and after whom you had read, certainly knew what they were saying? All, yes, "That is the secret of multitudes being misled. They have so much confidence in their leading men. I talked with an honest Quaker once who actually thought that neither water baptism nor the Lord's supper was mentioned 'after the Holy Spirit had descended on the day of Pentecost. But he soon learned better when he began to examine the New Testament on the subject.

"You say that you would like to know what will become of the Quakers in the final judgment? I don't know Neither does any one else know. As certainly as that the New Testament is right they are wrong. Whether the Lord can, by reason of mercies never promised, overlook their mistakes in rejecting water baptism and the Lord's supper no one can with certainty declare. I don't mean to say that they will all be lost, yet I would not occupy the position of one of them for a million of worlds like this in which we live. You think this uncharitable? Well, it may seem so. But I am so much interested in my own salvation that I would not for a million of worlds like this change positions with any one who has the privilege of learning what the gospel of Christ is and yet fails to enjoy that privilege. 'For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more,' Luke 12:48.

"Does all this sound strange to you? Permit me to assure you that I have not told *you* all that the gospel says on this subject. Hear this: 'He that believeth and is

baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.' Mark 16:16. What do you say—that this text don't state that he that is *not baptized* shall be condemned? Allow me to ask, What are you doing on that side of Christ's commission? By examination it is evident that Christ's world-wide commission had two sides—a *salvation side*, and a *condemnation side*. Now, if you desire to be saved why not keep on *the salvation side*? Repentance and confession of faith are not mentioned in Mark's account of the last commission of Christ, but belief and baptism are mentioned on the salvation side of that commission. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Now, if you wish to be saved you certainly should keep on the *salvation side* of the commission, and leave the other side for those who do not believe in Christ. Unbelief will be sufficient to justify a sentence of condemnation without anything else. Moreover, 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin,' (Rom. 14:23,) and thus those who do not believe certainly could not be baptized acceptably. Therefore, it would have been a waste of words for Christ to have said, 'He that believeth not,' and is not baptized 'shall be damned.'"

"Well, I must confess," said the man who a short time before dreaded to admit the value of water baptism, "I must confess," said he, "that you have more good sense and scripture on your side than I thought you had."

"Please don't say 'on my side' as if I had a side," remarked the preacher. "I would rather for you to say that you have found me to be on the side of good sense and scripture."

"You may shape the expression to suit yourself," remarked the man who had said that he did not wish to hear such doctrine as the preacher of Christ advocated concerning water baptism. To this he added, "I am not particular about the form of expression used; but it cuts

me to the heart to think that I have probably been deceived by my teachers. Yet I shall investigate closely and carefully in order to learn what the Holy Spirit intended to teach on the subject of water baptism."

Reader, the result in this case repeats the old story. That man became convinced that water baptism is a divine appointment and cannot be ignored without incurring Christ's displeasure. The doctrine that baptism is a non-essential to the alien sinner's acceptance with Christ he discarded. Moreover, having learned that he had been deceived or misled by his teachers he determined to study the Bible for himself on all questions. As a result he became a Christian in the New Testament sense of that word, and laid aside all humanisms in religion. This case illustrates many others that might be recorded. Thousands of honest people, who once feared and even dreaded to admit that water baptism was of any value, are now rejoicing in the truth as it is taught in the gospel. Their hearts are filled with gratitude that they were led to examine the gospel for themselves.

FIFTH CASE STATED,

"The doctrine that immersion is the only scriptural baptism is to me so narrow and uncharitable that it is positive! repulsive," said a man several years ago to a preacher of Christ. He then continued thus: "I don't understand how such an idea could ever have entered the mind of any one who claims to be a Christian. I have no patience with any people who are so narrow and so exclusive. They have a pet theory, and are disposed to send every one to hell who don't conform to that theory. Many of them seem to care nothing about conversion to Christ if they can only get people to be dipped. There ought to be a law forbidding men to preach such a heresy."

TREATMENT OF THIS CASE.

The preacher of Christ who heard the foregoing speech

handled it after this manner: "My dear sir, did you ever hear a discourse on this subject by a preacher of those people whom you so severely denounce? You say you never did? Then I will ask whether you have read any of their literature in which they ignore the necessity of conversion. What is your answer, affirmative or negative? All! I perceive you don't wish to talk to me. But you have made your speech against me and the people with whom I am connected in the presence of several, and it occurs to me as only fair that you should listen to my reply. You have listened to reports of prejudiced persons, some of whom, perhaps, never heard but one discourse from preachers of Christ; and that one probably was on the subject of immersion. Sometimes a preacher of Christ discourses a week or more on conversion of mind, of heart, of life, and sets forth that all who would be Christians must be thoroughly changed in all these respects before he is fit to be baptized. But certain persons who ought to hear a discussion of these themes are absent. Finally they are present, and the subject of immersion is considered. Having heard nothing of previous subjects they very unjustly conclude that the preacher and the people with whom he stands identified believe in salvation by water baptism alone. Such a conclusion is not true, but the very reverse of truth. I am acquainted with those people whom you are disposed to denounce as believing in a water salvation, and I say to you that they believe in no such doctrine. On the contrary, they insist that a seven-fold immersion in the river Jordan or any other stream would do no good, but would be positively sinful, without a previous change or conversion of mind, heart, and life. Those people teach that in order to salvation it is necessary to be thoroughly converted in spirit, soul, and body.

"Now listen while I reply to your remark about how

the idea that 'nothing else than immersion is baptism' ever entered the mind. Permit me to inform you that according to all the reliable histories concerning the primitive or apostolic practice certainly nothing else than immersion was practiced for over two hundred years after the Church was established. One of the best evidences-in this direction is found in the fact that the first case of sprinkling instead of immersion is on record. According to the testimony of Eusebius, who is called 'the father of church historians, it occurred after this manner: 'Novatus, being relieved therefore by the exorcists, fell into a grievous distemper; and it being supposed that he would die immediately, he received *baptism*, being besprinkled with water, on the bed whereon he lay, (if that can be termed baptism,) neither when he had escaped that sickness, did he afterwards receive the other things, which the canon of the Church enjoineth should be received: nor was he sealed by the Bishop's imposition of hands: which, if he never received, how did he receive the Holy Ghost?'

"This occurred not earlier than the year 251 or probably 253, and thus a hundred and fifty years after the last of the apostles had died. The connection in which the historian makes mention thereof clearly shows that it occurred after much superstition had been introduced. For instance, those whom Eusebius calls 'exorcists' in the quotation just made were persons who by shouts and declamations of various kinds claimed to drive the demons out of each candidate for baptism. In other words, they had a sort of pow-wow performance which the Church generally seemed to regard as necessary over each one to be baptized as a preparation for that ordinance. I mention these facts to show you under what circumstances sprinkling was substituted for immersion.

"In order to understand further the value of such a fact

as that just brought before your mind let us reverse the testimony. Suppose that history united in saying that Novatus regarded sprinkling or pouring as too easy and too small an expression of his faith in Christ, and therefore he insisted upon being immersed. Would not such a statement of history show that sprinkling and pouring had previously been the practice and that immersion was an innovation? *Certainly*. But this is not all. Suppose that immersion had afterwards been called fanatic baptism, to which comparatively few would submit, while sprinkling and pouring continued to be generally practiced? "Would not this be the most satisfactory evidence that sprinkling and pouring were the acts which constituted the original and apostolic practice, and that immersion was an innovation? *Undoubtedly*. But all this is substantially what history teaches in favor of immersion and against sprinkling. Novatus, or Novatian, as he is otherwise called, was the first to be sprinkled upon. This was used as a substitute for immersion because of his sickness. In course of time other sick or feeble folks were poured upon or sprinkled upon, and this was called 'clinic baptism' (baptism of those confined to a bed by sickness) and those who had submitted thereunto were held at a discount in regard to official position in the Church.

"Now, my dear friend, as you seem willing to listen, permit me to call your attention to the New Testament. But "before so doing I shall state what no Greek scholar will deny, namely, that the Greek text of the New Testament makes use of the word *rantzein* to set forth what we do by the expression *to sprinkle*. Suppose that the first chapter of Mark had recorded that John the Baptist was in the wilderness of Judea rantizing the people on a rock with water brought from a spring, then there would have been some show of reason for insisting that immersion

was not practiced. Suppose that in the eighth chapter of Acts the record had stated that when the chariot stopped the Ethiopian sent his servant down to a certain water which was near at hand, and that Philip baptized him therewith in the chariot. Then who would have the face to insist that, immersion was the general practice? With these suppositions in favor of sprinkling before the mind let the divine testimony now be presented. 'John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins: And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins.' Mark 1:4, 5. 'And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest: And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God: And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him: And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more; and he went on his way rejoicing,' Acts 8:36-39. Does such language look as if sprinkling or pouring was performed? Just about as much as the supposed account of bringing water and baptizing a multitude on a rock, or baptizing a man in a chariot indicates that immersion was practiced. In other words, my dear friend, I bring before you this statement: *If the New Testament were as plain in favor of sprinkling and against immersion as it is plain in favor of immersion and against sprinkling for baptism the advocates of immersion would be compelled to abandon their position or act a dishonest part.* "You say that some of the learned have told you that the Greek preposition translated by our preposition 'in'

does not necessarily mean actual entrance, but may mean *at* or *near!* Yes, I know they talk just that inconsistently. They will admit that John 'did baptize in the wilderness,' but deny that he baptized 'in the river of Jordan.' The Greek preposition translated 'in' is the same in both places, and they will admit the truth in one place and deny the truth in another! How inconsistent! Finally, as you have mentioned learned men I submit this proposition for their consideration: *Whoever says 'I baptize you' to a person, and then sprinkles or pours a small quantity of water on that person performs an act which makes the words, 'I baptize you' a falsehood.*"

"I shall" said the one who had so positively opposed immersion as the only scriptural baptism, "I shall consider what you have stated, I shall read for myself hereafter, and I shall submit the proposition which you have just stated to several learned clergymen and report to you what they say."

"All right, my friend, do so. I shall be glad to learn the results."

Thus these two friends parted. After several months had elapsed they met again and the reader will find next an account of their interview.

"I submitted your proposition to several learned preachers," said the opponent of immersion as the only baptism, "and to my surprise they all showed signs of temper. One of them claimed to be wholly sanctified, and he became very angry. Each of them used severe language concerning the man who would make such a proposition. The truth is, their behavior made an unfavorable impression on my mind, and I am more than ever disposed to investigate,"

"I am not surprised that those learned gentlemen became angry," said the preacher of Christ. "That proposition is such a direct challenge of their scholarship and

their honesty that they find it difficult to control themselves. They well know that when they sprinkle water on an individual in the name of the Godhead they ought to say 'I rantize you,' as the Greek word *rantizo* means *sprinkle*, just as plainly as *baptizo* means *I immerse*. To convince you of what I have just said concerning *baptizo*, which is always used, in one form or another, when the institution of baptism is referred to, I shall now bring before you what learned men have written on this subject. But before so doing I wish to assure you that what the learned say on this or any other Bible subject has but little weight with me. I only advance what the learned have said because you mentioned them as though you regarded them on your side. I have what Greek dictionaries say and what church historians say, but all that both of those classes of witnesses declare is summed up in what is said by the Encyclopedias. So I read briefly from them.

THE AMERICANA.—'In the time of the apostles, the form was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel.'

BLAIKIE'S MODERN.—'In the primitive Church the person to be baptized was dipped in a river or in a vessel.'

BRANDE'S.—'Baptism was originally administered by immersion.'

BRITANNICA.—'The usual mode of performing the ceremony was by immersion.'

CHAMBERS'.—'It is, however, indisputable that at a very early period the ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion.'

CONCISE.—'Immersion was, there is no doubt, the first rule of the Church.'

EDINBERG.—'Baptism, in the apostolic, age, was per formed by immersion.'

ENGLISH.—'The manner in which it was performed appears to have been at first by complete immersion.'

INTERNATIONAL.—It is, however, indisputable that in, the primitive Church the ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion.'

METROPOLITAN A.—'The word "baptism" is derived from the Greek *baptizo* and means literally dipping or immersion.'

NEW AMERICAN.—'The form of baptism at first was, according to most historians, by immersion, but as Christianity advanced into colder climates, the more convenient mode of sprinkling was introduced.'

PENNY.—'The manner in which it was performed appears to have been at first by complete immersion.'

POPULAR.—'In the primitive Church the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel.'

REESE.—'In the primitive times, this ceremony was performed by immersion.'

SCHAFF-HERZOG.—'In the primitive Church baptism was by immersion.'

STUDENTS'.—'The ordinary mode of administering the sacrament in the early Church was "by immersion.'

"These quotations, my dear friend," added the preacher. "sum up all that is found in scholarship concerning water baptism in the primitive Church—the Church which was established by the apostles of Christ. I have read these quotations because you happened to mention what the 'learned' say on this subject, and that you may understand that the scholars are on the side of immersion."

"That astonishes me beyond measure," was the reply which the preacher of Christ received. "I have been entirely misled on this subject. The facts are the very opposite of what I had supposed. My purpose is to investigate."

"Allow me to suggest," responded the preacher, "that in your investigation you consider this question: If the Sacred Text were as plainly in favor of sprinkling as it is in favor of immersion, would immersion have even one advocate or sprinkling one opponent? That is to say, if in the New Testament it was recorded that inspired men sent for water, and had water brought, and applied the water to the individual, and if the word *rantism* was used instead of *baptism*, who would have the boldness to reject sprinkling and advocate immersion?"

"Another question may also do you good. It is this: How many persons who once submitted to immersion have rejected it and desired to be sprinkled upon in course of the last century,? Possibly a dozen, but even that many cases, probably, cannot be found well attested. On the other hand, how many persons who were sprinkled upon have discarded sprinkling and insisted upon being immersed within the past hundred years? Probably a million in the United States alone. Do not such facts show that immersion is plainly taught while sprinkling is not? "But there is yet one other question which you ought to consider. Which of the so-called, modes of baptism is admitted to be right by all the religious denominations of what is termed Christendom? You know that they all admit immersion while a considerable number of them reject sprinkling entirely. Even the Quakers admit that immersion was the practice when Christ was on earth. Finally, I mention the fact, that all the denominations, even including the Quakers, hold that the word 'baptism' always means an overwhelming and thus means immersion when it refers to the Holy Spirit. But if the word 'baptism' always means immersion when it refers to the Holy Spirit, why does it not always mean immersion when it refers to water?"

"My friend you need not go any farther," said this

man who had so strongly opposed immersion, as the only valid baptism. To this he added, "I know most of the facts you mention to be genuine. To my mind this is only a question of honest examination. I am truly glad that we have become acquainted and that we have had these interviews. Though it grieves me to think of the many severe speeches I have made against immersionists, yet I am glad that I have seen my mistake. Don't regard me any longer as afflicted with Hydrophobia."

"I like to find an honest man," said the preacher of Christ. "If all who are afflicted with spiritual Hydrophobia were as honest as you have "been there would be no serious difficulty in curing them of that ailment. But many who are afflicted therewith refuse to hear or read seriously what is said against their position."

"But that which puzzles me is that sprinkling ever came to be practiced, as the testimony is so clear and so abundant in favor of immersion," remarked the man just cured of Hydrophobia.

"Permit me," said the preacher, "to give you information on that subject. The Edinburg Cyclopaedia in the article on baptism gives this account:

"The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II, being, driven from Borne by Adolphus, king of the Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before, had usurped the crown of France. "Whilst he remained there the monks of Cressy, in Britany, consulted him whether, in case of necessity, baptism poured on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of. this fact be allowed—which, however, some Catholics deny— yet pouring or sprinkling was only admitted in cases *of necessity*. It was not till the year 1311 that the legislature in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In Scotland, however,

sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases, till after the Reformation, (about the middle of the sixteenth century.) From Scotland it made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized in the Established Church.'

"This article in the Edinburg Cyclopaedia clearly shows that what was called 'clinic baptism' (bed or couch baptism), which began with Novatus about the middle of the third century, advanced slowly, and not until a thousand years or more had elapsed from the time of Novatus did it come to be generally regarded with favor for those who were not sick. Moreover, the Roman Catholic Church is responsible for its introduction."

Reader, the foregoing interviews have been reported for your benefit. What effect will you permit them to have on your mind? Has your dread of water been such that all the facts, and truths, and arguments in the chapter which you have just read are of no importance? Be this as it may, I have tried to assist you in securing relief from a serious spiritual ailment. May the Father, of all mercies lead you in the way of truth and righteousness.

ELEVENTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

One reason why multitudes of good people are afflicted with Hydrophobia of a spiritual kind is because they have concluded that it is possible to fear God, love God, love the Lord Jesus Christ, know God, and love the children of God as the Scriptures require without obeying all that the gospel enjoins. They seem to think that to fear, love, and know God is wholly an internal 'something, and may be fully accomplished in their thoughts and feelings without actual obedience to the divine commandments. In the chapter hereby introduced this question will be fairly and fully considered.

EVIDENCE OF FEARING GOD.

Abraham, through Isaac and Jacob, was the father of the Jewish nation, and he is likewise called "the father of all them that believe" because of his great and unwavering faith in God. By examination of Heb. 11:7 it is evident that faith is the foundation of fear. "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear." Noah's faith caused him to be "moved with fear," and the record further informs the reader thereof that he was "moved" to build the ark just as God had directed. Therefore when in the history of Abraham it is discovered that he feared God it will be understood that his fear was the outgrowth of his faith.

"With the foregoing explanation clearly before the mind let attention be given to the twenty-second chapter of Genesis. It is therein recorded that God commanded Abraham, saying, "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I shall tell thee of." When Abraham had received this command he did not stand around the next morning and reason, against what God had enjoined, nor did he try to plan how he might avoid obedience thereunto. On the contrary, "he rose up early in the morning" and made the necessary preparations for his journey. How he spent the first and second days of that important journey the record makes no mention. Whether he spent the nights in prayer, and straining his eyes toward heaven looking for an angel to come and recall the terrible mandate is not stated. But "on the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place afar off." Then he told the young men with him, who were doubtless his servants, to abide where they were while he and the lad would go and worship. That lad was Isaac. On Isaac's shoulder Abraham then placed the wood, taking the fire and knife in his own hands. "And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father and said, My father: And he said, Here am I my son: And he said, Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together." The record further states that when they had reached the appointed place Abraham built an altar, laid the wood thereon in order, bound his son Isaac, and placed him on the altar upon the wood. He then stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son. But just then the angel of the Lord called to him and said, "Lay not thy hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto

him; for *now* I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me."

Does the statement "now I know that thou fearest God" seem strange to the reader's mind? Does the question, arise whether God did not previously know what was in Abraham's mind and heart? Here, dear reader, is the key to unlock this secret. God is infinite in knowledge as David declared in the hundred and thirty-ninth Psalm. Therefore God doubtless knew what was in Abraham's mind and heart. Yet God did not *acknowledge* that Abraham feared him until Abraham had shown his fear by going as far in obeying a terrible command as God's mercy would permit. In other words, the existence of internal or theoretical fear in Abraham God did not acknowledge. But when Abraham's fear became *practical*, and was manifested in obedience to the farthest extent that God would permit, then acknowledgment thereof was made. So, then, Abraham's fearing God was not determined at the point of *thinking* nor *feeling*, but at the point of OBEYING. He doubtless thought much and felt much. Yet if he had stopped with thinking and feeling there is no evidence that God would ever have acknowledged that Abraham feared him. This explains the great question of fearing God in all ages. Though the Sacred Text sometimes makes use of the word "fear" when reference is made to fear in a theoretical or internal sense, yet it is of no value before God unless it be manifested in actual obedience. "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. In view of what God said to Abraham on this subject it is evident beyond question that the language just cited from Solomon can mean nothing less than this: *Fear God and show it by obeying his commandments.*

In modern times there are many who say that Christians

should serve God through love and not through fear. But this is a mistake. Though Christians should not have the fear which begets torment, yet the command "Fear God" is as plain as any other in the New Testament. (1 Peter 2:17.) Besides, at the house of Cornelius the apostle Peter said, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Acts 10:34, 35. In addition to this let Heb. 12:28 be considered: "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear." Without presenting further evidence it may be safely stated that even under the gospel dispensation of religion mankind are required to fear God and serve him with fear. To this it may be safely added that fearing God is only acceptable in heaven's sight when it is manifested by obedience. As it was in Abraham's case so it is in regard to all others. Fearing God is determined at the point of doing the divine will, and not by thinking, feeling, nor intending. True, it is necessary to think and feel the profoundest and best. Right intentions are likewise necessary. But all these combined will not be sufficient unless OBEDIENCE be rendered as far as God requires by command or permits by restriction." That is to say, all those who would be sure that God acknowledges that they fear him must submit themselves unto all that is divinely enjoined upon them. Those who fear God acceptably will not discard repentance, confession, nor water baptism as requirements that are non-essential to salvation. Neither will they adopt every conceivable fallacy, subterfuge, or sophistry in order to avoid the conclusion that immersion in water is the only baptism that is required of an alien sinner in order to become a Christian. Those who fear God as they should will be afraid, to set themselves in opposition to

the plain reading of the Sacred Test on the subject of water baptism. On the contrary, they will honestly inquire what the precepts and examples found in the New Testament on the subject of water baptism really teach, and they will not fear nor dread to admit and obey what they find that teaching requires. All such will show themselves free from spiritual Hydrophobia.

EVIDENCE OF LOVING GOD.

That it is necessary for mankind to love God the Father in order to be saved from all sins, and finally enter into the rest which is prepared for the obedient, needs only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted. Even those who are unacquainted with the gospel in its special requirements understand that it is their duty to love God. Nothing is more generally taught by those who profess to be teachers of Christ than the duty and importance of loving God. Very few sermons are preached, except by unscientific speculators in the pulpit, without mention being made of the necessity of loving God. A majority of the hymns and spiritual songs which constitute modern hymnology bear in the same direction.

But what is the evidence of such love when it really exists? Nine of every ten, and probably a larger proportion, of religious people when inquired of with reference to this subject promptly answer that it is something that they "feel but cannot explain." Many of them promptly place one hand or both on the left side of their chest and declare, "I feel it in *here*." They know that fleshly love affects the fleshly heart, and this seems to be their only idea of love. They imagine that they really love God because they have certain emotions or feelings. The idea that love for God consists of such loyalty or allegiance to him as will cause them humbly to obey all that he requires seems never to occur to their minds. "But what saith the Scripture?" "For this is the love of God, that

we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." 1 John 5:3 is therefore not a mere emotion, neither is it determined by emotions, however joyous they may be; nor" even thoughts and intentions. In other words, thoughts, feelings, and intentions of the highest, purest, and best order and degree toward God may exist, but where there is disobedience to his commands the Most High will not acknowledge that love toward him really has an existence. "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous."

What shall then be said concerning those who discard the idea that repentance is necessary to salvation, holding the doctrine of universal and unconditional salvation? Do they love God? They may think they do, and may so affirm. But does the divine Father so acknowledge? What about those who claim to love God and yet regard confession of faith in Christ as unnecessary, and refuse to conform thereunto? Do they certainly love God so that acknowledgment thereof will be divinely made? To these questions there can be but one reply. "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." Those who refuse to repent and confess as the gospel requires certainly do not love God in the sense and degree that the gospel approves. They may have a theoretical love, but it is not the practical which the Father will acknowledge.

But this is not all.. What shall be said with reference to those who claim to love God, yet deny the importance of water baptism, and will resort to every subterfuge that they can adopt in order to explain away what the Sacred Text says with reference to that institution? How much love have they toward God, and what is its character? The only command found in the New Testament which requires that the name of the Godhead shall be pronounced

over those who render obedience therein they pronounce a non-essential. The only command by obedience to which believers are definitely said to "put on Christ," they discard as unnecessary. To escape the conclusion that immersion in water is essential to the alien sinner's salvation from sins they adopt methods of reasoning which violate common sense and common honesty, to say nothing of discarding reverence for God. If the sacred historian did not tell the truth when he said of John the Baptist, that the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him" (Luke 1:30), then the question arises, *When did he tell the truth?* If to refuse the water baptism that John preached was a rejection of "the counsel of God" when that baptism was in force, what is it but a rejection of "the counsel of God" for people now to refuse or disparage the water baptism which Christ enjoined in his last great commission and which is now in force? Reader, art thou numbered with those who have adopted the irreverent notion that the Lord Jesus Christ by all authority in heaven and in earth commanded a non-essential to be performed in the name of the Godhead? If so, thou art now forewarned against continuing, to hold such notion. Those engaged in teaching that notion are doubtless afflicted with Hydrophobia of a spiritual character, and that is doubtless a dangerous disease. They dread to admit immersion for the remission of sins because of its results, and not because it is not plainly taught. Preachers that have long practiced sprinkling and pouring rather than immersion, and who have always declared that "baptism is not a saving ordinance" have a ministerial pride, which very few of them are disposed to overcome. By reason of their pride they close their eyes and ears to every intimation that they are wrong on this subject. So they go onward, seemingly disposed to risk the disappro-

bation of the great Judge in the last great day rather than to humble themselves before their fellow men in confessing that they have long held and taught and practiced a falsehood. There is no right principle of Biblical interpretation, of logic, of common sense, nor of common honesty which has not been violated or ignored by those who have tried to break the force of the divine Reaching concerning water baptism. Hydrophobia—dread of water —fear of water—fear of admitting the value of water baptism is their ailment, and unless cured thereof it will prove their eternal ruin. Reader, be careful that they shall not involve you with themselves. "For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed." Isaiah 9:16. "Let them alone; they be blind leaders of the blind: And if the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the ditch." Matt. 15:14. These two declarations just quoted are among the severest in the Bible. The forewarning contained therein should cause all who read them to be filled with fear and trembling.

EVIDENCE OF LOVING CHRIST.

It may be justly supposed that the important subject of loving Christ is decided on the same principle which decides love for God. But the reader is not left to suppositions, however just they may be, for direct testimony may be produced. "He that hath my commandments, and, keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." If a man love " me he will keep my words. ... He that loveth" me not keepeth not my sayings." John 14:21, 23, 24. Such language from the lips of our adorable Redeemer, and from the pen of inspired John, ought to settle this question without controversy. Christ did not say, He that has my commandments and *thinks* that he keeps them, nor he that has my commandments and *feels* that he keeps them, nor did he say, If a man has my commandments

and *intends* to keep them, *or feels happy*, he it is that loves me. Good thoughts, good intentions, and happy feelings are all right in their place, but they will not serve in the place of keeping the divine commandments. In other words, there must be obedience to the divine commandments or Christ will not acknowledge any love that may be professed for him. This shows that love for Christ is a practical something which must show itself in the actualities of obedience before it will be divinely acknowledged. Therefore the question with each believer in Christ should not be, Do I *think* that I love him? nor, Do I *feel* that I love him? nor, Do I *intend* to love him? nor yet, Do I *feel happy*? But the all-important question is this: Does Christ *acknowledge* that I love him?

Let no one suppose that the writer means to say that any one can become a Christian without good thoughts, feelings, and intentions, nor that any one can really be a Christian without being happy. On the contrary the writer holds that the highest, purest, and best thoughts, feelings and intentions must attend becoming a Christian and living a Christian's life. Yet, according to the teaching of Christ on this subject it is evident that all good thoughts, feelings, and intentions will be empty and vain without *obedience to Christ's commands*. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. If a man love me, he will keep my words. . . . He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings. Such language should settle the question of evidence concerning love for Christ. It is determined by obedience and not by thoughts and feelings without obedience.

But is not water baptism a command of Christ? *Certainly*. Then must not obedience in water baptism be rendered in order to show love for Christ? *Undoubtedly*. Can persons fully show love for Christ who discard water baptism? *Nay, verily*. Are not those who declare that

water baptism is a non-essential making a tremendous mistake? *Most unquestionably.* Christ said, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them he it is that loveth me. . . . If a man love me he will keep my words. . . . He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings." John 14:21, 23, 24.

EVIDENCE OF KNOWING GOD.

But this subject is not yet exhausted. "And hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments: He that saith, I know him and keepeth not his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John 2:3, 4. By such inspired statements it is evident that to know God is to obey him, and to obey God is to know him. Knowing God is therefore determined by obedience to what he requires, and not by happy thoughts and feelings. Not that those who obey God are not possessed of happy thoughts and emotions. On the contrary they are the happiest people on earth. They have the best right to feel happy, because they can rejoice in the assurances of the divine promises. Yet their knowing God is not determined at the point of their happy thoughts and feelings, but at the point of their obedience. "And hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments." Could testimony be more definite? Could the fixtures of language more definitely set forth a truth on any subject? Yet the apostle John wrote these words: "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him."

Now let the reader consider this question: *Is not water baptism a command of God through Christ?* To this question there can be but one answer, and that is affirmative. All who have read the last commission that Christ gave to his apostles, or have read the book called Acts of Apostles must admit that water baptism is mentioned in the form of a command to be obeyed. Therefore it is one of

the divine commandments. Being one of the commandments it must be obeyed by mankind in order for God to acknowledge that they know him. "And hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments." The reader will notice that this text does not say, "If we keep" *some of* "his commandments." Yet many seem to entertain the idea that all will be well with them if they only keep a part, or the principal part, of the divine commandments. They talk about "essential commands" and "vital commands" as though the gospel gave non-essentials or dead commands. But David, as a pious Jew, knew better than that. He said, "Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect unto all thy commandments." Psa. 119:6. Such language shows that king David regarded it as necessary to obey *all* the divine commandments. If that was necessary for a Jew it is certainly necessary for a Christian, and in order to become a Christian. Christ said in course of his personal ministry, "Woe unto you, scribes, and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." Matt. 23:23. Does this look as if there were non-essentials in the Jewish law? *Certainly not*. Can any one justly suppose that God was more jealous concerning his commands in the Jewish law than he is for his commands in the gospel? Read the following: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. 22:18, 19, What are "the words of this

prophecy?" The following statement gives an illustration: "Blessed are they that do hie commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14.

In the light of such teaching with reference to both the law given through Moses and the gospel of Christ who can reasonably conclude that the Holy Spirit ever enjoined what was non-essential? *No one*. Yet there are many who shut the eyes of their understanding to all that is reasonable in order to have views of the gospel which will not reflect upon certain good people that are dead and others that are living. "But what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid! Tea, let God be true, but every man a liar." Rom. 3:3, 4. Such utterances from the apostle Paul clearly indicate that mankind have no business to make efforts to adjust the gospel to any proportion of their unfortunate race whether living or dead. Let God be true, even though every man be convicted of falsehood.

EVIDENCE OF LOVE FOR BRETHREN,

But sometimes a man says, "The scripture declares, 'We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren. Now I know that I have passed from death unto life because I love the brethren, or the children of God, and I have never been immersed.'"

In reply to the man who makes such a speech it may be correctly said, that what is called "love for the brethren" means nothing more to certain ones than love of party, or love of sect. Thus it is in politics, and among those who are members of secret societies. They love those of their own party in a special manner or degree, and they have a reason for so doing, But that is party love or sect love.

"But I am not a sectarian, and I love the children of God everywhere regardless of party or sect, and yet I have never been immersed," perhaps some one promptly declares.

In reply to this the inquiry may be made, By what evidence are people to decide that they love God's children? Multitudes promptly respond that they can decide by their feelings or emotion's. They feel good toward God's children and therefore they know that they love them. This seems to be the general idea. But is this correct? Let the Sacred Text testify. "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments." 1 John 5:2. The same writer then added, "For this is the love of God that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous."

Could anything be plainer than such teaching? Even the love which Christians are required to have for each other is determined by obedience to divine commands, and not by mere thinking, feeling, nor intending. Christians may think well, may feel well, and intend well toward their brethren, but unless they will do or act well toward them the Lord will not acknowledge that they love their brethren,, however strong their profession of love for them may be. To love God and keep his commandments is the divinely mentioned evidence that Christians love the children of God. Besides, the evidence of loving God consists of keeping the divine commandments. Therefore, even the love which Christians are required to have for each other is a practical something, which must show itself in obedience, Christians may think well, feel well, and intend or purpose well concerning their "brethren, yet if they do not act well toward them the Lord will not acknowledge that they love them.

With all before the mind which has just been submitted, it is evident that the man who says that he loves his brethren because he feels well toward them is making a serious mistake. Good and kind feelings are in place and may prompt or incite good actions, yet such feelings without good actions do not constitute what is divinely called

love for the children of God. Therefore when a man claims to have passed from darkness to light because he loves God's children, and thinks that love for them is determined by mere feeling he certainly don't understand the subject of which he is speaking. He may have a theoretical love, hut that is not the love which heaven will acknowledge as just and genuine.

OTHER QUESTIONS CONSIDERED.

The value of faith, repentance, confession *oi* faith, and prayer, are all determined in the divine sight by a practical bearing. "Nevertheless, among the chief rulers also many believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." John, 12:42, 43. Was the faith or belief of those Pharisees of any value before God? *Certainly not*. It was a mere theoretical something, and therefore was worthless. "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? 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? Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." James 2:20-22, 24, 26. Who can read such statements of scripture as those just quoted without being impressed that faith without obedience in both sinners and saints is in vain? Faith only or faith alone is a dead something, which bears no fruit, and thus is of no value in heaven's sight.

In regard to repentance John the Baptist taught the people to whom he preached, saying, "Bring forth therefore fruits meet [fit] for repentance." Matt. 3:8. This shows that repentance, in order to be acceptable to God,

must be accompanied or followed by a change of conduct that is in harmony therewith. A change of thought and feeling without a change of life is merely theoretical, and thus is unacceptable. The internal change must have a corresponding external change in order to be approved of heaven.

With reference to confession of faith the same is true. "And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? "They profess that they know God, but in works they deny him." Luke 6:46; Titus 1:16. Such language ought to be sufficient to convince candid people that even a profession of faith in Christ by calling him Lord, and professing to know God are of no avail without obedience. Moreover, it ought to be well understood by all intelligent people that in rendering obedience to Christ there must be no choice of commands. All that Christ requires must be obeyed, water baptism with the other commands that are enjoined.

On the subject of prayer the same principle prevails. "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." Matt. 7:21. So, then, even prayer must be brought to a practical bearing. At the point of obedience the value of any prayer is tested or determined. Israel's wisest monarch said, "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9. On this principle who can justly hope to pray acceptably while turning away from the gospel or any command connected therewith. "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." Could any thing be plainer? Now suppose that a man turns away his ears from hearing, or turns away his eyes from reading, concerning water baptism, Will the Lord accept

that man's prayer? The reader can decide. Though water baptism by itself is of no value—is worse than useless, yet in its own divinely appointed place it is for the remission of *sins* as certainly as that it is a divine command. But there are those who dread to make an admission to this effect. Indeed, there seems to be no admission that they dread so much to make as that immersion in water is for the remission of sins, or is necessary to salvation. Such people are afflicted with Hydrophobia of a spiritual character, and that is a dangerous disease. The remedy for that ailment consists of honest reading and searching of the Bible.

SUMMING UP.

The reader has been invited to consider the great questions of fearing God, loving God, loving Christ, knowing God, loving the children of God, believing or Laving faith, repentance, confession, and prayer. All these important subjects have been brought to a practical test or bearing. It has been shown that not one of them is decided by mere thinking, feeling, nor intending. In other words, not one of them is decided in heaven's sight by a theoretical or internal test. Until the thoughts, feelings, and intentions that may be entertained be ripened into obedience they are insufficient and ineffective.

AN "OBJECTION" CONSIDERED,

But some one may ask, "Will not God accept the will for the deed?" The answer is, that he has not so stated. Neither has he so intimated in regard to persons who know their duty or could know what they are required to do. So far as the Inspired Record informs us God never did take the will for the deed except in the case of Abraham, and in that instance God recalled the command that he had given. A man may cherish evil thoughts and emotions which will take him to perdition without committing overt acts of iniquity. But when it comes to the

great question of becoming and continuing a Christian it is evident that something more is needed than cherishing good thoughts and emotions. "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Matt. 5; 28. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." John 3:15. Thus the Sacred Text teaches on the side of sin, for it is an easy matter to go down hill. But when we come to the side of righteousness the teaching is different. Good thoughts and emotions may be cherished, but in order to be acceptable they must be accompanied or followed by good actions, such as the Lord requires. True, God does not require impossibilities, and so no one should endeavor to break the force of divine truth by appealing to the imagination. To suppose the case of a man on an island, or in a desert, where he could not be immersed, and then try to show thereby that immersion is not necessary under any circumstances—such, a supposition is a mere subterfuge.

THE GREATEST MISTAKE OF PROTESTANTS.

In the first half of the sixteenth century pious men began, to protest effectively against certain doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church. In course of time those men began to be called Protestants, and their religious position was called Protestantism. There were others who had protested against Rome, but not so effectively as those who began operating in the early half of the sixteenth century. Therefore the rise of Protestantism is generally dated in the first half of that century. These statements are made for the benefit of those who may not be acquainted with the history of that period, and to assist them in appreciating other statements yet to be submitted.

One of the capital errors of the Roman. Catholic Church against which the Protestant Reformers protested was the

claim of infallibility in regard to doctrine, Protestants rejected that claim or pretension of Rome, and with united voice declared that the Inspired Scriptures constituted infallibility in regard to doctrine. They admitted the possibility of mistakes being made in human inferences or decisions, but held that the Sacred Text is infallible or unerring. This was all right on the part of Protestants, but in all this they seemed to regard the Sacred Scriptures as only sufficient in regard to theory or doctrine. When the practical question, "How can I know that I am a Christian?" arose for decision the Reformers or their followers, it seems, with one consent appealed to their own inward feelings or emotions. Luther, Calvin, Zwingle, and the "bishops of Henry VIII. of England in the sixteenth century, likewise George Fox the father of Quakerism, and John "Wesley the father of Methodism at later dates all seemed to conclude that they needed to appeal to their own internal feelings or emotions to decide whether they were acceptable to God. This much, at least, is apparent from the results of their work. Calvinist, Arminian, and Quaker, all seem to regard their emotions as the criterion or standard by which to measure their acceptance with God. If they feel happy in religion then they consider themselves accepted; if they feel unhappy then they fear that they are rejected. The Calvinist decides by his feelings whether he has been effectually called by the election of divine grace. The Arminian decides by his feelings whether he has believed with a saving faith. The Quaker decides by his feelings whether the Holy Spirit *is* operating within him in a saving manner. Thus Protestants generally are united in measuring themselves by their internal feelings, and this may be called *INTERNALISM*.

EXPOSITION OF INTERNALISM.

From an early date in their history Roman Catholics

held that their church in its councils was infallible or unerring in regard to doctrine, and whatever else pertained to the maintenance of their faith. But not until the year 1870 was it declared by a council that the Pope was and is the infallibility of the Church. In other words, by a general council which then met it was decided that the Pope, by reason of his official position, is so guided by the Holy Spirit as to be infallible. Thus Rome's infallibility is, according to that decision, in-Tested in one man.

Protestants reject Rome's claim in that direction. They hold that, theoretically, the Bible is the only infallibility here on earth. Yet when they come to the practical question whether they are certainly children of God a great majority of them appeal to their own internal emotions with as much confidence, it seems, as Roman Catholics appeal to the Pope. Thus all those Protestants who make such appeal to their feelings seem to think that they carry in their bosoms a little infallibility of their own. By reason of this notion many of them under-estimate the written word of God as found recorded in the Scriptures, and even discard that word wherever it conflicts with their feelings. Some of that number have even been, heard to declare, "I don't care what the Bible says—I *know* how I *feel*." They are willing to take the Bible where it does not conflict with their feelings, but are disposed to reject any part thereof which does conflict with their feelings. Their internal feelings or emotions are therefore regarded by such as the standard by which they can measure their own religious condition, and the value of any portion of God's word. This is INTERNALISM, and it is the most mischievous ISM now found in the Protestant world. By reason thereof the Sacred Text remains un-reverenced, unstudied, unread by multitudes. They have learned by experiment that by a certain course of

conduct, or line of thinking, or kind of praying they can secure happy feelings or joyous emotions. Having been taught that such feelings or emotions are unerring or infallible evidence of their acceptance with God the multitudes who believe such teaching are disposed to regard with discount every utterance of the Sacred Text which conflicts therewith. On this account millions speak of water baptism as a non-essential. Immersion as the only baptism, and especially immersion for the remission of sins, is regarded by them as bigotry because it conflicts with their feelings. To admit immersion in its divinely appointed place, and at its divinely appointed value is to them a dreadful something. This dread shows that they have Hydrophobia of a spiritual kind. Yes, and it will cling to them while they continue to entertain the idea that their feelings are an infallible criterion or standard by which to measure. Israel's wisest monarch said, "He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool." Prov. 28:26. A certain prophet wrote, "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it?" Jer. 17:9. An apostle declared that certain characters in "measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves are not wise." 2 Cor. 10:12. Do such utterances of the Holy Volume indicate that mankind have anything in them which may be justly regarded as a guide in religion? Can a being who has the stamp of imperfection on him in every particular be unerring or infallible in any particular?

CONSCIENCE A GUIDE.

Nothing is more common among religious people of denominations not mentioned in the Bible than the idea that conscience is a guide, even an unerring guide in religion. Multitudes speak of "worshipping God according, to the dictates of conscience." This is a mistake. Conscience is not a guide, but is to the convictions what
a

ratchet is in machinery. Its office is to hold mankind to their convictions, whether those convictions be right or wrong. Thus there are as many different consciences in religious people as there are convictions. In other words, each individual has a conscience according to convictions, and the conscience of each one approves when the conduct of that one is according to convictions and disapproves when that one's conduct is contrary to convictions. Thus the Jew has a conscience according to his convictions, and the same is true of the Pagan, the Mahometan, the Roman Catholic, and the Protestant. Then the different classes or sects of Protestants have consciences according to the convictions produced by their man-made creeds, or their ideas of the word of God. Finally, the Christian has a conscience according to the gospel of Christ, as that is accepted by him as the rule of his faith and practice, and thus the gospel determines the Christian's conscience. Moreover, as a ratchet in machinery holds the machinery to what its motion has gained, so all these different classes of religious people are held by their consciences to what their convictions may be or may have gained. True, a ratchet may be bent or broken, and a man's conscience may be overpowered. In other words, a man may, at the point of his will, crowd his conscience into subjection until it is ruined. Convictions, whether right or wrong, determine the conscience, and thus whenever a man acts contrary to his convictions he acts contrary to his conscience. Thus conscience may be trained in any direction and violated at any time.

If a man thinks that he is doing right his conscience will approve, and he will feel comfortable, perhaps happy, even if he be doing what is altogether wrong. Thus Saul of Tarsus felt comfortable, and probably happy, while he was persecuting the Church of Christ. In Acts twenty-third chapter he spoke as Paul the apostle and said, "I have

lived in all good conscience before God until this day." If such a man as Saul of Tarsus could live in "good conscience" while acting the part of a blasphemer and persecutor (1 Tim, 1:13), how unreasonable it is for intelligent people now to claim that conscience is a dictator or guide. Saul's conscience blindly followed or accompanied his convictions, so that while his convictions were against Christ his conscience approved his persecution of Christians. On the same principle conscience universally operates in mankind.

CONSCIENCE AND HYDROPHOBIA.

The wrong notion concerning conscience that has just been exposed is closely connected with spiritual Hydrophobia. Multitudes have been so taught in religion that they dread immersion, especially immersion for the remission of sins, and those multitudes are consoling themselves in their position because they have the approbation of their consciences. "If I were wrong I could not feel happy." Such is the expression of many when told that their position in not accepting immersion at its divinely appointed value is erroneous. The fact that they feel comfortable is regarded by them as positive evidence that they are right. But this *is* a mistake which all should understand. The Pagan's conscience approves his denial of the only true and living God, the Jew's conscience approves his rejection of Christ as God's Son, the Mahometan's conscience approves his rejection of the Christian's Bible, the Roman Catholic's conscience approves his rejection of Christ's claim to be the only head of the Church. But in all those cases it is evident to Protestants that conscience approves what is wrong. Then why depend on the approbation of conscience when immersion for remission of sins is rejected?

TWELFTH CHAPTER.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS.

This volume would be incomplete without a chapter on *Holiness*, since *Holiness* is divinely declared to be necessary in order to see the Lord. It is very important to be saved from spiritual Hydrophobia, as preceding chapters of this volume have set forth. But if those who have been saved from that ailment do not lead a holy life they will be eternally lost as certainly as that the Bible is true. For this reason a chapter on *Holiness* is now submitted for the reader's benefit, though a discussion of this subject may prove unpopular. Probably none except those possessed of humble spirits will read it from beginning to end.

HOLINESS SCRIPTURALLY DEFINED.

The Greek word translated "holiness" in the New Testament, means "sanctification, moral purity, sanctity." It comes from another Greek word which means "to separate, consecrate, cleanse, purify, sanctify, regard or reverence as holy." Closely connected therewith is the Greek word translated "holy" and which means "separate from common condition or use, hallowed, pure, righteous." According to such definitions it is evident that the word "holiness" in the New Testament means separation from all that is evil, and thus means moral purity. It also means consecration or devotion to that which is pure and

right, and thus it means deep piety. It is said of Christ that he is "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners" (Heb. 7:26), also that he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered he threatened not, but committed himself unto him that judgeth righteously." 1 Peter 2:22, 23. Such is the character which our great Exemplar, the Lord Jesus Christ, manifested while he was on earth, which character all Christians are required to imitate. Holiness therefore requires personal separation from all that is impure and wrong, personal devotion to all that is pure and right, and it thus requires personal imitation of the life of Christ on earth, for in him who found the perfection of purity and righteousness.

HOLINESS POSITIVELY REQUIRED.

"Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. 12:14. If this were the only sentence in the Bible enjoining holiness it should be sufficient to cause all to be holy who wish to make sure work for eternity. Holiness is here enjoined, and then it is said that without holiness "no man shall see the Lord." This shows beyond all question or controversy that holiness is necessary to final salvation.

Besides what has just been presented the reader will find in Rom. 12:1, that Christians are required to present their bodies as living sacrifices "holy, acceptable unto God;" and in Eph. 5:25-27 Christ is spoken of as having given himself for the Church that it "should be holy, and without blemish;" and in Col. 1:22 Christ is mentioned as intending to present the Church "holy, and unblamable, and unreprouvable in his sight;" and in 1 Peter 1:15 it is said to Christians, "But as he who hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation." But this chapter would be largely filled with quotations should all that bear on this subject be given, and this one

more must suffice for the present. "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." 2 Cor. 7:1. With all these declarations of the Sacred Text before the mind there can be no question concerning the importance of holiness nor that it requires personal deliverance from everything that is impure and wrong, and personal devotion to everything that is pure and right. The last scripture quoted speaks of "cleansing ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit," and of "perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

TWO EXTREME POSITIONS.

Because the word "holiness" in the New Testament means sanctification, and because the word sanctification means separation, there are many who regard themselves as holy when they are separated from positive immorality and positive violations of the doctrinal teachings of the gospel. On the other hand, because the word "holiness" means fervent piety there are others who seem to think that they can be holy without regard to certain features of the doctrine which are found in the gospel. Those constituting the former class are disposed to ignore fervent piety, while those who make up the latter class are disposed to ignore strict obedience to the gospel. These extremes are both wrong. Those holding the one extreme are in the ditch on one side of the narrow way, while those holding the other extreme are in the ditch on the other side of that way. Unless both classes leave the ditches and come upon the narrow way as divinely delineated and which in prophetic language is called "the way of holiness" (Isaiah 35:8) it is questionable whether either class will be saved. Those who have obeyed the gospel as set forth in the New Testament, but ignore personal piety if not personal purity are certainly not "per-

fecting holiness in the fear of God." Those who are trying to be exceedingly pure and pious in personal life, but have ignored the importance of being buried with Christ in baptism, and continue to ignore the holy communion, which commemorates the Savior's sufferings, are certainly not doing what holiness requires.

THE RIGHT METHOD OF PROCEDURE.

Nothing becomes more evident to those who read the Bible with care than that doctrinal sins are just as condemnable in Heaven's sight as are sins of the flesh. Cain's offering was rejected because of a doctrinal sin. (Gen. 4:3-7.) Nadab and Abihu lost their lives because of a doctrinal sin. (Lev. 10:1,2.) Moses and Aaron were not permitted to enter the land of Canaan because they sinned doctrinally. (Num.20:10-12.) Uzzah was struck dead because of a sin that was simply of a doctrinal character. (1 Chron. 13:10; 15:12-14.) When attention is turned to the New Testament the same principle is found. In Galatians 5:1-4 the reader may learn that one doctrinal sin was sufficient to cause Christians to be numbered with those who had "fallen from grace," and unto whom Christ had become "of none effect."

With such facts before the mind as those just submitted for consideration it is certainly evident beyond all question that whoever ignores baptism and the Lord's supper cannot be holy as the New Testament requires. There may be personal purity and personal piety, but that will not compensate or make up for a failure to observe these other requirements. Israel's wisest monarch said, "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9. In addition to this the evangelist Luke said concerning John the Baptist, "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him," Luke 7:30. Such statements certainly indicate that

prayer cannot be substituted for obedience, but obedience must be rendered whenever it is divinely required. For this reason those "Holiness People," as they are sometimes called, would do well to pause and reflect. After all their personal purity and piety the Great Judge may not say unto each of them in the last great day, "Well done good and faithful servant." It needs only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted among mankind that faithfulness in a servant consists in prompt and correct obedience to the commands given, and not in trying to substitute something else for obeying what is commanded.

The right method of procedure in regard to holiness is the one that will make sure work for eternity. That method requires that each candidate for heaven shall begin by a whole-hearted faith in Christ as the Son of God. The next step is a whole-hearted repentance. Following this is required a whole-hearted confession of faith in Christ. Then is required a whole-hearted baptism of the whole person so that the language of scripture is fulfilled which says, "buried with him in baptism." Col. 2:12. When such obedience has been rendered then comes this assurance: "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life." Rom. 6:22. Certainly this is the right beginning, and those who have thus begun have "come out from among" the disobedient. In so doing they have become the "sons and daughters" of "the Lord Almighty." 2 Cor. 6:18. Just at this juncture is found the following exhortation: "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." 2 Cor. 7:1. This exhortation requires personal purity and personal piety, an unworldly life, and daily communion with God and Christ

in prayer and thanksgiving. "Pray without ceasing," and "in everything give thanks; for this is the will of God concerning you." 1 These. 5:17, 18. Then comes this prayer from the apostle Paul: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 These. 5:23. Finally for the present let attention be given to Eph. 6:18, which says, "Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints," Can any one read such language and avoid the conviction that personal purity and personal piety are required of all who have become Christians?

THE TOBACCO HABIT.

The use of tobacco is universally acknowledged to be a "filthy practice." Those who make use thereof are as ready to make this acknowledgment as any others. Seldom is one found who denies that using tobacco is a "filthy practice," and it is even more seldom that one is found who can use tobacco even a few years without showing its filthiness to others. A sly and covert use of tobacco soon ripens into a bold and disgusting use thereof. Well, Paul says to those who are Christians, "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." In order to perfect holiness in the fear of God it is therefore evident that "all filthiness of the flesh," which embraces tobacco, must be discarded. Indeed, when alien sinners are buried with Christ in baptism they are raised to "walk in newness of life." Rom. 6:4. This should imply, to each one such personal purity as will discard the use of tobacco as a habit. "Therefore, if any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature; old things are passed away;

"behold all things are become new." 2 Cor. 5:17. Certainly the old practice of using tobacco should pass away when one becomes a new creature.

But besides the filthiness of using tobacco the expense thereof should trouble the conscience of every Christian. As stewards all Christians are responsible for every dollar, every dime, and even every cent that is entrusted to their care. Many persons who have obeyed the gospel seem to think that all the money they have and all they can honestly obtain belongs to themselves. But let them consider the following: "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in ye, 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." 1 Cor. 6:19, 20. According to such language Christians do not even belong to themselves, but they are owned by the Lord Jesus Christ who bought them with the precious price of his own blood. How then can they justly claim to own the money that is entrusted into their hands or is placed within their honest reach? The truth is, though it may be said to belong to them, yet they are responsible for the use they make thereof. Many there are who spend more for tobacco than they give to the Lord's cause. But whether they spend more or less for tobacco than they give to support the gospel, yet all that is spent to gratify their depraved or vitiated taste in that direction is certainly misspent, and they will no doubt be held accountable therefor in the last day. Many good men use tobacco, but they would be better men if they were free from the use thereof. Many who enjoy reasonably good health use tobacco, but they would doubtless have better health if they would discard it. The time has come when medicinal aid can be secured in discarding tobacco. There are several good cures for the habit, and by a few weeks of care in

taking those cures the deliverance from bondage to the habit is accomplished. Then let all, especially all Christians who may read these remarks, and who feel the need of such help, make a selection from among the tobacco cures now offered to the public, use the remedy selected according to directions and soon the victory will be won. Then the exhortation will no longer be objectionable which says, "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the Spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

THE USE OF BAD LANGUAGE.

Under this heading both vulgarity and profanity may be classed. They are condemned in the gospel as "corrupt communication," It may to certain minds seem unnecessary to forewarn Christians against the use of such language. But the apostle Paul thought differently. "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers." Eph. 4:29, What the apostle means by such an injunction is evident by the following language: "Neither filthiness nor foolish talking, nor jesting which are not convenient [not becoming]; but rather giving of thanks." Eph. 5:4. Such and such like are the scripture teachings on this subject. But they are overlooked by multitudes who profess to be Christians because they have joined a church, and perhaps a church that is not mentioned in the Bible. But an unfortunate number even of those who have been buried with Christ in baptism and stand identified with the Church of Christ are unmindful of what the gospel says concerning bad language. Not that they are either vulgar or profane in direct and positive speech, but in relating incidents they sometimes permit themselves to use such speech indirectly. Persons who are entirely free from

such language in their ordinary and direct speech are at times guilty of swearing and using vulgarity in relating another's language. This is being profane and vulgar over another's signature. The only time that the writer of this volume ever heard a white woman use profane language was when he heard the wife of a Federal Colonel in the late civil war repeat the horrible profanity of General Sheridan when trying to rally his retreating troops at Cedar Creek, Virginia. That was shocking, and the recollection thereof continues vivid. Little did that woman, who was a member of the Church of Christ, suppose what kind of an impression she made on at least one of her hearers by the profanity which she repeated. What was true of that woman is true of an unfortunate number of others who claim to be Christians. Both men and women sometimes permit themselves in relating incidents to repeat both profanity and vulgarity. In so doing they permit "corrupt communication" or "filthiness" to proceed from their lips, which is in direct violation of that which the Holy Spirit enjoins. How much more becoming it would be in relating an incident which partly consists of profane or obscene language to drop out such part with the remark, "omitting some language that I don't wish to repeat," and then go on with the incident. Any incident that depends for its value on profane or vulgar speech should not be related by any one, and it is seldom important to relate a story that is even incidentally profane or obscene. "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth" should be inscribed on every mind and fixed in every heart, especially of such as claim to be Christians.

THE USE OF TRIFLING LANGUAGE.

"Foolish talking and jesting," or joking, are likewise proscribed or ruled out as among things unbecoming for those who are in the Sacred Text called "God's dear children." Not that all pleasantries and cheerful conver-

sation is opposed to holiness, for God has made man what Is sometimes called "a laughing animal." Besides, the physical and mental health, even of Christians, requires that they shall incidentally permit themselves to look on and enjoy the pleasant features of life which are in harmony with the gospel. But all joking and efforts at wit for the sake of fun, or in any wise engaging in making fun—all such conduct is unbecoming in those who would perfect holiness in the fear of God. The world of mankind has long since gone astray by seeking fun, frolic, and nonsense. The churches have generally gone in the same direction, except the Church of Christ, and a few minor denominations not mentioned in the Bible.

WORLDLINESS IN CHURCHES.

The arch-enemy of holiness never, perhaps, suggested a more damaging thought to churches than the idea that they should furnish amusement for their members. By that one idea the last line of debarkation in outward life between the Church and the world has been blotted out or obliterated. Worldly minded church members and respectable people of the world have united in amusements furnished by churches. In consequence thereof such churches have been brought to the level of the world's respectable behavior, so that worldlings are made to feel comfortable in their worldliness, In some instances church members have done what respectable worldlings discard, As a result the name of Christ is reproached, and the power of Christ's religion is destroyed. Instead of trying to live as godly as possible while compelled to remain in this world it seems that multitudes are disposed to live as worldly as possible while remaining connected with a church. Worldly practices which were formerly regarded by a majority of Protestants as sinful have been adopted as harmless. Meeting houses have been turned into religious theaters with operatic music which is partly

if not entirely made by the ungodly. Pulpits have been changed to lecture platforms where religious dudes often play pranks and cut capers. From much of the so-called preaching that is done Christ is so generally absent that the pious mind is sometimes disposed to exclaim with weeping Mary Magdalene at the Savior's sepulcher when she said, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know-not where they have laid him." John 20:13.

Church members now dance, play cards, play pool, throw dice, play any kind of game they may wish, attend theaters, horse races, or any other place of amusement. Charity balls are given and preachers sometimes lead in the dance, Church fairs are held in which gambling schemes are operated. Festivals in behalf of churches are so common that they cease to be interesting even to many for whom they are specially intended. Nearly all kinds of schemes are devised to draw money from the pockets of worldlings to help the Lord out of his supposed financial troubles.

WHAT SCRIPTURE SAYS.

With such facts as those just stated before the mind let attention be given to the following inspired description of Christians: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." 1 Peter 2:9. Does such language indicate that the Lord intended that the Church and the world should so closely resemble each other that one could scarcely be distinguished from the other? No, but the very opposite is indicated. The divine intention was that the Church should be so unlike the world that a point of resemblance could scarcely be recognized. This, indeed, is the meaning of being buried with Christ in baptism and being raised to walk in newness of life. But where is the newness of life found, and

where is the new creature found in those church members who play cards, attend theaters, dance, go to horse races, and such like worldly arrangements? Do they seem to be of the chosen generation, royal priesthood, holy nation, and peculiar people of whom the apostle Peter wrote? Do they show forth the praises of him who hath called them out of darkness into *his* marvelous light? Do they conduct themselves as if they had really left the domain of spiritual darkness and entered the marvelous light of the glorious gospel of the Son of God? Oh reader, be careful! Dancers, card-players, theater-goers, horse-race-attenders are not trying to cultivate holiness, to say nothing of "perfecting holiness in the fear of God." Yet the Sacred Text plainly declares that "holiness" is something "without which no man shall see the Lord." Worldly minded church members are simply playing at religion. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." James 1:27. But such church members generally care but little about the widows and fatherless in their affliction, and far less about keeping themselves unspotted from the world. In truth, an unworldly life is to them very objectionable, and they seem to have only sufficient religion to make the way to perdition comfortable.

ANOTHER QUESTION CONSIDERED.

Before leaving this feature of this important theme another quotation from the Sacred Text should be made. The apostle Paul wrote the saints at Ephesus thus: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in

love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ which [in its perfection] passes knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. 3:14-19.

This prayer of Paul indicates the divine desire with reference to Christians. The apostle prayed for that which it was the divine will should be accomplished in the Church of Christ at Ephesus, and that for which he prayed indicates what is now the divine will concerning the Church of Christ everywhere. Therefore this question arises: CAN THAT CHURCH JUSTLY CLAIM TO BE OF CHRIST WHICH DISREGARDS THE BURDEN OF PAUL'S PRAYER, AND CAN THOSE PERSONS JUSTLY CLAIM TO BE CHRISTIANS WHOSE LIVES DO NOT CORRESPOND TO THAT PRAYER? Here is thought for reflection. Those who would make sure work for eternity should cease trifling. But some one may ask, "What is meant by Christ dwelling in the heart by faith?" The correct answer to this question can best be given through the following illustration: When a reward is offered for the arrest of any man ordinary people read the offer and the description given of the man whose arrest is desired, and lay aside the paper in which it is contained. But it is far different with the detective. He reads the account once, twice, thrice, perhaps a dozen times, and studies the description of the man to be arrested until the appearance or image of that man is deeply and vividly impressed on his mind. Then he goes forth in search of the one to be arrested, and as he moves among mankind he sees many men, yet in the midst of all companies and even multitudes he holds in mind the image of him whose arrest he intends to accomplish. Throughout the period that the detective thus holds the man whom he would arrest that man dwells in his mind by faith. On the same principle it is doubtless the divine intention that Christ shall dwell

in the Christian's heart or affections by faith. By reading and studying the gospel, especially the four records given of Christ's earth-life, it is possible to have the beautiful and perfect personage of Christ as "the Son of Man," and as "the "Son of God," as "the Lamb of God." and as "the Lion of the Tribe of Judah" so impressed on the thought and affections that he will dwell in the heart by faith. Then Christ will be to each one in whom he thus dwells the close and intimate Friend, the dear and daily Companion, the wise and loving Brother, the kind and mighty Helper. Then life in the midst of all its trials will be rich and blessed. Then cares and afflictions, toils and distresses will be divested of their severest features. No night will then be entirely dark, no cloud will then be without a ray of light. No day nor even hour of anguish will then need to be without a joyous thought. For Christ to dwell in our hearts by faith prepares us to "be "rooted and grounded in love," and to "comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ [in its man-ward bearings] which [in its perfection] passes knowledge," and prepares us to be "filled with all the fulness of God," When Christ dwells in our hearts by faith then it will be easy to obey the exhortation which says, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things 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.

The secret of a pure life is found in pure purposes, and the secret of pure purposes is found in cherishing pure thoughts and emotions. When Christ dwells in the heart by faith then pure thoughts and emotions, pure purposes and resolutions, pure words and actions are the result. When all these dwell within us and attend us we can

"cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." Then we shall understand what is meant by the saying, "If any man be in Christ Jesus he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." 2 Cor. 5:17. "We shall then appreciate what is meant, by this language likewise: "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? 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." Rom. 6:2-4. How many, O how many there are who *try* to live the new life without being buried with Christ by baptism into death, and raised to walk in newness of life! They ignore the divinely recorded line of demarcation between their old life in sin and their new life in Christ. How great this mistake is no human language can describe. But there are likewise many who once ceased the practice of sin and in that sense died to sin; then they were buried with Christ "by baptism into death." and raised to "walk in newness of life." But soon they forgot nearly all they ever learned about "newness of life." Their conduct shows that perhaps nothing is more widely separated from their thoughts than the purpose of "perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

EFFECT OF HOLINESS ON BUSINESS LIFE.

Immersion of a believing, confessing, penitent one looks backward to the old life and forward to the new life. Therefore it should be permitted to have its effect on the business life of every one who has been immersed. Business promises should all be made with caution and kept with care. Even when this is done there will be times and occasions when difficulties will arise by reason of the unreliability of those with whom Christians are sometimes

required to deal. Many who will read these lines know something of the annoyance, and even anguish of spirit, caused by carelessness on the part of those on whom they had reason to depend. In view of this all business promises should be made with caution. Having been made they should be kept, whenever it is possible. When it becomes evident that they cannot be kept then due explanation should in due time be made. A timely explanation often relieves the mind of those with whom a business transaction is on hand, and avoids confusion. Pure and strict honesty will give the courage to meet a man in due time and explain the circumstances so as to prevent him from being seriously disadvantaged. A timely explanation may give him opportunity to look elsewhere for relief. The expression "not slothful in business" (Rom. 12:11), is full of meaning. Christians, above all others, should be careful to meet their financial obligations.

Those Christians who occupy the position of servants or are employed to work for others in any department should serve those who employ them "not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart, with good will doing service, as to the Lord and not to men." Eph. 6:6, 7. Such teaching as this just submitted clearly shows that holiness in the life of a servant or any employee will cause a separation from all deceit, shirking, and treachery. The gospel of Christ when fully accepted will make a servant man or servant girl a reliable servant. Besides, even the life of a servant may be made happy by the thought of "doing service as to the Lord and not to men." Whoever works-with such diligence as will please the Lord will generally, if not always, please those for whom the work is done. Employers delight to have honest, industrious and careful employees. Let a Christian who occupies the position of a servant do service as to the Lord, and not with eye-ser-

vice as a man-pleaser, and be quiet in regard to speech so as not to annoy the employer by talking, and the results will generally, if not always, be favorable. Employers, as a rule, like to have quiet people to work for them. Holiness tends to make people quiet because it gives them something to think about that is satisfactory.

EFFECT OF HOLINESS ON SOCIAL LIFE.

In proportion as people are personally holy they will beautify and adorn social life. One godly man or woman in a company will check folly and extravagance in speech, and will cause frivolous conduct to be discarded. This can be done without rebuking that will cause every one to feel uncomfortable who may be in the company, but by turning the conversation in the direction of the Bible or something connected therewith. Evil speaking of all kinds is beneath the dignity of those who are living a life of holiness. Besides, those who are holy are above all manner of hypocrisy. Hence holy men and women can not adopt all the suggestions of books on decorum. Some of those suggestions are in the direction of hypocrisy. Books on decorum recommend that course of conduct and character of speech which will be pleasing to others, regardless of whether it be strictly honest and truthful. But all this is condemned by the doctrine and practice of holiness. Holy people are always opposed to every thing that is evil or has the appearance of evil.

HOW HOLINESS AFFECTS TREATMENT OF THE POOR.

Nothing is more evident to those who read the Bible with care than that God considers the poor. The Jewish law is detailed and explicit on this subject, and it is certainly not ignored by the gospel. Between the giving of the law and the beginning of the gospel David wrote thus: "Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in the time of trouble: The Lord will preserve him and keep him alive; and he shall be blessed

upon the earth; and thou wilt not deliver him unto the will of his enemies: The Lord will strengthen him upon, the bed of languishing; thou wilt make all his bed in hie sickness." Psa. 41:1—3. Such language as the foregoing clearly shows that in David's day God considered the poor, and considered those who favored the poor. In the New Testament it is recorded that when Paul and Barnabus met Peter, James, *and* John at Jerusalem a request was made in behalf of the poor, which was fulfilled. "Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do." Gal., 2:10. In addition to this the apostle James wrote thus: "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons: For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment: And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place, and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool: Are ye not then partial in yourselves and judges, of evil thoughts? Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him? But ye have despised the poor." James 2:1-6. Finally it should be mentioned that in Matthew twenty-fifth chapter the Savior declared that every thing done in visiting, feeding, clothing, and relieving his poor he would regard as done unto himself. On the other hand, he declared that all neglect of his poor when they needed help he would regard as neglect of himself. When such teachings are considered there can be but one conclusion, namely, *It is the divine will that the poor should be helped and it is dangerous not to help them.* If Christ were sick, or in prison, or needing clothing, would not his followers visit him, and supply his needs?

There is no doubt on this subject. Yet very few of his followers ever think that in visiting the poor of his people and supplying their needs that they will be rewarded as if they had shown such favors to Christ himself. But this is because they do not consider the subject as set forth in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew's gospel record. Any one may learn therein that whatever is done to Christ's disciples, whether good or bad, will be finally regarded as having been done to Christ himself. How very careful, then, all should be to treat the humble followers of the Lord Jesus in the best possible manner. Especially should those who are Christians, and have abundance of the things of this world, be careful to distribute among God's poor.

In many instances no one within reach is as poor as the preacher of Christ who gives much, if not all, of his time to proclaiming; the gospel. "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should live of the gospel." 1 Cor. 9:14. If all Christians who have more of this world than they really need were as holy as they should be, then those preachers who depend on the free-will offerings of the Church would not be oppressed and afflicted for want of support. The expression "live of the gospel" would not then be changed to "starve of the gospel." But remembering that all the good done to God's poor will be richly rewarded in the last great day they would be liberal to the poor preacher. On the same principle they would treat all poor people of all classes. They would do good to all, but especially to those who are of the household of faith. (Galatians 6:10.)

What a change holiness would make among professed Christians and in the world! How the Church would then rise and shine in beauty, strength, and power! How the seeming need for beneficial societies of human origin

would then cease to be felt! How cheerfully the preacher of Christ would labor, and how joyous those who would support him would feel! "What happiness would then reign in the earth!

EFFECT OF HOLINESS ON DOMESTIC LIFE,

The family is a divine arrangement. It was instituted in the Garden of Eden when God formed Eve and gave her to Adam to be his wife. Adam was made the head of the family and Eve was made his helpmeet. The relationship between them was divinely ordained. Each was so constituted as to admire and love the other. In purity and holiness God intended that they should live throughout their earthy pilgrimage.

The first command given them was, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." Gen. 1:28. Though man and woman were so constituted in the beginning that they would love each other, yet by having children born to them as the fruit of their love it was the divine intention that they should become more deeply devoted to each other in their love. Besides, it was the divine intention that in so doing they should increase sufficiently to subdue the earth. Had this divine arrangement never been ignored, nor in any wise discarded, mankind would have been, far happier in all ages. For a true man to receive from his wife an infant that is the image of himself or of herself is an unutterable joy, and for a true woman to receive from her husband an infant that is the image of herself or of himself is doubtless another joy that is unutterable. Moreover, it seems from the Sacred Record, that the longing for children was, for many centuries, mutual on the part of husbands and wives. Especially did women regard it as a reproach when they were incapable of bearing children. "Give me children or else I die," was the appeal of Rachel to her husband. Gen. 30:1. Then in 1 Samuel 1:11 the fol-

lowing is said concerning an excellent woman named Hannah, who was the wife of a God-fearing man: "And she vowed a vow, and said, O Lord of hosts, if thou wilt indeed look on the affliction of thine handmaid, and remember me, and not forget thine handmaid, but wilt give unto thine handmaid a man-child, then I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life, and there shall no razor come upon his head." In other words, that godly woman prayed for a son and promised him to the Lord. Then follows one of the most beautiful and touching stories ever placed on record. Hannah was granted her request and she fulfilled her vow. Afterwards she bore unto her husband three sons and two daughters, and was doubtless one of the happiest women on earth. Thus it was with God-fearing women for many centuries after the family was first arranged. Yes, and the same is yet true. God-fearing women—holy women—are afraid to reject the first commandment and tamper with laws that are divinely arranged. Holiness in men and women will cause them to observe God's holy arrangements. Those who are not holy, but regard themselves at liberty to discard God's laws which were intended to control the family relationship suffer the dreadful consequences thereof in this life and will suffer the divinely ordained penalty throughout eternity. Millions of husbands and wives are mutually unhappy, and perhaps are filled with mutual dislike if not hatred, because they have positively decided not to obey the first of God's commandments. They once loved each other and wonder why that love has so subsided or been so changed as to cause them to live a kind of "cat-and-dog life." The explanation is found in their own wickedness: Many of them claim to be Christians, and some of that number perhaps think that they are holy people. Many people marry because it is fashionable and not because they are impelled thereunto by natural fitness for

that relationship. It is no marvel if such regard children as a nuisance. But there are multitudes who are naturally fit for the marriage relationship, but by reason of pride reject the first commandment. In order to have the privilege of floating around in society at all times they suppress their natural love for children to the utmost, and what they cannot suppress they pervert by bestowing it upon cats and dogs. This iniquity is found especially in the higher circles of society. In those circles many husbands and wives consent to have one or two children to inherit their wealth and then decide against nature and against God's first explicit command. The suffering on the part of women in obeying that command is sometimes very great, but as it is divinely imposed it should in humility be borne. Those who do what God has required and bear what God has imposed will be permitted to enjoy what God has promised.

HOLINESS IN MINISTERS.

All Christians are required to perfect holiness in the fear of God. It may not be too much to say that professed Christians are what they claim to be only in proportion as they are holy. But while all this is true, yet there are certain members of the Church who should set an example in regard to holiness. Prominent among these are overseers, deacons and preachers. If all who constitute these classes of ministers or servants of the Church would live unworldly lives how glorious would be the results. Holiness in them would not exclude cheerfulness, but would only tend to make them more cheerful in the midst of trying circumstances. It excludes all unbecoming speech and conduct. "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers." Eph. 4:29. Here is an apostolic injunction which holiness requires to be observed. Those ser-

vants of the Church who may be called ministers, should be exemplars in observing the command just quoted. Neither profane nor vulgar speech should ever escape their lips even in relating an incident. Nor should incidents be related for the sake of fun. If to illustrate a principle an occasional chaste incident be related that causes a smile or even a laugh there is no law either human or divine that is violated. But to relate incident after incident simply for the sake of fun is certainly unbecoming. On this subject Paul wrote thus: "Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient [not becoming], but rather giving of thanks." Eph. 5:4. Overseers of the Church should avoid this to the utmost. Deacons of the Church should do the same. Preachers are closely watched by the people generally, and thus should be very careful to avoid everything resembling levity. In order so to do it is necessary to be constantly careful in regard to relating incidents even to illustrate a principle that may be under consideration. There is constant danger of going to an extreme, and of gaining the reputation of "telling jokes," Such a reputation will destroy a preacher's influence for good almost as soon and seriously as to obtain the reputation of being a "ladies' man." For that reason constant care is needed in conversation in order to avoid being regarded as "funny" or "jokey."

"But extravagance in speech is, if possible, more condemnable than funniness. To overstate and understate for the sake of making an impression is by many people called LYING, No doubt it is a kind of lying, and may be so regarded by Him whose *eyes* behold and whose eyelids try the children of men. That extravagant speech is not in harmony with the gospel must be admitted by all who pause to reflect. The writer once heard an old Quaker say that there were a hundred men at the post-office

where he had been that day. Then after a moment's pause he said, "I can say there were fifty there and tell no lie about it." That speech showed that its author was scrupulous in regard to truth. He sat in judgment on himself, and did not propose to permit any extravagant speech to remain unconnected. How blessed it would be if all who claim to be Christians would do the same. The public servants of the Church should certainly set an example in this direction. Indeed, the entire Church should be very scrupulous on this subject. Correctness of speech and holiness are inseparably connected; extravagance of speech and holiness are contrary to each other. Those who would be holy men and women must be on their guard constantly both in public and private. The masses of mankind are in a great measure given to extravagant speech and should be corrected. Holiness in the Church will prove a constant help in making the correction that is needed.

The thought of elders, deacons, and preachers going to theaters, attending horse races and dances has just occurred to mind. But it seems scarcely necessary to dwell thereon, Certainly no one whose official position or public work requires that he shall set a good example before others would do anything of that kind. But if there be some who are so indifferent concerning their influence for good as to visit such places they should be reprov'd. If they will not repent they should be regarded as enemies rather than friends of the Savior's cause.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The writer and the reader are now about to part company, but I trust not forever. We have had twelve interviews on subjects not generally considered. "We first had a talk on Hydrophobia of a physical nature. Then attention was directed to spiritual Hydrophobia. In so doing the subject of "water baptism" was discussed in all

its bearing and relations, including its antecedents and consequents. This was not because the writer believes that "water baptism" is a savior, nor that it will by itself do any good. But in its own divinely appointed place it is important, and cannot be reverently ignored. It has a divinely arranged place and value. If this be denied then irreverence for the Sacred Text is manifested.

The reader has been requested to consider the Bible from beginning to end. Both the Old Testament and the New have been in a great measure examined. The relations of the two testaments to each other and their relations to mankind have been considered. Much truth, not generally set forth by religious teachers, has been brought before the mind. To the writer this has been highly profitable, and he rejoices in the thought that it has not been unprofitable to the reader. The domain of religious truth has not yet been fully fathomed by uninspired minds. What such minds would have been capable of doing in this direction has been prevented by man-made creeds. Such creeds began to be framed early in the apostasy or falling away from the gospel as revealed in the New Testament. Creeds were also framed by Protestant reformers in the sixteenth century, and their example has been imitated from that time till the present. Those creeds became stereotyped, and became authority for those who accepted them. As a result they prevented free investigation, and in the same measure prevented those who were under their influence from learning what God's Holy Word declares.

But the time has fully come when all human bondage in religion should be discarded. There is no human authority in religion. What men have assumed in this direction is presumption and usurpation. God is the author of all true religion, while man, under Satan's influence, has originated false religions. The true religion

that is how authority is the gospel of Christ. This does not mean that the Old Testament is rejected, for it is exceedingly valuable as a history. It informs us concerning God's relation to man in the Patriarchal and Jewish ages. The Old Testament is also of great value because it makes a revelation of man unto himself. But an inspired apostle referring to the Jewish law said of Christ that he is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believes. (Rom. 10:4.) But while the Jewish law is ended so far as authority is concerned, yet it is very important as a history. "For whatsoever things were written afore time were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom 15:4. By reading and studying, the Old Testament mankind can become better prepared to understand and appreciate the New Testament. But no one is prepared to understand either the Old Testament or the New who is bound by human creeds, or is under the influence of those who advocate human creeds. The chief reason why mankind do not understand the Bible when they, read it is because they approach the Bible in a perverted or veiled condition of mind. By creeds and catechisms their mental vision has been damaged, and they can see but little of the gospel in a clear and unperverted light. Deliverance from bondage to creeds, and freedom from the influence of creed advocates are therefore of first importance. This much accomplished the living word of the living God should be carefully read, and studied, and the gospel of Christ should be sincerely obeyed.