

To Infidelity and Back

Henry F. Lutz

Table of Contents

<u>To Infidelity and Back</u>	1
Henry F. Lutz.....	1
<u>DEDICATION</u>	2
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	2
<u>PREFACE</u>	3
<u>PART I. TO INFIDELITY AND BACK</u>	5
<u>CHAPTER I. To INFIDELITY AND BACK</u>	5
<u>CHAPTER II. MY PARTING MESSAGE TO THE UNITARIAN SCHOOL</u>	16
<u>CHAPTER III. THE FUNCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE MIND</u>	22
<u>CHAPTER IV. LOOKING THROUGH COLORED GLASSES</u>	31
<u>PART II. HOW I FOUND CHRIST'S CHURCH</u>	36
<u>CHAPTER I. SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM</u>	36
<u>CHAPTER II. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH</u>	47
<u>CHAPTER III. THE CHURCH SINCE THE APOSTLES</u>	52
<u>CHAPTER IV. OUR NEGLECTED FIELDS</u>	63

To Infidelity and Back

Henry F. Lutz

This page copyright © 2003 Blackmask Online.

<http://www.blackmask.com>

- DEDICATION
- INTRODUCTION
- PREFACE
- PART I. TO INFIDELITY AND BACK
 - CHAPTER I. To INFIDELITY AND BACK.
 - CHAPTER II. MY PARTING MESSAGE TO THE UNITARIAN SCHOOL.
 - CHAPTER III. THE FUNCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE MIND.
 - CHAPTER IV. LOOKING THROUGH COLORED GLASSES.
- PART II. HOW I FOUND CHRIST'S CHURCH
 - CHAPTER I. SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM.
 - CHAPTER II. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.
 - CHAPTER III. THE CHURCH SINCE THE APOSTLES.
 - CHAPTER IV. OUR NEGLECTED FIELDS.

Produced by Charles Franks

TO INFIDELITY AND BACK

To Infidelity and Back

A Truth-seeker's Religious Autobiography

How I Found Christ and His Church

By

EVANGELIST HENRY F. LUTZ

Author of "Economic Redemption; or, Hard Times: the Cause and Cure" etc.

"I will bring the blind by a way that they knew not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known: I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them and not forsake them"—Isa. 42:16.

"Slight tastes of philosophy may perchance move one to atheism, but fuller draughts lead back to religion"—Lord Bacon

CINCINNATI, OHIO

1911

DEDICATION

To the sacred memory of the pioneers of the great Restoration Movement of the nineteenth century, who forsook the religious associations of a lifetime and cheerfully endured poverty, persecution and every hardship in their endeavor to restore Christian union on the primitive gospel, and who held forth a beacon-light that helped me to find the truth in its simplicity as it is in Christ Jesus.

My Soul Struggle in Symbolism

Upon the fly-leaf of my Bible I find the following, which was written shortly after I emerged from the stormy sea of heartrending agony through which I passed in my conflict with sectarianism, rationalism, infidelity and doubt. It was not written for the public, but was simply an effort of my soul to express in a measure, through human symbols, the painful experiences through which it passed. It will seem extravagant language to those who have never had their souls lacerated by doubt and despair. But the sensitive souls who have endured similar experiences will understand, and it is with the hope of reaching and helping them that it is given to the public.

“A TEN YEARS' JOURNEY

From the childhood land of ignorant innocence to the kingdom of Christ: by way of deserts of negation; mountains of assumption; rivers of irony, sarcasm and conceit; bays of contention; gulfs of liberalism; and oceans of infidelity, doubt and confusion—swept by undercurrents of selfish passion, tempests of blind sentiment, maelstroms of fear and despair; covered with black clouds of prejudice and preconceived ideas, dense fogs of theological speculation, gigantic icebergs of indifference, monstrous sharks of procrastination, and ruinous rocks of materialism; through the strait of darkness and absurdity, over the sea of twilight and joy, into the haven of rest.

“In the ship, religion; pole-star, faith in God; rudder, free will; compass, conscience; sextant, rationalism and experience; anchor, hope; guiding chart, creeds and opinions of men vs. the Word of God; pilot, Jesus Christ.

“Motto: Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.

“Prayer: O God! thou knowest the secret desire of my heart. Thou knowest how earnestly I have sought the truth. God forbid that my life should be a barren waste; that I should so use the powers that thou hast given me that the world shall not be better for my having lived in it. Lord, grant I may ever find the work that thou wouldst have me do. 'Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts, and see if there is any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting. Amen.”

This, in substance, was my daily prayer for ten long, dreary years; for, while my intellect was in doubt and confusion, my heart continued to cling to God.

INTRODUCTION

One of the clearest expounders of the Scriptures in my acquaintance is the author of this book, who honors me in asking that I write these few lines of introduction. His experience is full of interest. I have listened night after night with profit to his sermons, and he has dug his way in the most painstaking fashion out of the

To Infidelity and Back

darkness of unfaith into the beauty and strength of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

There is no institution like the church of God, for it is founded upon the divine Sonship of Jesus, and his Holy Spirit has given to it divine life, so that Isaiah's prophecy lights up the pathway of victory, when it is said: "He will not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set justice in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law." Its right to advance has been disputed, and, at times in its long history, it appears to have stood timidly doubting its power and right to soul conquest, but this has only been apparent, for every century has brought with it a greater courage, so that in this day believers in Jesus are speaking in the language of every nation on the earth, and hosts of these are as ready to lay down their lives for their faith in Jesus as did Stephen and James and Paul and that host of martyrs whose willing sacrifices gave strength and solidarity to the early church.

The ordinances have naturally suffered at the hands of every invasion, and, in consequence, some of the most devout have not been able to find the path to the ordinances as practiced in the apostolic days, but the skies are brightening, and, without questioning for a moment the sincerity and devotion of those who think otherwise, the Scriptures are being read to-day with more freedom than at any other period in the history of the church, and its ordinances are gradually coming to light in the public mind. God has been patient with us and we must be patient with those who do not think as we do. One of the most important problems now facing us, however, is that all believers shall find a common way for entrance into the church. When that has been done, a long step will have been taken towards world-wide evangelization.

The fields are already white unto harvest. This is the day of opportunity. Christ is waiting on us. If the time was short, like a furled sail, in Paul's day, how much shorter is it in our day! The gospel has been sent to all nations, and God is sending men from all nations to America to hear the gospel, so that the lines are crossing and recrossing each other and are so many prophecies of the fulfillment of the commission of Jesus, when he said: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Deciding for Christ and being baptized into him is only a small part of the work that is to be done. Then begins their training into real discipleship, when they are to produce the fruit of the Spirit, which is "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control."

This book is a contribution to that end, and may those who read its pages be brought to yield their best to the glory of Him who is our all.

Baltimore, Md. Peter Ainslie.

PREFACE

This book contains my religious experience in a forty years' sojourn on earth. If any doubt the propriety and value of relating one's religious experience, I would refer them to the case of Paul, who used this method on a number of occasions. However, we should be careful not to make an improper use of this method and preach our experiences in place of the gospel. Paul says: "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake" (2 Cor. 4:5). We should refer to our experiences simply to help deliver people from human error and center their attention on the gospel of Christ, which alone is the power of God unto salvation.

I do not take any great credit to myself for my experiences recorded in this book, realizing that they were largely the result of my inherited proclivities and religious environment. It must be admitted that the great mass of mankind are what they are in religion, politics, etc., by heredity and environment. This is powerfully

To Infidelity and Back

impressed upon us by the ministers who give their experience in “Why I Am What I Am.” Even the fact that it is natural for me to seek to know what is right for myself, I attribute more largely to my natural hereditary mental bent, than to any particular merit of my own. I trust this book will help us all to realize the danger of drifting with traditionary religion, and thus defeating the revealed truth of Jesus Christ, and the need of searching the truth for ourselves that thus we may be used of God to advance his kingdom of unity and truth. Christian civilization would make much more rapid strides if we all would struggle to find the truth instead of acquiring our ideas through the colored glasses of prejudice and ignorance.

My ancestry on mother's side were German Reformed and on father's side Lutheran. While a boy I lived for three years with Mennonites and attended their church. I attended a Moravian Sunday-school, was taught by a Presbyterian Sunday-school teacher, educated at a Unitarian theological school, graduated from a Christian college and a Congregational theological seminary, and took postgraduate work at a United Presbyterian university. I was born and raised in southeastern Pennsylvania, which may be called “The Cradle of Religious Liberty” in America. For while the colonies to the north and south persecuted people on account of their religious opinions, Penn opened his settlement to all the religiously persecuted in America and Europe. As a result Pennsylvania became a great sectarian stronghold. To-day some twenty denominations have either their national headquarters or leading national center in southeastern Pennsylvania. The reader can readily see how my contact with this Babel of sectarianism affected my religious life and experience.

There are some things that seem too sacred to drag before the public. For years I said very little in my public ministry about my experience with doubt. While, as city evangelist of Greater Pittsburg, I was assisting a minister in a revival, he learned incidentally of my experience with infidelity; and as there were a number of skeptics in the community, he urged me to preach on the subject. The message seemed to do much good to the large audience that heard it. Since then it has been repeated a number of times, and the largest auditoriums have not been able to hold the people who were eager to hear it. This demonstrates that the message supplies a great need, and has encouraged me to prepare this book for the public. The Christian Temple in Baltimore was packed with people, and on account of the jam the doors were ordered closed by the policeman in charge half an hour before time for the service. At Portsmouth, Va., twenty-five hundred were crowded into a skating-rink, and many failed to get admittance. At Halifax, Can., hundreds were turned away. But this has been the experience wherever the sermon has been thoroughly advertised. To illustrate this, I quote from the Harrisonburg (Va.) papers of Jan. 9, 1911, where the sermon was delivered the night before in Assembly Hall, the largest auditorium in the city. About sixteen hundred people were jammed in the hall and many crowded out. It was the largest audience that ever assembled in that city for a religious service.

“Evangelist Lutz says that on every occasion on which he has delivered his address on 'My Conversion from Infidelity,' no matter how large the hall may have been, people have turned away for lack of room. Last night's attendance at Assembly Hall maintained the record. Presumably the hall has never been more closely packed. Seats, stage, box, aisles, windows, doorways, were filled, and many found place in the flies of the theater. A number couldn't find places anywhere and went away. Mr. Lutz is a fine example of evangelist. He has a magnetic personality and a strong, oratorical way of talking, fluent in speech and filled with figurative language and the phrases of his profession.”—*Harrisonburg Daily Times*.

“Evangelist H. F. Lutz spoke last night at Assembly Hall on 'The Story of My Conversion from Infidelity.' The audience showed close attention and earnestness. Many were turned away because of the crowded condition of the hall. Many people from the near-town sections came to attend the service.”—*Harrisonburg Daily News*.

I trust that my bitter experience with rationalism, infidelity and doubt will help to reveal their true nature and thus keep many young men from these dangerous rocks, and will help to deliver many others from this terrible bondage. May the Father graciously bless my humble efforts to win souls to Christ and to help bring about Christian union on the primitive gospel in order to the Christian conquest of the whole world. Henry F. Lutz.

Millersville, Pa., March 28, 1911.

PART I. TO INFIDELITY AND BACK

CHAPTER I. To INFIDELITY AND BACK.

To Christ by Way of Rationalism, Unitarianism and Infidelity.

I inherited on the one hand a strong religious nature, and on the other a tendency to be independent in thought and to question everything before adopting it as a part of my belief. Ever since I can remember I was a praying boy, and early in life there came to me the desire to devote myself to the ministry of the gospel.

Among my earliest religious impressions were those received by having the story of the Patriarchs and Jesus read to me in German by a saintly old Mennonite for whom I worked on the farm for a year. Among the first things that aroused my reason in religion was the declaration of my Sunday-school teacher that before we are born we are predestined by God either to go to heaven or to hell, and that anything we might do would not alter our eternal destiny. This declaration came like a thunderbolt into my religious life, and stirred up a violent agitation from which it took me ten years to fully deliver myself. I was now about fourteen years old, and already had a desire to measure everything in the crucible of logic or cause and effect, and to accept nothing which did not come within the range of my reason. Looking at things from the standpoint of cause and effect, I was naturally caught in the meshes of fatalism, and this aggravated the religious agitation above referred to.

At this time in my life there arose many religious questions, and the answers I received from religious teachers tended to drive me away from the church rather than to it. I feel to-day that if my case had been clearly understood and the nature and the limits of the finite mind had been patiently pointed out to me, in its relation to faith and revelation, I could have been saved years of agony on the sea of rationalism. But my questions were not answered and my honest doubts were rebuked, so that I was naturally driven out of sympathy with the church and Bible, since I judged that my doubts could not be satisfied because religion itself is unreasonable.

Through the kindness of Christian people the way opened to prepare myself for the ministry. But by this time many religious doubts and perplexities were in the way, and I decided that I would a thousand times rather be an honest doubter out of the church and ministry than a hypocrite in it. Thus my fond hope of entering the ministry had to be given up, and instead I determined to use the teaching profession as a stepping-stone to law, and law as a means of serving humanity.

I was very fond of study, and read scores of books on all kinds of subjects. Emerson was my favorite, and I procured and read his complete works. Gibbon and Macaulay were eagerly read as revealing some of the religious life of the world. Ingersoll, with many others, got his turn. But the book that produced the greatest effect on my life at this time was Fleetwood's "Life of Christ," with a short history of the different religious bodies of the world attached. Through my reading and observations I became greatly perplexed over the religious divisions of the world. I discovered that thousands of people had died as martyrs for all kinds of religions and sects, and that each claimed to have the truth and to teach the right way to heaven. I concluded that since they teach such contradictory doctrines they cannot possibly all be right, although they might all be wrong. I formed a desire to make a thorough study of all the different religious bodies of the world, to find out where the truth is, if there is any in religion. My first information along this line was obtained in the above-named history of the religious bodies of the world. Being of a rationalistic turn of mind, I was naturally very favorably impressed with Unitarianism and its teaching. I sent for a number of their works and read them with great interest. I learned many things that have been a benediction to my life ever since, but you

To Infidelity and Back

will see later on how far it satisfied my rationalistic proclivities. I learned to my delight that I could enter a Unitarian theological school to prepare for the ministry without first joining a church or signing a creed. For a person in my state of mind nothing better could have presented itself. I determined to go there and make a thorough study of the Bible and all the different religious bodies, and to fearlessly follow the truth wherever it might lead me.

The time came and I entered the school. And a fine school it was from an intellectual standpoint and for the purpose of investigation. I have been a student at six educational institutions since I left the high school, but this was far ahead of the others for the development of the logical and philosophical faculties. Here there was absolutely no restraint to thought; and all kinds of systems and ideas were represented, from philosophical anarchy to socialism and from mysticism to materialism. The moral and spiritual earnestness I expected to find among the Unitarians I did not find, especially among the younger and more radical ones. Its effect, on the whole, was to relax rather than intensify the moral fiber. Their ideals seemed so grand and noble that I thought those possessed with them could scarcely find time to eat and sleep in their zeal to put them into practise; but I discovered that they not only had plenty of time to eat and sleep, but also for dancing, card-playing, theater-going, etc. Many of the young men studying for the ministry often spent a large part of the night in card-playing, and the Sunday-school room served also as a dancing-floor. Unitarians pride themselves upon the high standard of morality among their people and upon the few prisoners you find among their members, but this is due to the character of the people they reach rather than to the restraining influence of their teaching

My reading had given me a wrong impression as to the teaching of Unitarianism. Like many others, I was fascinated and enticed by the writings of conservative Unitarians, whose contention is largely against the bad theology of human creeds; but the present-day teaching of the vanguard of Unitarianism is an entirely different thing. It rejects all the miraculous in the Bible, and, in many cases, even denies the existence of a personal God. All the students were required to conduct chapel prayers in turn. Those who did not believe in a personal God explained that they were pronouncing an apostrophe to the great impersonal and unknowable force working in the universe. I had read Channing, Clark, Hale, Emerson, and other conservative Unitarians, and found much food for my soul, but I discovered that these were considered old “fogies” and back numbers by most of the students in attendance.

But I must tell you of my evolution along the line of rationalism. My rationalistic proclivities were given a free rein. And as a child, when left to run away, will soon stop and return to its mother, so this freedom was the natural cure for my intellectual delusion. To the statement of the creeds, “The Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God,” my rationalism replied, that is logically inconceivable, therefore I became a Unitarian. No sooner was I happy in this faith than a Universalist addressed me and said, “If you want to be rational, you must give up your belief in eternal punishment, for God could not give eternal punishment for a finite sin.” As a rationalist, what could I do but yield, and so I became a universalist Unitarian. I felt I had at last found the truth, but my peace was short; for a student accused me of being irrational, “because,” said he, “an omnipotent, loving God would give an infinitely large amount of good and an infinitely small amount of evil; but an infinitely small amount of evil is not perceptible, evil is perceptible, therefore there is no such God.” This was an awful pill and gave a terrible shock to my religious sensibilities, but as rationalism was my guide, I had to follow on or stand accused as a superstitious coward.

Again rationalism declared, through my teachers, that all the supernatural must be eliminated from the Bible as mythical and unreliable, and so I was robbed of my Christ, my God and my Bible. Misguided by rationalism, I thought it my conscientious duty to accept, step by step, the dictates of destructive criticism until the Bible was only inspired to me in religion as Kant in philosophy, Milton in poetry, and Beethoven in music. But when I came to the end of the matter I discovered that my conscience, which had urged me along, was gone also. For I was gravely taught that conscience is merely a creature of experience and education, and

To Infidelity and Back

that it is right to lie or do anything else so long as you do it out of love. Doubtless you have all heard of the farmer and his wife at the World's Fair who went to see the "Exit." There was nothing in it, and of course they had to pay to get in again. This was my bitter experience with rationalism. I thought I was following a great light, but I discovered there was nothing in it, that I was following an *ignis fatuus*. Rationalism has indeed proven the "Exit" to multitudes, from the peace, joy and moral security that accompany faith in evangelical Christianity into the desert of doubt, darkness and despair.

But not even here did I find a staying-place. For rationalism, in its bold confidence, led me on and on until it brought me to materialism and absurdity. In going too far, it revealed its true nature and character, and thus led me to see its fallacy and enabled me to get free from its bondage. From atheism it led me to fatalism, and declared that there is no free will and consequently people are not to blame for their sins and shortcomings. If we "shall reap as we sow," it declared that we cannot give anything to anybody and therefore philanthropy is a delusion.

But I taught rationalism in guile one day by which it thoroughly exhibited the absurdity of its teaching. Its continual song was, "You dare not believe what you cannot conceive to be true." So it declared one day, in its bold folly, that an object cannot move in the space in which it is, nor in the space in which it is not; therefore you cannot conceive of an object moving; therefore you cannot move to walk, eat or live. So the conclusion to which my rationalistic guide finally led me was that I must sit down and die or be irrational. Well, this was too much for me. I refused to die, and concluded that rationalism is not a safe guide, and commenced to investigate as to where the difficulty lay.

But before I tell you how I discovered the false tricks of rationalism, let me say that all these things into which rationalism led me were against my strong religious nature, and gave me continual and excruciating pain. I never for a day ceased to pray to God for help; for while my intellect was held in doubt through the bondage of rationalism, my heart held on to God, and thus I was in a mighty conflict. In my despair I cried unto God, and when he had accomplished his purpose concerning me, he set me free. Blessed be his name! Surely "he bringeth the blind by a way that they knew not, and leads them into paths that they have not known. He makes darkness light before them, and crooked things straight, and does not utterly forsake the honest in heart."

Most people have come to their religious and political position by heredity and are held there by inertia. If you can set a person free from this hereditary inertia, you can convert him to almost anything at will; for it is but few who are sufficiently informed on any subject to defend it against an expert, and none are thus qualified on all subjects. So when I entered this school, free from all hereditary ideas, determined to accept every position that I could not refute in argument, you can imagine my experience. At first I was converted from one thing to another by the different students and professors until I was about all the "arians," "isms," and "ists" ever heard of, together with a number of other things for which they have no names as yet.

But how did I discover the fallacy of rationalism? and how was I delivered from its mighty clutches by which it had dragged me from one pitfall to another so ruthlessly? My deliverance came from a source where you would perhaps least expect it. It was through the study of John Stuart Mill's "System of Logic." In it I learned "that inconceivability is not a criterion of impossibility," as rationalism claims. On the other hand, that we know things to be true that are just as inconceivable as that there can be two mountains without a valley between.

Let me introduce a few of these contradictions or inconceivabilities. Before you can reach your mouth with your hand, you must go over half the distance, then half of the rest, then half of the rest, and so on *ad infinitum*. But you cannot make the infinite number of divisions, and therefore you cannot reach your lips. Again, you cannot conceive of extension of space or time without a limit, nor can you conceive of a limit to space or time. Here conceivability contradicts itself. Furthermore, you cannot conceive of existence without a cause, nor of a cause without existence. To the statement of the believer that, "as the wonderful mechanism of

To Infidelity and Back

the watch presumes a designer, so the infinitely more wonderful mechanism of the universe presumes God, the infinite designer,” Ingersoll replied that this is simply to jump over the difficulty by an infinite assumption. Ingersoll, on the other hand, claimed that the material universe has always existed; apparently unaware that he thus was guilty of the same fallacy of which he accused others, by *assuming* infinite existence without a cause. The difference is that the believer's assumption gives us a personal God, a kind, loving heavenly Father who provides for the eternal bliss and welfare of his children, while Ingersoll's assumption gives death and darkness and despair.

An object thrown from one point to another is always at some point, therefore it has no time to move from one point to another. And yet we know that it does move, even though we cannot conceive how it can do so. Again, suppose that the hour-hand of your clock is at eleven and the minute-hand at twelve. Now, you cannot conceive how the minute-hand can overtake the hour-hand, although you know by observation that it does overtake it. For by the time the minute-hand gets to eleven, the hour-hand has passed on to twelve, and by the time the minute-hand has reached twelve, the hour-hand has passed beyond it. Every time the minute-hand comes to where the hour-hand now is, the hour-hand has passed beyond. The distance becomes less and less, but theoretically, or in conceivability, the one can never overtake the other.

Through this line of reasoning I learned, clearly and once for all, that *inconceivability is not a proof of impossibility; but, on the other hand, that we know many things to be true that are not conceivable to the finite mind, and therefore we must follow truth learned by experience and observation, irrespective of rationalism. In this way the mighty fetters of rationalism that held me in bondage were cut and I was set free to search for the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. I learned the limitations of the finite intellect and the truth of God's word when he says: “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts.” “Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.”*

After the empirical school of philosophy had taught me that we must follow inductions based on experience and observation rather than rationalism or conceivability, I began to value Paul's admonition, “Prove all things, hold fast to that which is good.” If inductive philosophers have often been opposed to religion and the Bible, it is because they have not carried their inductions far enough to cover the entire world of facts. It is admitted by all historians and observers that prayer and faith and religious convictions have been among the mightiest forces at work in the world, and any system of reasoning that does not take these facts into consideration is neither philosophical nor scientific.

To illustrate what is meant by saying that we must follow experience rather than conceivability, let us suppose that you are suffering from a malignant disease and you hear of a medicine that has cured this disease whenever it has been tried, and you know of nothing else that will cure it. Would it not be foolish for you to refuse to use the medicine because you cannot conceive how it produces the cure? It might be discovered later that it was not the medicine, but your belief in its curative qualities, that produced the result. But this would not affect your common-sense duty in the matter. If certain desirable results follow the doing of a certain thing, we are bound to do that thing until we know how to get the good results without doing it.

This reveals the folly and inhumanity of the conduct of some infidels towards religious people. When I was minister of a church in Ohio, I was visited by a noted infidel. After he went on in a tirade against preachers and Christians, I asked him if he was not an unhappy man. At first he denied it; but I called his attention to some of his utterances, and he soon admitted that he was a very unhappy man. But he said he was unhappy because he knew too much, and claimed that Christians were so happy because they were ignorant and deluded. He claimed to be a great lover of humanity, and although, according to his profession, he had no God or conscience or judgment to require it of him, he spent his time in spreading the knowledge and wisdom

To Infidelity and Back

which made people unhappy by destroying that which he admitted gave people great joy and peace and happiness. Suppose a man should come to town who is as lean as a skeleton and is slowly dying because he is not getting enough nourishment out of the food he eats, and should begin to lecture well-nourished and healthy people for eating the food they are eating. Would we not put him down as a fool? Well, if he would add the claim that we are well fed because we are ignorant and deluded, while he is suffering and dying because he knows too much on the food question, he would be on a par with many of our infidelic friends.

It is said that Beecher and Ingersoll were both present at a banquet in New York City. Ingersoll brought a railing accusation against Christianity. Everybody expected Beecher to reply, but he held his peace until later in the evening, when it became his turn to speak. When Beecher arose he said: "When I came to this hall to-night I saw an old, crippled woman wending her way across the crowded street on crutches. When she had reached about midway, a burly ruffian came along and knocked the crutches out from under her, and she fell splash into the mud." Turning to Ingersoll, he said, "What do you think of that, Colonel?" "The villain!" replied Ingersoll. Beecher, pointing to Ingersoll, said: "Thou art the man! Suffering, heart-broken, dying humanity is wending its way through this world of sorrow and turmoil on the crutches of Christianity. You, sir, come along and knock them out from under them, but offer nothing in their place." It was a crushing blow to Ingersoll and his gospel of despair.

We do not understand how spirit and matter can be inter-related, and we can not conceive that our willing it can move our arm; but this does not deter us from moving, because we know through experience that we can move. We do not understand the philosophy of digestion, and we cannot conceive how bread and butter can have any relation to thought and life; but we know by experience that they do, and we go on eating and living. We cannot conceive how the same grass produces lamb, pork and beef; but we keep on raising stock just the same, because we are guided by facts learned by experience and observation rather than by conceivability. We do reach our mouth, the minute-hand does overtake the hour-hand, objects do move in space, etc., rationalism and inconceivability to the contrary notwithstanding.

Man is a religious being, and we know by experience that religion gives him joy and brings him good. If we had no revealed religion, science and duty would compel us to develop a religious system out of our religious experiences. This is what has actually been done by the different peoples of the earth who know not the revelation of God in the Bible. The secret of the hold that even a false religion has upon people is the fact that it does them good and gives them happiness by exercising the pious emotions of their being, even though it may bring them harm in other ways. Even a religion based on human experience is better than none; for it is better to feed the religious nature on husks than to starve it out altogether. To this agree the words of Paul when he says that God "made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth... that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him." But while man, unaided by direct revelation, can grope in the dark and feel after God, and can invent systems of religion based on experience that are better than none, any man that accepts facts and testimony will soon discover that God has not thus left us in the dark on religious matters, but has "appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained, whereof he has given assurance unto all men, in that he has raised him from the dead."

It is said that a lawyer and a noted preacher, who was a lecturer, happened to meet at a hotel breakfast-table. The lawyer suspected that his companion was a preacher, and, as he was an infidel, he thought he had a good opportunity to give a thrust at the Bible.

"Excuse me," said the lawyer, "I take it from your appearance that you are a preacher."

"Yes, sir," said the preacher.

To Infidelity and Back

“Well, now,” said the lawyer, “don't you find a great many contradictions and difficulties you cannot understand in the Bible?”

“Yes, sir,” replied the preacher.

“How, then,” said the lawyer, “can you continue to believe in it?”

“Why,” said the preacher, “do you see what I am doing with the bones of this fish? I lay them aside and enjoy the good of the fish. So with the Bible. I lay aside the things I cannot understand, and feast upon the rich spiritual food it contains, willing to wait until all mysteries shall be removed hereafter.”

If the finite mind could understand everything contained in the Bible, it would become worthless as a revelation, for the finite mind could produce it. But since it reveals the infinite mind, we must expect it to contain things that the finite mind cannot understand. We can understand the evidence that it is from God and for our good, and it is reasonable that we should accept its great truths by faith, although we may not now be able to see how all the truths it reveals are consistent with each other. “Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.”

As has often been said, no one can do better than to live the pure, clean, benevolent life that Jesus inculcated and incarnated. If you imitate him in goodness and good deeds, you are pursuing the best possible course, even if the Bible is not true. If, on the other hand, the Bible is true, and you do not live for Christ, you are doomed for ever and ever.

Having been delivered from the bondage of rationalism, I found my way back to Christ with comparative ease. If experience and facts are our ultimate guides, then we must trust the testimony of history. With the help of the *Bi-Millennial Telescope on the opposite page*, and limitless similar testimony, we can trace the existence of the Bible clear to the days of the Apostles. None ever had better means of knowing the facts they bore witness to than the Apostles, and none ever gave stronger proof that they sincerely told the truth as they knew it. The Gospels being genuine and reliable, the life and words and miracles of Jesus they narrate, give sufficient proof of the divinity of Christ to satisfy every reasonable demand of the intellect. This is especially true concerning the resurrection of Christ, on which the proof of Christianity hinges. “He showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs.” And if he arose from the dead, he was demonstrated by it to be the Son of God. And if he is the Son of God, then the Bible is the Word of God, for he has endorsed it all. Thus there were restored to me Christ, God and his Word of truth. The thing that robbed me of these was rationalism, but it had been proven false and therefore was ruled out of court.

Unitarians used to tell me that Christ was the Son of God, but we all are sons of God. I now saw that Christ was *the* Son of God in the special and peculiar sense in which he claimed, or he was a fool. When he was on trial he was asked upon oath whether he was the Son of God or not, and he answered “Yes” when it cost his life to do so. If he meant that he was the son of God in the same sense in which we are, all he would have had to do was to explain and he could have saved his life.

The proof that Christianity is from God as revealed in its effect upon the life of individuals, communities and nations, is so apparent and has been pointed out so often that I will give it but a passing notice. “If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself,” was Christ's challenge, and millions have verified it in their own religious experience. Nearly all the voluntary educational and philanthropic institutions of the world are supported by Christian people, and the nations of the earth are prosperous, enlightened and influential in the exact proportion as their people are intelligent and consecrated followers of the lowly Nazarene.

To Infidelity and Back

It was thus that I found my way back to Christ as my Lord and Saviour, and I never before fully appreciated the words of Jesus, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." The truth dawned upon me gradually, but with irresistible force. How often have we been perplexed and in doubt on some great question of truth or duty until finally the solution came to us as if by magic. Through what the psychologists call subconscious cerebration our mind has been working at the great problem even when our conscious attention was given to other matters. I have had a number of such experiences before and since, and, had I not examined them critically, I might easily have been led to believe they were direct revelations from heaven.

For many months the great question had been occupying my mind by day and by night. Finally the solution came as clear as a revelation from God. It wakened me in the still of the night and ravished my soul with peace and joy unspeakable. I arose and took a walk into the country to a mountain spring and back. I shall never forget that night, and the ecstatic joy it brought to me. My religious nature had been outraged so long that when it was set free it returned to its Lord with a violent bound. The fittest words I could find to express my feelings are in the 103d Psalm: "Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name."

The question as to what church I should join, or what religious body I should affiliate with, now confronted me and demanded solution. As I already intimated, I was perplexed, and partly led to doubt and confusion by the many different religious bodies, all claiming to be right. One of my objects in entering this school was to make a thorough study of the different religious bodies and their doctrines. One incident that helped me in the solution of this problem was an occurrence in our New Testament Greek class. The professor declared that all Greek scholars of note are agreed that the proper meaning of the word "baptism" in the New Testament is *to immerse*. As I was raised in a pedobaptist church, this declaration was a great surprise to me, but I looked up the authorities and found that the professor had stated the facts correctly.

We had a class that made a study of the character, government and teaching of the different religious bodies. In this study I was especially impressed with the polity and teaching of the people designated as "Disciples of Christ," or "Christians." I procured their literature and made a thorough study of their position. I naturally found myself in harmony with their teaching. I had myself come to see the folly of enforcing upon all believers the speculative theology of the creeds, and the weakness and waste that result from a divided church. My experience revealed to me the relative value of human wisdom and God's wisdom as found in his Book. The thought of preaching Christ rather than theology, and of restoring the apostolic church in its teachings, ordinances and practices, came to me as a godsend in my condition of mind. I was, however, very slow to act in this matter, as I had been deceived before and it was my desire not to make a mistake again. After a year's consideration and considerable correspondence with one of their preachers, I finally united with the Christian Church at New Castle, Pa. I have been preaching the plea for Christian union on the primitive gospel ever since, and the longer I preach it the more I see its beauty and power.

Having been delivered, through the goodness of God, from this blinding cloud of rationalism, let us take a backward look at it and its chief product—Unitarianism—and let us see what lesson God would teach us through it. Unitarianism, as a church movement, started near the beginning of the last century. It enlisted many of the best hearts, brains and purses of this country. It had Harvard University back of it. It numbered among its followers most of the great poets, historians and prose writers of our country. It has flooded the country with free literature, and has furnished to thousands of ministers its standard works without money and without price. No movement ever seemed to have such mighty agencies back of it to insure its rapid spread. And yet, after a century of effort, what do we see as the result? Only a few hundred churches, most of which are numerically weak and enlist only a certain class of people.

My conviction of the depressing, devitalizing and disintegrating effect of Unitarianism has been intensified through my recent experience in evangelistic work in New England. The rationalistic liberalism of

To Infidelity and Back

Unitarianism has largely permeated New England Protestantism. It was not an accident that it was in New England, where, to a large body of clergymen, a speaker declared, with applause, that "Protestantism is decaying and will soon be displaced by a new form of Catholicism." Here Protestantism is indeed decaying through its contact with Unitarian teaching, and is already largely displaced by old Catholicism and new Christian Science and other antichristian delusions. Nowhere else did I ever see Protestant churches so saturated with worldly pleasures and so indifferent about the salvation of souls. It was here I had the humiliating experience of sitting in a union Thanksgiving service where the preacher called the Pilgrim Fathers *religious fanatics*, and spoke of words writers of the Pentateuch put into the mouth of Moses to give them influence with the people. Yet I never saw a sign of disapproval in the audience or heard a word of criticism. It is true he was a Universalist preacher, but that makes it all the worse. To think that Protestantism has so degenerated in a New England city that a preacher who does not believe in the divinity of Christ nor in the inspiration of the Bible should be appointed to represent it on such an occasion. It is enough to make the Pilgrim Fathers turn in their graves and groan for pain. Had present-day Protestantism of New England a fraction of the moral and spiritual earnestness that the Pilgrim Fathers possessed, it might have been spared the abject humility of sprawling in weakness before the same vaunting religious intolerance of Catholicism that through cruel and bloody persecution drove the Pilgrim Fathers to "the bleak New England shore" for safety and religious liberty.

When a prominent Catholic recently aped the Protestant clergymen by declaring that Protestantism is decaying, the preacher at Tremont Temple called it a "damnable lie." This is a hopeful sign, and indicates that the sick man is not dead yet. It shows that at least some think it is not true, or wish it not true; and if enough get a strong desire that it shall not be true, it will not be true. When we renounce rationalism and its products it will not be true.

At a meeting of one of the leading ministerial associations of New England, at which the writer was present, the speaker of the day declared that the church has been claiming too much for itself. The contents of the speech indicated that he had reference to its claim of supernatural power to transform the sinner. He also said he had given up the effort to reconcile the first chapters of the Bible with science. The significance is in the fact that some Protestants acquiesce in such teaching, and that they are in harmony with the doctrines of Unitarianism.

Although its advocates must admit that Unitarianism is a monumental failure in organizing churches, it is their boast that it has powerfully affected other religious bodies. This fact we admit; but as the effect is devitalizing, disorganizing and ultimately demoralizing, we consider the result the crowning shame rather than the crowning glory of Unitarianism.

That the liberal theology resulting from rationalism and championed in this country by Unitarianism is merely negative and destructive, is evidenced on every hand. Dr. Pearson, in the *Missionary Review*, has recently pointed out its fatal effects in the mission fields, and still more recently it has been compelled to confess its own defeat in Germany, where it originated and where it has found its chief support. The evidence of this is found in the *Literary Digest* of Feb. 25, 1911, where we find the following:

That "liberal" theology has made an almost utter failure in Germany is asserted by one of its leading spokesmen in a liberal religious organ. It consists too much of mere negation, he thinks, and has no strong faith in anything. The masses have rejected it, and the educated have accepted it only in small numbers. Practically it is a failure, and he demands a reconstruction along new lines, with new ideals and new methods. This courageous liberal is Rev. Dr. Rittelmeyer, of Nuremberg, and he writes in the *Christliche Welt* (Tubingen). Here are the main points of his argument:

"Let us ask honestly what results modern theology has attained practically. As far as the great masses of workingmen are concerned, practically nothing has been gained. They either do not understand it or they

To Infidelity and Back

distrust it. All the public discussions and popularization of modern critical views have not found any echo or sympathy among the ranks of the laboring people.

“And how about the educated classes? It has long since been the boast and hobby of advanced theology that it, and it alone, will satisfy the religious longings of the educated man who has broken with the traditional dogma and doctrines of orthodox Christianity. But what are the actual facts in the case? It is a fact that there are a considerable number among the educated who thankfully confess that they can accept Christianity only in the form in which it is taught by the advanced theologian. But how exceedingly small this number is! A periodical like the *Christliche Welt*, the only paper of its kind, has not been able to secure more than five thousand subscribers, although its contributors are the most brilliant in the land of scholars and thinkers; while periodicals that are exponents of the older views are read by tens and even hundreds of thousands. There are whole classes of society among the educated who are antagonistic to liberal tendencies in religion. Among these are the officers in the army and the navy, practitioners of the technical arts and of engineering, and almost to a man the whole world of business. It is foolish to close our eyes to these facts.”

What is the matter? asks this writer. What is the weakness of liberal and advanced theological thought? These are some of the answers:

“One trouble is that modern theology has entirely grown out of criticism. Its weakness is intellectualism; it is a negative movement. We can understand the cry of the orthodox, that advanced theology is eliminating one thing after the other from our religious thought, and then asks, What is left? True, we answer, God is left. But is it not the case that the modern God–Father faith is generally a very weak and attenuated faith in a Providence, and nothing more? And on this subject, too, we quarrel among ourselves, whether a God–Father troubles himself about little things only or about great things too, such as the forgiveness of sins. We do the same thing with Jesus. We speak of him as of a unique personality, as the highest revelation of the Father, and the like, but always connected with a certain skeptical undercurrent of thought; but we do not appreciate him in his deepest soul and in the great motives of his life. He is not for modern theology what he is for orthodoxy, the Saviour of the world and the Redeemer of mankind.”

Quite naturally this open confession of a pronounced liberal attracts more than ordinary attention. The liberal papers, including the *Christliche Welt* itself, pass it by without further comment, but the conservatives speak out boldly. Representative of the latter is the *Evangelische Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, of Leipzig, which says:

“The psychological and spiritual solution of Rittelmeyer's problem is not so hard to find. The soul of man can not live on negations. To stir the soul there must be positive principles and epoch–making historical facts, such as are offered by the Scriptural teachings of Christ and his words. There can be religious life only where there is faith in him who is the truth and the life. Liberal theology has failed because it has nothing to offer.”

Dr. Harnack, its great high priest, found it an unsatisfying portion, and, doubtless influenced by its failure, has resigned and turned his energies into other channels.

Unitarianism appeals almost entirely to the head and but little to the heart. It supplies a kind of abnormal stimulant to the intellect, but usually freezes out the emotions. It is like the arctic regions, where they have six months of light, but no heat, and where consequently there is no growth of any kind. It is broad, but really superficial and shallow. It is like a piece of rubber stretched over a wide surface; it is wide, but it becomes very thin. Emerson seemed to recognize how shallow rationalism makes people when he declared that “a small consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds—little philosophers, little statesmen and little divines.” The finite mind cannot see the consistency of the great and deep truths of life and God. To try to deal with these great questions with human logic is like manipulating a circle with a break in it. Each reasoner calls attention to the break in the circle of logic of others, but dexterously manipulates his own circle so as to hide its missing

To Infidelity and Back

link.

Rationalism is a delusion and a snare, and, when followed to its logical conclusion, leads to absurdity and death. Fortunately, most people who are tainted with this disease do not follow it to its legitimate conclusions. Through preconceived and inherited ideas and sentimental inertia, they are held to their moorings. But, unfortunately, their pupils are not always thus protected. Many preachers who are held in their place by religious habits and associations, give expression to rationalistic ideas that take lodgment in the minds of young men who are not surrounded with religious habits and associations to hold them; and who, following these rationalistic ideas to their logical conclusion, are led to doubt and confusion. I believe that hundreds of thinking young men have been led away from Christ and the church in this way, all because they and their teacher did not recognize the true character of rationalism and the proper functions and limitations of the finite intellect. Mansel gives a proper diagnosis of rationalism in the following words:

“The rationalist . . . assigns to some superior tribunal the right of determining what (in revelation) is essential to religion and what is not; he claims the privilege of accepting or rejecting any given revelation, wholly or in part, according as it does or does not satisfy the conditions of some higher criterion, to be supplied by human consciousness.” Rationalism proceeds “by paring down supposed excrescences. Commencing with a preconceived theory of the purpose of a revelation, and of the form which it ought to assume, it proceeds to remove or reduce all that will not harmonize with this leading idea.” “Rationalism tends to destroy revealed religion altogether, by obliterating the whole distinction between the human and the divine. If it retain any portion of revealed truth, as such, it does so, not in consequence, but in defiance, of its fundamental principle.”

But while many ministers are not much injured apparently by their rationalistic taint, many others are, and all are more or less. Eternity alone will reveal how much faith in God's Word, and therefore in God himself, has been weakened or destroyed by this dread mental disease. Look at the destructive ravages of rationalistic criticism of the Bible. The Unitarians have completed this work and have eliminated all the supernatural from the Divine Record. But it is the preachers in the evangelical churches who are following the Unitarians afar off in this matter, that are doing the most damage to the faith of Christ's followers. I have been there, and know how Unitarians look at this matter. They point to these evangelical preachers as an evidence that the entire religious world is rapidly coming to their position. On the other hand, they look at these preachers with pity and contempt because they do not follow the thing to its logical conclusion, and drop the Bible entirely as a supernatural revelation. And I believe the Unitarians are right in this. The same fundamental reasons that led the rationalistic critics in the evangelical churches to their present conclusions will inevitably and logically lead to the Unitarian conclusions, whenever preconceived ideas and inherited prejudices are sufficiently relaxed. When I first studied this question of destructive higher criticism so called (it is often *hire* criticism) from the rationalistic standpoint and under rationalistic guides, its conclusions seemed the most reasonable thing on earth. I wondered that I had not seen it myself long before, and I looked with pity upon the deluded victims who did not see it. But after I was delivered from rationalism and my eyes were opened, I commenced to study the other side of the question and discovered where I was deceived.

Let me give you a few samples of the reasoning of rationalistic criticism as exhibited by its strongest advocates. Where it says that Jesus walked upon the water, we were gravely informed that Jesus did not walk upon the water at all. It happened to be a foggy morning and the disciples were deceived; he was really walking on the shore. Where it says “one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side,” we were informed that the Greek word here means primarily to prick as with a pin, to pave the way to belittle the wound of Jesus, despite the fact that the narrative adds, “straightway there came out blood and water.” The purpose of this was to make way for the *theory* that Christ did not die on the cross, but was simply in a lethargy, and when he came to in the tomb he pushed the stone away, and this so frightened the soldiers that they took to their heels, thinking it was a ghost, while Christ escaped to the mountains, where he lived secretly the rest of his life and finally died a natural death. All this without a scrap of historical basis, and despite the express declaration of

To Infidelity and Back

the narrative that an expert, who was sent by Pilate to ascertain if he was dead, reported that he was. This is so contrary to the facts of the narrative, and the character of Jesus and his disciples, that it is harder to believe it than any miracle recorded in the Bible. Why these ridiculous and absurd conclusions, despite the historical facts? Simply because of the necessity to get rid of the supernatural at the mandates of rationalism. To preserve such puerilities, the manuscripts were kept in a fire-proof vault lest fire should destroy them. The claims of destructive criticism are so absurd and ridiculous, when looked at from a truly scientific standpoint, that I confine myself in this book to exposing the erroneous viewpoint of rationalism, believing that when that is done any one can easily see that there is nothing in it. Besides, its quibblings have been often and ably exposed by competent authors and their works are accessible to all. That any one who claims to believe the Bible should give his time to teaching innocent and uninformed children and adults the conclusions of rationalistic criticism seems almost too absurd to believe; and when it is done under the pretense of honoring the Bible, it is but another illustration of how our moral and intellectual vision can be warped and distorted when we look through the colored glasses of rationalism and bias.

It is said that a minister kept telling his congregation that different parts of the Bible were myths, legends, etc., and not historical. One of his members cut out of her Bible every section he said was not true. When he made a pastoral call she showed him her mutilated Bible. Upon his remonstrance, she replied that he had said that these parts were not reliable, and so she did not want them as a part of her Bible. He was shocked at his own vandalism.

I have shown that the same rationalistic objections that are brought against facts revealed in the Bible can be brought against facts revealed in nature. The only sensible thing to do is to recognize the limitations of our finite intellects and accept all well-authenticated facts, whether revealed in the Bible or in nature. We must learn that in the very nature of things our finite minds cannot fully grasp and comprehend the infinite. Therefore we have God's revelation in the Bible, which, though not the product of the human intellect, fully satisfies its every reasonable demand.

We have also learned that man has by nature strong religious emotions, which, if exercised, give great joy and peace. Even unguided by revelation, they grope after God with the help of the finite intellect. These emotions are blind and were never intended to give us light. They are a source of great joy and power, but must be guided and filled by divine revelation to be properly exercised. The neglect of this fact has led to all kinds of mysticism and fanaticism. And while this is better and more helpful than cold rationalism, it is nevertheless an unsafe guide, and does more harm than good to humanity. Faithfulness compels me to say that, as rationalism, so mysticism has found its way into the evangelical churches and has done much to rob God's Word of its power and to divide Christ's followers into warring camps. The religion that does not thoroughly enlist, exercise and sanctify the human emotions is not worth having; but we are not to believe every spirit, but to try the spirits by the Word of God. Let us lay aside our "think-so's" and "feel-so's," and let us turn to the revelation that comes from above, that our intellects may be flooded with light and our emotions may be submerged in God's love, so that our entire being—body, mind and soul—may be filled, occupied and sanctified to the glory of Christ.

With the Unitarian movement that started at the beginning of the last century, with so many human instrumentalities back of it, let us compare the Apostolic church which was started in the first third of the first century by a handful of poor, illiterate and despised Galileans. Although the wealth and culture and political power of the world were all against them, at the end of the century we are told that they numbered five hundred thousand.

Again let us compare with Unitarianism, this modern movement for the restoration of primitive Christianity which started somewhat later than Unitarianism. Its reproach in the eyes of men—that it has no literature—is its glory in the eyes of God; for the Bible is its literature. Its work has been done chiefly among and through the common people. At the end of the century it numbered among its adherents more than a million and a

To Infidelity and Back

quarter. While sectarian churches numerically much stronger report meager increases and even decreases, it reports an average of over forty thousand increase for the last several years.

The experiences narrated in this chapter have made real to me the belief that God is in every act of our life. That through his loving care, "all things work together for good to them that love God." When I think of how, in his providence, he took me away from the community and religion of my early neighbors and brought me in a mysterious way to a religion and people I had never heard of, I am overwhelmed with the evidence of his hand in it.

To the honest doubter I would say, take courage, my brother, the Lord will lead you, in his providence, to the way, the truth and the life. I can testify that he brings the spiritually blind by a way that they knew not and leads them in paths they have not known. He makes darkness light before them and crooked things straight, and will not forsake them if they continue to sincerely seek for light until he has accomplished his purpose concerning them and brought them to the feet of Jesus.

To those out of Christ I will say, that I have tasted and seen that the Lord is good. After having tried both, I have found a hundred times more real pleasure in than out of Christ. And while I am yet tied to clay and suffer many things through the weakness of the flesh, so that I groan within myself and long to be entirely delivered from this bondage of death, yet I am filled with love, peace, joy and power through the earnest of the Spirit dwelling in me, and I serve Jesus patiently, waiting for the hope set before me, even the coming of our Saviour, when this corruptible, mortal body shall be changed into the likeness of the glorified body of Jesus, and I shall be with him and shall be like him. Oh, how this hope fills my being with love and joy unspeakable! Will you come and accept this salvation? In the Saviour's name, who died to purchase it for you, we bid you come. *Come while it is called to-day!*

CHAPTER II. MY PARTING MESSAGE TO THE UNITARIAN SCHOOL.

During my third year at the Meadville Unitarian Theological School, after I became thoroughly convinced that the Unitarian position was untenable, and I had found my way back to Christ, it so happened that it was my turn to read a paper and to preach to the school, as the members of the higher classes preached before the school in turn. In these parting messages I frankly and sincerely presented my change of viewpoint, and argued against the Unitarian position as strongly as I could at the time. The school is open, on equal terms, to anybody wishing to study for the ministry, no matter what their views, or what religious body they belong to. Everybody is supposed to be perfectly free to hold and express his honest religious opinions. In the spirit of this generosity, I patiently listened to all the school could offer me in presenting what it believed to be the truth, and gratefully accepted every help it could give me in my search for the truth. I felt I was acting in entire harmony with the spirit of the founders of the institution when I used the knowledge and culture imparted to me in kindly contending for the truth as I saw it, even when it was against the truth as held by the teachers of the school.

Most of my sermon on "The Proper Method of Inquiry in Religion" has been lost or mislaid. But I have the paper read before the school, and the last part of the sermon. I give these here because it shows how the matter looked to me at that time, and how I treated it in the presence of the keen, intellectual audience of students and professors.

The professor of homiletics, who read and criticised all sermons before they were preached, rather took me to task for my bold attack upon Unitarianism, but he admitted to me that, although he had preached and taught it for more than a score of years, there were yearnings in his soul that it did not satisfy. The sermon was listened to with great respect and sympathy, especially by the more conservative students. About ten years later I received a letter from a young Unitarian minister in Massachusetts who referred to the sermon, and said he had never forgotten it, but was often reminded in his experience of how true it was, especially in what I said

To Infidelity and Back

about the coldness and fruitlessness of Unitarianism.

Although the matter in this paper and sermon is largely the same as that in the previous chapter, I present it because, as the line of thought is out of the ordinary and somewhat difficult to the general reader, its repetition in this conversational style will help to get a better grasp of the deadly delusions of rationalism. Truth usually has to be repeated in various ways before it gets a thorough hold upon the average mind. Therefore “precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little and there a little” (Isa. 28:10).

A Religious Discussion Between Mr. Liberal, Mr. Orthodox and Mr. Freethinker.

SCENE.—Ocean of Life. STEAMBOAT.—Experience.

[The three above-named persons had made each other's acquaintance, and had engaged in discussions with each other on several occasions. They now seat themselves in a group on deck and enter upon the following discussion.]

Mr. Liberal—The great objection to your religion, Mr. Orthodox, is that it violates reason and conscience. To be more specific, let us consider a few instances. There is your doctrine of eternal punishment, in which you ascribe fiendish qualities to our dear heavenly Father such as the most savage human being could not be capable of. Then, take your doctrine of the Trinity, around which most of your dogmas cluster, and we see at once that it violates the simplest postulates of reason. I know that you will answer that these are all mysteries which are to be accepted on faith. But it is perfectly clear that there is no mystery about it. It is as clear as daylight that three cannot be one. You talk about mysteries which we must accept by faith, but all such talk is nonsense and ignores our sacred reason. The idea of getting over all difficulties by declaring them mysteries, and exhorting your opponents to leap over them by the exercise of faith, is truly, as some one has said, “a touchstone for whole classes of explanations based on no evidence.” You orthodox people are the cause of all the infidelity that is afloat in the land. People come in contact with your irrational and ridiculous claims, and, taking them as religion itself, they throw overboard the whole business, the good with the bad. What we need is a pure and simple religion that will satisfy man's reason and conscience as well as his heart. And we do not have to go far for such a religion, for we find it in the liberal faith which it is my privilege to represent. Let us compare our grand, simple and rational beliefs with your irrational, absurd and mysterious products of the Dark Ages, and see what a contrast there is between them. Instead of your “Son is God, Father is God, Holy Spirit is God; yet there are not three Gods, but only one,” we have the simple faith in one heavenly Father—all-powerful, all-wise and all-good. No mystery about it. It would be absurd to suppose that such a God could punish his children to eternity, or that He would require the suffering of the innocent to enable him to forgive the guilty. Then, of course, we reject all the absurd dogmas clustering around your conception of the Trinity. The simple belief in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is enough for us. Instead of your endless punishment, we have the reasonable belief that the Father punishes simply to bring us good, so that our joy may be greater. This is all perfectly simple, and can be understood by the uneducated man as well as by the philosopher.

Mr. Orthodox—It is an easy thing to make charges; and, as they are usually made in sweeping terms, it frequently requires hours of time and much explanation to answer the charges made in a few minutes, even when the charges are false. I shall endeavor to defend myself, but must beg you to give me sufficient time to make myself understood. In the first place, I claim, as you say, that you cannot understand all the mysteries about religious doctrines. They must, to a large extent, be accepted by faith. And I claim that it is more reasonable to accept them by faith than to reject them on the ground that you cannot understand them. This may seem ridiculous to you, but wait until I explain myself further. Take eternal punishment. You say that man is a free agent, and that through his free agency he is able to bring evil and punishment upon himself. You say that God has so ordained because it is best for man that he should be left free, even though he

To Infidelity and Back

becomes liable to suffer because of it, as it will be for his final good. In other words, you claim that God does punish his children for their own good. It seems perfectly just to you that God should punish a person because he is a free agent, but when we say that man can bring eternal punishment upon himself through his free agency, then you think it ridiculous, although the principle is exactly the same and the only difference is that of degree. But I see that I must be more general in my statements or I will not get far. You bring a host of other charges against us, either directly or by implication. You say that yours is a pure and simple religion that can be understood by uneducated people as well as by philosophers. Here we get at the very heart of the difference between us. It is true that your doctrines are *very simple*, but that is their chief demerit. *They* are simple, but the facts that they attempt to deal with are very complex. To declare that religious problems are simple is to go counter to the expressed opinions of the great thinkers of all ages. Such questions as evil, good, life, immortality, free will, God, and a host of others, are decidedly complex.

They are largely inscrutable and have always been considered so. And yet all the complex realities of life and death which have defied the theologians and philosophers of all ages, you now tell us are very simple, and you carry the simple solution around with you only too glad to give it free to everybody. Why is it that all of the thousands of worried and distressed souls don't come flocking to you? Why is it that the philosophers and thinkers don't come rushing in from all directions, to get from you the truths they have so long sought after? Why is it that the uneducated masses do not come to you and accept your simple doctrines which they can so easily understand? I know that you are ready with a charge of ignorance, prejudice, self-interest, etc., but I claim that as a rule your charges do not charge. You, believing in an all-wise, all-good and all-powerful God, who is Truth itself, must believe in the triumph of truth; and here I agree with you. I believe that just as soon as truth is brought in contact with error the latter will have to vanish just as sure as the darkness vanishes when a light is brought into a room. Error may apparently linger because of peculiar circumstances which we are ignorant of, but as soon as truth has a fair chance of coming directly in contact with error, the victory is won. I claim, therefore, that the reason that your explanations are not accepted, is because they do not explain. Your doctrines offer protection to a small part of the man, but leave all the rest exposed to the cold and inclement weather. The uneducated do not accept your doctrines because they belie their own experiences.

Mr. Freethinker—I hope you will pardon me for interrupting you, Mr. Orthodox. You are getting too hot. I think it will be better for you to cool off before you continue, and in the meantime I will have my say. That is the greatest objection I have to you religionists— you are all fanatics. You get an idea into your head, and then think that the continuance of the world depends upon you thrusting it into everybody's face. Of course you are willing to suffer for your doctrines, and even to die for them if need be, but that is the way with all fanatics. Your foolish notions give occasion for amusement to cool-headed free thinkers, who see perfectly well that they are all the result of self-delusion. I believe in keeping perfectly cool; in always keeping the head as high above the heart as it is in the body. I don't believe in attacking a man from behind while he is engaged by another in front, but, during the time Mr. Orthodox is cooling off, I wish to show you, Mr. Liberal, wherein I differ from you. Your great appeal is to reason, and I agree with you entirely on that point; but I don't arrive at your conclusions. You have been fixing your eyes on the monstrous outrage of reason in your brother's position so steadfastly, and yours is so much more in accordance with reason, that it is not surprising that you should have failed to see the irrationality of your own position. Furthermore, you have had a great deal of inherited prejudice to overcome, and a man cannot be expected to get rid of all those at once, especially when they have reference to the heart or feelings. You say that your God is all-good, all-wise and all-powerful. The inevitable, logical conclusion from that is that such a God would give his children an infinitely small amount of evil and an infinitely large amount of good. But such is not the case; therefore, to keep that jewel of rationalism which is so dear to you, you must give up your belief in such a God. Just wait a minute! I know that you are ready to give a lot of quibbling that will satisfy some people who follow their prejudices and inherited feelings, but I defy the whole world of logicians to show that such a conclusion is less logical than the claim that there can be three in one. You say that it is in the nature of things that God must give us evil that we may enjoy good the more afterwards. But if you clear yourself from all prejudice, you will see that this is the old method of the ostrich of putting its head under the sand and imagining that its entire

To Infidelity and Back

body is protected. Nay, even worse than that, you don't even protect your head. Any man that gives clear sweep to his reason will see that if God must comply with certain conditions, then he is not all-powerful. If he is all-powerful, he can give us all good without any evil, and if he is all-good it would logically follow that he will do so. Then, again, while affirming that man is a free agent, you at the same time claim that every effect must have a cause, or that something cannot come out of nothing. Now, the reconciliation of these two facts has ever defied the reason of mankind. And those that have adopted the belief in free will have confessed that reason did not lead them to that conclusion, but experience. On the other hand, the logical conclusion is inevitable that man cannot be free. I know that people have endeavored to satisfy themselves to the contrary, and I know that some have really succeeded in deceiving themselves so far as to believe that they could logically hold to it; but I declare that they have never succeeded in convincing any unprejudiced mind, and I defy any logician to prove that the conclusion of free will as consistent with eternal causation, is less absurd than that two and two make five.

Again, you preach that what a man sows, that also shall he reap. If that is true, then no person can really give him anything; therefore philanthropy is a delusion. Now, then, Mr. Liberal, you want to be reasonable and drop the false position to which your inherited prejudices have held you, and adopt my views, which are thoroughly simple and entirely consistent and logical. Belief in God is the product of superstition, and belief in free will is a self-delusion. I know that you will appeal to intuition in this case, but that is only a scapegoat for deluded and illogical minds to hide behind. You see that my conclusion is not only simple and logical, but it is really more beautiful than your complex affair, and you will see it as such after you succeed in overcoming your inherited prejudices. There is no God. The universe is governed by blind law; at least, that is all we know about it. We are evolved from the lowest forms of organic life. What about conscience? Well, that is a matter of education. Of course we should follow it, because it is a safer guide than our present judgment, since it represents the judgment of all our ancestors. Utility is our only standard of right and wrong in morals, and we follow utility because we are not free and are therefore compelled to do so.

Mr. Orthodox—If you are through, Mr. Freethinker, I will now continue. But I must consider myself your opponent as well as Mr. Liberal's. In the first place, I must admit that you are thoroughly consistent with yourself as far as you go. But, my dear fellow, where does your consistency lead you to? You claim to be a freethinker, and yet you conclude that you are an entire slave and even think as you do because you cannot help it.

I stated at the beginning of my reply to Mr. Liberal that many religious facts must be accepted without thoroughly understanding them, and claimed that it is reasonable to so accept them. I will now endeavor to explain myself more fully. It seems to me that if anything has been proven, it is that our logical reason is not always a safe guide. For example, we cannot conceive of an end to divisibility of space; and therefore we cannot conceive how we can reach a given point. Now, practice gives the lie to this conclusion, and if some rationalist should follow his reason here, he would conclude that he can never get a piece of food into his mouth; or, in other words, the logical conclusion would lead to starvation. I know that some will deny this as a logical conclusion to get out of the difficulty. But I could never see it as otherwise than logical, and I have a goodly list of thinkers who have reached the same conclusion before me. Again, it is admitted by all thinkers of all ages that our reason tells us that there cannot be existence without beginning, or, on the other hand, there can be no beginning of existence without something existing before to cause its existence.

The conclusion is that inconceivability is not an infallible proof of the absence of a fact, and that we must follow our experience even if it conflicts with our reason. This is what we claim to do in religion. Whether experience is the sole source of knowledge is a question we need not discuss here. It is certainly the only safe method in most things. For example, I wish to know what will cure a certain disease. Suppose that I find a medicine that has cured every case in which it has been administered. Would it not be irrational for me to refuse to use that medicine because I cannot conceive how it effects the cure? Of course it might be possible that the medicine did not effect the cure; that it was the belief in its curative power that produced the effect.

To Infidelity and Back

Cases have frequently occurred where a thing was for a long time believed to be the cause, while future investigation proved that it was some other attendant circumstance that was the real cause. But if our experience is that a given medicine cures a certain disease invariably, and that no other known medicine will cure it, we would be foolish not to use that medicine. The same is true in religion. If we wish to accomplish certain results and we have found a way in which those desirable results can be brought about, and know of no other way to bring them about; it would be irrational not to adopt that way, or follow out the requirements of that theory. I told you, Mr. Liberal, that your theory or doctrine was too simple. This is still more true of our friend, Mr. Freethinker. You claim to hold very broad, liberal and enlightened views. But although they are broad, they are not deep enough. They are stretched out over the surface merely, and thus hide from your view the great ocean of reality below. Yes, you have an abundance of light, but not enough heat. In the polar regions they have six months of light in one stretch, but no one would think of starting a garden there, as there is not enough heat. To the cold reason of some bachelor it is perfectly clear and indisputable that the young lover is a deluded fool and should follow his reason by never marrying. But I fondly believe that young lover sees the true worth of one human soul, and gives us an idea of the worth we shall see in all souls when we shall cease to see through a glass darkly. As the bachelor does not touch the reality in his case, so I believe that our friend, Mr. Freethinker, does not touch the great ocean of reality in religion. We are convinced by experience that man is free, and that nevertheless eternal causation does exist. We believe these to be two co-ordinate truths and we are willing to wait until we can solve the mystery; but in the meantime we wish to make use of the practical belief in both truths. People are convinced that there is a God who deals out exact justice; yet they are also convinced from experience that there is a God who is love who forgives the penitent sinner. That one God can possess both of these qualities seems as impossible as that three Gods can be in one God. And yet people are convinced that no other theory will explain their complex experiences, and that living according to no other theory will enable them to get the desirable results that they know from experience that they do get. They may be mistaken; but it will be time enough to consider that when some one has a theory that will account better for all their various experiences. Well, you see my point and I shall apply it no further. You see it is simply the principle that the empirical school of philosophy claims to employ, but which many of them employ only in the physical realm and fail to carry into the spiritual or religious realm. They must admit that religious convictions are and have been among the strongest, if not the strongest, motive powers in the world's history. And thus their philosophy of life leaves out the greatest pleasures and mightiest incentives to action found in life.

But Mr. Liberal and his friends would tell us that this all refers to theology. That doctrines are of no account. That what we want is works. Exactly, but don't you see that if after the afore-said experience you should not form the theory that the given medicine cures the given disease and act in accordance with the theory, the result would probably be death instead of health and life? The question is, is it true to experience? Does it accomplish what it purposes to accomplish better than any other theory, and can that result be accomplished only by following the said theory? According to many authorities, most if not all of our physical actions are performed according to a theory based on induction as to facts in the physical world. Thus we arrive at the conclusion that food nourishes our body because it has always been found to do so. In the same way many people have, through experience and facts, come to believe in God who guides them and nourishes them spiritually.

If now we judge by fruits rather than by doctrines, or rather judge our doctrines by their fruits, I claim that the orthodox doctrine is superior to yours, Mr. Liberal. In the first place, you admit that the lower ignorant classes you cannot reach, and you are greatly surprised that they do not eagerly accept your *simple* doctrines. It is not the whole, but the sick, that need a physician. A religion that cannot help those that need the greatest spiritual help cannot be the religion of Christ. But let us suppose that an intelligent foreigner who does not understand our language nor know our doctrines should attend our respective churches and see the result produced— the pleasure taken in coming and receiving our spiritual medicine. And making allowance for all other differences, should observe which helps most to make life worth living, and which makes the most and best changes in the character of its adherents. He would have no trouble to discover that orthodoxy ministers more

To Infidelity and Back

to the needy soul than your simple faith.

You, Mr. Liberal, talk about making infidels of people and drawing them away from the church, but I believe it would have been fortunate for you if you had not mentioned this subject; because you, according to the confession of your own men, have driven more people from the churches than any religious body having a similar numerical strength. You tell people to use their reason, and after you have drawn them out of the orthodox churches by that bait, they see that they must go further than your position to satisfy what you call reason, and they find large numbers among you ready to lead them to that logical conclusion. It seems that the advocates of your liberal faith have always believed that they were on the verge of accomplishing great victories by drawing the multitudes to them; but as with the victim of tuberculosis, who imagines he is getting better all the

time, it is always expectancy and never realization. If it is prejudice that prevents the spread of your belief, then it ought to grow most in New England, where it has largely worn away prejudice. But the facts seem to be that there it is growing the least comparatively; while out West, where it is a novelty and meeting with opposition, it is making the most progress. A person is almost tempted to conclude that if it were not for the opposition of some mistaken people, who do not realize your real error, your progress would come to an end at once.

I believe, Mr. Liberal, that Mr. Freethinker has the best of you because he vanquished you according to your own method of inquiry. But you are more nearly right according to the true method of inquiry. You see it is the proper method of inquiry that I am contending for. A person with the wrong method of inquiry in his head will only be repulsed by poking dogmas at him and nothing can be done with him until he has discovered the fallacy by following his method to absurdity, its natural conclusion. After that he may be induced to follow the empirical method of inquiry with a demonstration that experience and well-authenticated testimony are to be followed rather than rationalism.

What follows is the last part of the sermon on “The Proper Method of Religious Inquiry.” Text: “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.”

It is not only important that we should appeal to our own experience in trying to discover what is true in religion, but we should also take into consideration the experiences of others. If a man, who is partially color blind, should base a science of color on his own experience, it would necessarily be partial or incomplete. So if a class of men, with certain peculiar traits, should build up a system of theology on their religious experiences, it would necessarily be partial and not adequate for universal application. Suppose, for example, that a number of persons with large reasoning powers, cold temperaments, and very little religious feeling, should build up a religious system on their experiences. Is it not perfectly clear that it would be partial and narrow? It would make no allowance at all for people of strong religious experiences. While it might be of some use to these few people, it would never help the great bulk of humanity who need the help of religion the most. To say that a religion is not for the common people is to admit that it is narrow and not true to universal human nature. Certainly it is not Christian, for the common people heard Jesus gladly; and they ever will hear gladly any one who preaches a religion that is true to their own religious experiences.

In trying to discover what is true in religion, we should also carefully examine the religious experiences of all ages, as recorded in their religious writings. I shall here quote from an authority on this point, because I think it of much value, and because it is not probable that the writer was influenced by prejudice and preconceived ideas. I shall quote from John Stuart Mill's “System of Logic,” page 477: “There is a perpetual oscillation in spiritual truths, and in spiritual doctrines of any significance, even when not truths. Their meaning is almost always in a process either of being lost or of being recovered. Whoever has attended to the history of the more serious convictions of mankind—of the opinion by which the general conduct of their lives is, or as they conceive ought to be, more especially regulated—is aware that even when recognizing verbally the same doctrines, they attach to them at different periods a greater or less quantity, and even a different kind of

To Infidelity and Back

meaning. The words in their original acceptation connoted, and the propositions expressed, a complication of outward facts and inward feelings, to different portions of which the general mind is more particularly alive in different generations of mankind. To common minds, only that portion of the meaning is in each generation suggested, of which that generation possesses the counterpart in its habitual experience. But the words and propositions lie ready to suggest to any mind duly prepared to receive the remainder of the meaning. Such individual minds are almost always to be found; and the lost meaning, revived by them, again by degrees works its way into the general mind.

“The arrival of this salutary reaction may, however, be materially retarded by the shallow conceptions and incautious proceedings of mere logicians. ... These logicians think more of having a clear, than of having a comprehensive, meaning; and although they perceive that every age is adding to the truth which it has received from its predecessors, they fail to see that a counter process of losing, truths already possessed, is also constantly going on, and requiring the most sedulous attention to counteract it.”

But, as a matter of fact, people have, as a rule, followed their experiences in everything, despite the sneers and ridicules of the would-be wise. People have planted their vegetables during the increase of the moon despite all ridicule and laughter. And in due time the wise men came to their position, declaring that the sunlight reflected by the moon helps the growth of vegetation. People in all ages have believed in faith cure under one form or another to the utter amazement of the intelligent physicians who made fun of them and pitied their ignorance. But now, through the facts discovered by hypnotism and other means, the scientists are coming around and admitting that the old women were right, that the people really did get help from faith cure.

In religion, too, people have followed their experience, despite the sneers, ridicule and protests of wise men. And, on the whole, I have no doubt that they are better off than if they had listened to the persons who showed them that their beliefs, from a rationalistic standpoint, are false; and at the same time offered them beliefs that were about as ridiculous from a logical standpoint, and which left out all the power and good of their own system of belief.

CHAPTER III. THE FUNCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE MIND.

The objections made to faith are by no means an effect of knowledge, but proceed rather from ignorance of what knowledge is.—*Bishop Berkley.*

No difficulty emerges in theology which has not previously emerged in philosophy.—*Sir Wm. Hamilton.*

The human mind inevitably and by virtue of its essential constitution finds itself involved in self-contradictions whenever it ventures on certain courses of speculation.—*Mansel.*

In the last two chapters I presented the reasons that led me to infidelity and back to Christ, as they appeared to me while in the thick of the conflict and soon after. In this and following chapters I wish to present the matter in the light that has come to me on the subject up to the present date.

As will be noticed in the previous chapters, the external causes that drove me to infidelity were the theology of creeds, sectarianism and the apparent difficulties in the Bible and in religion. But the real underlying cause was rationalism, or a failure to recognize the proper functions and limitations of the finite intellect. In later chapters, I shall show how I overcame the difficulties about creeds and speculative theology and how I solved the problem of sectarianism by turning to Christian union on the primitive gospel. In this chapter I wish to speak more definitely of rationalism or the subjective cause of my infidelity. For, after all, the whole matter resolves itself into a question of psychology, or science of the mind. What is the profit of reading numerous books on the subject, *pro* and *con*, so long as we are reading the books through colored glasses that deceive our vision and lead us to apply false tests as to what the truth in the matter is?

To Infidelity and Back

There must be some matters that require our prayerful and serious consideration, when we observe how the most talented, scholarly, devout and honest of all ages have been divided into warring camps on questions of religion, politics, medicine and science. Certainly truth is not divided; and there must be some mysterious, deceptive mental pitfalls that have caused this Babel of confusion. When we count the cost of this warring conflict of the choicest spirits of the earth in waste, failure, suffering, bloodshed and death, and contemplate the gain in prosperity, progress, happiness and conquest over ignorance and evil, that would have resulted had all the good been enabled to see alike, and thus unite on the truth, we cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that this is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, theme that has ever engaged the attention of mortal man. Well may we ask with Pilate, "What is truth?" Or perhaps the more important question, "How can we discover what is truth?" What is there in the nature of the mind that side-tracks the wisest and best in their effort to know the truth? Why was Paul, the conscientious, intellectual giant, so deceived that he "verily thought he was doing God service" while destroying the best and holiest thing that had ever come to earth? Why did Cotton Mather and other saintly, scholarly Christians martyr innocent saints as witches? Why did devout patriots of the North and South slaughter each other in cold blood? Why were the scientific theses written at Harvard during forty years, all found out of date by Edward Everett Hale? Why are the intelligent and consecrated hosts of Christ wasting three-fourths of their men and money through sectarian divisions? Why are the intelligent, patriotic citizens of America divided into two camps on free silver and other issues when the truth and their interest are one, and by a united effort they could carry every election for truth and righteousness? Common sense asks, Why? The interests of humanity ask, Why? Love and compassion ask, Why? I believe we must find the answer chiefly in the failure to understand clearly the nature and functions of the mind.

The Nature of Conscience.

Turn, for example, to conscience. What is its nature? Is it a safe guide? Does it always tell us what is right? Why has conscience fought on both sides of every great historical conflict? Surely we should stay this awful, pitiable and destructive conflict of the conscientious; at least, long enough to examine most earnestly into the cause of this strange and disastrous puzzle. If conscience is not a safe guide, then woe betide us; for it is the only moral guide we have, or, at least, the only avenue through which human and divine truth can guide us. For it is the moral nature itself.

The eye without light cannot see, but if we are lost in a forest, the eye becomes helpless as a guide, even if there is light. Yet the eye is a safe guide, and in bodily movements it is essentially the only guide we have. We thus learn that to exercise their function the eyes must have light and knowledge of the localities in which they are to act as a guide. What the eyes are in guiding our bodily movements, that the conscience is in guiding our moral actions. But as the eyes without light and knowledge are helpless as a guide, so conscience without love and truth is a blind monster. There is conscience and *conscience*. And as long as we use the term ambiguously and fail to discriminate between conscience proper and the term as used in the looser, larger sense, we will have nothing but confusion. Conscience proper is simply the impulse of the soul that urges us to do right as we see the right. We do not deny that it also embodies the basic element in the soul that enables us to discover what is right; but our conviction as to what is right is dependent upon knowledge acquired through other faculties. When we speak of conscience in the loose and general sense, we refer to both of these elements. In this sense conscience is the product of a number of faculties working together. Thus when we talk about following conscience, we mean following the voice of our moral nature, or the convictions of the highest and best aspirations in our soul. Conscience should always be followed as a guide in both its proper and larger sense; but as an impulse to do what we believe to be right, it is infallible, while as a guide to knowledge of what is right, it is fallible and liable to lead us into all kinds of folly and error.

While, therefore, we should always follow our conscience, or our highest conviction of what is right, we should assiduously probe our conscience day by day to seek for errors in the part that is dependent upon information. In other words, a truly conscientious person not only scrupulously does what he believes to be

To Infidelity and Back

right; but he also constantly strives to get all the truth, that his conscience may be enlightened more and more. To follow our conscience, therefore, in searching for and obeying the truth, is our highest duty to God, and it is the *sine qua non* of acceptance with him. This is the “love of the truth” (2 Thess. 2:10), “the good and honest heart” (Luke 8:15), through which the gospel becomes fruitful. To refuse to follow our conscience, or highest light of duty, as revealed in the Bible or from any other source, is treason toward God in whose image we were morally created; and such persons forfeit heaven, no matter how faultless their outward acts may be. With God it is a matter of the inner motive, as the entire Bible reveals. The man who lives a respectable life outwardly, but fails to meet his inner moral obligations, is not a good moral man, but a hypocrite. Therefore no man can ever be saved without morality in the full and true sense of the word. Conscience, then, enlightened by truth, is the voice of God to the soul. The Proverb says, “The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the inward parts” (Prov. 20:27), while in Rom. 2:14–16 we read: “For when Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, not having the law, are the law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ.”

God wants us to follow our present conviction of duty until by investigation we discover a better one. Thus God guides the individual in his conduct through his conscience enlightened by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 9:1). But this guidance is only for the individual. It has a fallible element in it that needs to be improved by constant and vigilant readjustment as the individual increases his knowledge and sharpens his conscience by exercise (Rom. 12:2). Alas! how much mischief has come from neglect of these facts. How many have tried to thrust the leadings of their conscience on others, in and out of creeds. Again, how many good people have become self-righteous and despised those who differed from them because they mistook matters of opinion and expediency as matters of conscience, through failing to recognize the fallible, variable element in their conscience. How foolish we act if we do not keep in mind these distinctions. The infidel who claimed that he was unhappy because he knew too much, and that Christians are happy because they are deluded, and then promulgated his misery-producing doctrine for conscience' sake, is an illustration of the absurdity into which a sensitive but perverted conscience will lead a person. But yesterday I met a very conscientious young man who left the ministry because he could not agree, with members of the church he was serving, on matters of expediency. On my table lies a letter recently received from a young man who graduated for the ministry last spring, but through doubts, similar to those I formerly experienced, left the ministry for conscience' sake. This unhappiness of doubters and this testimony of their consciences, even while they hold opinions that logically rob conscience of any authority, should cause every one to think; and is strong evidence that skepticism is unnatural and fundamentally wrong. I followed rationalism into infidelity for conscience' sake. I gave up belief in the miraculous and supernatural in the Bible *for conscience' sake*. But after the rationalists had driven me to this bitter end, through my sensitive conscience, I was gravely informed that conscience was a mere creature of education and therefore should only be followed conditionally.

I discovered sufficient truth in this claim to open my eyes to the fact that I had been deceived and had followed the fallible part of my conscience, which is a creature of education, as though it were infallible and the voice of God.

It will be noticed that eternal life depends on the infallible element of conscience, while stupendous, yet only mundane, interests depend upon its fallible element. This is a mystery that perplexes a great many people. Is ignorance an excuse? Does it not matter what you believe, just so you are honest? The highest and best thing anybody can ever do, is to follow his conscience, or the voice of his highest moral and spiritual nature. This the teaching of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. To teach that God would damn a soul for doing this is destructive of all moral distinctions, and is as abominable as the old doctrine that God elects certain people and damns others irrespective of their thoughts and conduct. Ignorance is an excuse if it is *innocent ignorance*. What about those who are willfully ignorant? or those who have a seared conscience? They are not following their conscience at all. Conscience insists that we make every possible effort to get the truth. By a

To Infidelity and Back

seared conscience we mean a person who does not follow his conscience at all, and he knows it.

We know that ignorant innocence is an excuse in the sight of God, but we do not know who is innocently ignorant. The former fact is revealed to us in the Bible, but the latter is known only to God. Therefore in these matters we should “judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the heart; and then shall each man have his praise from God” (I Cor. 4:5).

Nothing has ever been revealed more clearly in the Bible than that innocent ignorance is an excuse in the sight of God. The cities of refuge and the entire ceremonial law were based upon this fact. Christ said, “Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do” (Luke 23:34). James says, “To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin” (Jas. 4:17). In Acts 17:30 we read, “The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked.” In the second chapter of Romans Paul makes it clear that each person shall be judged by the light that comes to him, whether in or out of the law or of the gospel. Heathen people, who never heard the gospel, will not be condemned for rejecting the gospel, but for rejecting the light that came to them through their conscience and through other sources. “For this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil” (John 3:19). But we will be condemned if we do not do all in our power to bring the gospel to the heathen.

We need not worry about the pious, conscientious peoples scattered among the sectarian churches; but we need to worry lest we do not do all in our power to make it impossible for them to remain pious and conscientious while upholding sectarianism. It is our duty to help them to understand the Word; and if, after they understand it, they refuse to obey it, they are under condemnation. But we cannot and dare not decide whether they understand it or not. It is ours to preach the Word, and it will judge them in that Great Day.

The ground or mainspring of conscience is love—love of the well-being or welfare of all sentient beings, or of all beings capable of enjoying happiness. Our conscience goads us to do what love demands as our duty. He who, through want of discrimination, ignores the love element in conscience, becomes a cruel misanthrope, and is misguided by a perverted conscience. May the Lord help us to clear up our minds on this subject of conscience so that this divine light may lead us onward and upward towards perfection in holiness; and that this eye of the moral nature may not be deprived of love and knowledge and thus flounder around like a blind giant spreading misery and suffering everywhere.

The Feelings or Emotions.

Psychology divides the mind into intellect, sensibilities and will. This is doubtless a valuable classification in a general way. But the classification is very general and indefinite. Indeed, school psychology has confined itself almost entirely to a consideration of the *general operations* of the mind and has given us very little light on the classification of the mental faculties. The limited attempts at classification have varied considerably according to the subjective make-up of the author, as the classifications were based on introspection.

While the deductive, axiomatic or intuitive, scholastic or introspective methods of inquiry prevailed in the intellectual world, systems of philosophy, psychology and theology were built up according to the peculiar subjective nature of their author, and held the field until some other strong mind projected its views of the subject and thus rivaled or supplanted the other systems. It was the modern inductive or empirical method of investigation, introduced by Bacon, Locke, Mill and others, that has put knowledge on a real scientific basis and has led to the marvelous scientific and material progress of recent times. I believe the time is not far distant when the old medieval, introspective psychology of the schools will be displaced by a more scientific system. All that is of value in the old system will be retained, but the most valuable psychological knowledge will come from the new system. That this need is generally recognized by those who have given the matter most attention, is evidenced by the words of that prince of modern psychologists, Professor James, when he

To Infidelity and Back

says, "At present psychology is in the condition of physics before Galileo and the laws of motion or of chemistry before Lavoisier." I believe that phrenology has blazed the way for this new psychology. It was violently attacked by the old-school psychologists because it taught that the brain is the instrument of the mind, that the mind has a plurality of faculties and that various brain functions can be localized. Every one conversant with the present literature on physiology and psychology will see that phrenologists have conquered, and that their basic principles are now accepted by all. It is now simply a matter of the application of these principles by further investigation. The psychologists have made some progress in brain localization through various mechanical and more or less abnormal methods of investigation. When they come to a more sensible and natural method of inquiry by observing the concomitance between various brain developments and various mental traits, I feel sure that they will have to admit that the phrenologists are essentially right in their brain localizations, just as they have already admitted that they are right in their basic principles.

That the tide is already turning is manifest from the following quotations.

Alfred Russell Wallace, one of the greatest of scientists, in his book, "The Wonderful Century," says: "I begin with the subject of phrenology, a science of whose substantial truth and vast importance I have no more doubt than I have of the value and importance of any of the great intellectual advances already recorded.

"In the coming century, phrenology will assuredly attain general acceptance. It will prove itself to be the true science of mind. Its practical use in education, in self-discipline, in the reformatory treatment of criminals, and in the remedial treatment of the insane, will give it one of the highest places in the hierarchy of sciences; and its persistent neglect and obloquy during the last sixty years, will be referred to as an example of the almost incredible narrowness and prejudice which prevailed among men of science at the very time they were making such splendid advances in other fields of thought and action."

Benard Hollander, M.D., F.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., in his late book on "Functions of the Brain," says: "What Gall knew at the close of the eighteenth century is only just dawning upon the scientists of the present day. The history of Gall and his doctrine is given in these pages, and will be quite a revelation to the reader. No subject has ever been so thoroughly misrepresented, even by learned men of acknowledged authority." In his "Scientific Phrenology," Dr. Hollander says: "In this volume I have laid stress on the strictly phrenological method of observing special parts of the brain, distinct lobes and convolutions, and comparing their size to development of the rest of the brain—which, if applied in conjunction with the study of the mental characteristics of our fellow-beings, would enable us to make observations by the million. This method, which was considered unscientific, and hence shunned, for a long time, has found favor with scientists, since the author's first papers on scientific phrenology were published in 1886, and was for the first time advocated publicly last year by Dr. Cunningham, professor of anatomy in Dublin University, in his presidential address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association at their meeting in Glasgow. Dr. Cunningham was upheld by Sir Wm. Turner, professor of anatomy at Edinburgh University and president of the General Medical Council, who, like Sir Sam. Wilks, the expresident of the College of Physicians, and the late Sir James Paget, besides others with whom I have not come in contact, have always kept an open mind on this subject. In Germany, Dr. Landois, professor of physiology at Griefswalt, has been long urging a reinvestigation of Gall's doctrines; Dr. R. Sommer, professor of clinical psychiatry at Griessen, recommends it, not dogmatically, but as a working hypothesis; and the Swiss professor of physiology, Dr. Von Bunge, in his text-book just published, acts as pioneer in devoting two chapters to a rehabilitation of Gall; Dr. Mobius, of Leipsic, has published several books on the same subject, and, quite lately, the renowned professor of psychiatry in the University of Vienna, Dr. R. Von Krafft-Ebing, has joined in the defense of this great discovery."

Beecher said that if he were in the pulpit without his knowledge of phrenology, he would feel like a mariner at sea without a compass; and he declared: "All my life long I have been in the habit of using phrenology as that which solves the practical phenomena of life. I regard it far more useful, practical and sensible than any other

To Infidelity and Back

system of mental philosophy which has yet been evolved.”

Horace Mann said: “I declare myself a hundred times more indebted to phrenology than to all the metaphysical works that I ever read. . . . I look upon phrenology as the guide to philosophy and the handmaid of Christianity. Whoever disseminates true phrenology is a public benefactor.”

Joseph Cook declared: “Choosing a foreman or clerk, guiding the education of children, settling my judgment of men in public or private life, estimating a wife or husband, and their fitness for each other, or endeavoring to understand myself and to select the right occupation, there is no advice of which I so often feel the need as that of a thoroughly able, scientific, experienced and Christian phrenologist.”

Oliver Wendell Holmes changed his views on phrenology in his maturer years and said: “We owe phrenology a great debt. It has melted the world's conscience in its crucible and cast it in a new mould, with features less like those of Moloch and more like those of humanity.”

Andrew Carnegie said: “Not to know phrenology is sure to keep you standing on the 'Bridge of Sighs' all your life.”

I think the superiority of the phrenological classification of the mental powers to that of other systems of psychology will be apparent from the following:

Phrenological Analysis of Mental Faculties.

I. Domestic Propensities (Family Affections).

1. Amativeness—Love between the sexes.
2. Conjugal love—Matrimony, love of one.
3. Parental Love—Regard for offspring, pets, etc.
4. Friendship, sociability.
5. Inhabitiveness—Love of home.
6. Continuity—One thing at a time.

II. Selfish Propensities (Lookout for “No. 1”).

1. Vitativeness—Love of life.
2. Combativeness—Resistance, defense.
3. Destructiveness—Executiveness, force.
4. Alimentiveness—Appetite, hunger.
5. Acquisitiveness—Accumulation.
6. Secretiveness—Policy, management.
7. Bibativeness—Fondness for liquids.

III. Selfish Sentiments (Promote Self-interests).

1. Cautiousness—Prudence, provision.
2. Approbativeness—Ambition, display.
3. Self-esteem—Self-respect, dignity.
4. Firmness—Decision, perseverance.

IV. Moral Sentiments (Religion and Morality).

To Infidelity and Back

1. Conscientiousness—Justice, equity.
2. Hope—Expectation, enterprise.
3. Spirituality—Intuition, faith, credulity.
4. Veneration—Devotion, respect.
5. Benevolence—Kindness, goodness.

V. Semi-intellectual Sentiments (Self-perfecting Group).

1. Constructiveness—Mechanical ingenuity.
2. Ideality—Refinement, taste, purity.
3. Sublimity—Love of grandeur, infinitude.
4. Imitation—Copying, patterning.
5. Mirthfulness—Jocoseness, wit, fun.
6. Human Nature—Perception of motives.
7. Agreeableness—Pleasantness, suavity.

VI. Intellectual Faculties.

1. Perceptive Faculties (Perceive physical qualities).

- (1) Individuality—Observation, desire to see.
- (2) Form—Recollection of shape.
- (3) Size—Measuring by the eye.
- (4) Weight—Balancing, climbing.
- (5) Color—Judgment of colors.
- (6) Order—Method, system, arrangement.
- (7) Calculation—Mental arithmetic.
- (8) Locality—Recollection of places.

2. Semi-perceptive or Literary Faculties.

- (1) Eventuality—Memory of facts.
- (2) Time—Cognizance of duration.
- (3) Tune—Sense of harmony and melody.
- (4) Language—Expression of ideas.

3. Reasoning or Reflective Faculties.

- (1) Causality—Applying causes to effects.
- (2) Comparison—Inductive reasoning.

NOTE.—These definitions are taken from “The Self-instructor,” Fowler & Wells Co., New York, the leading phrenological publishing-house.

I have received more help for my practical work in the ministry from phrenology than from any other half-dozen studies, except the Bible. Even if its physical basis could not be substantiated, its analysis of the mental faculties is far better and more helpful than that of any other system of psychology. While it places the intellectual, moral and spiritual faculties at the top as supreme, it is just as vitally interested in the care of the body, education, discipline, self-culture, choice of occupation, matrimonial adaptation, heredity and all the practical affairs of life. How could a person be more healthy, happy and successful than by normally and harmoniously developing all his faculties as phrenology points them out to him?

To Infidelity and Back

Phrenology teaches that the mind has certain elementary, selective instincts, or propensities and sentiments, that attract to them the mental food germane to their function just as the various cells of the body select from the blood the elements required. I say that these instincts have selective power, but they are subject to perversion, and dependent upon the guidance of judgment and knowledge, just as conscience does. Take, for example, the appetite for different kinds of food, the faculty of music, judgment of color, beauty, etc.; and you will see at once that they have selective power, but that this power can become perverted, and thus lead to great difference of opinion. Notice that while these faculties are not infallible guides, and need the earnest help of other faculties to be the most useful to us, no one can deny that they point toward truth on these subjects, and are our proper and only guides along these lines.

Some of the faculties of the mind inspire the specialized affections; as, love for wife, children, home, friends, etc., which are at the very foundation of our Christian civilization. These special affections have their proper claims upon us, and in so far as they are neglected we become unhappy; but when they exert more than their proper influence, they warp our judgment and more or less unbalance our character. How many people are blinded to truth because of selfish love for their children, or their home, or their party, or their church.

There are some things that the feelings cannot do. For example, they cannot give us information about facts outside of the mind. The faculty of love cannot reveal to a young man the existence of a young lady; but when he gets acquainted with her through what he sees and hears, he can feel that he loves her; and after learning that she is willing to become his, he can and will feel happy because of the fact. The world is full of folly, division and fanaticism because people look to their feelings or impressions for things that they cannot furnish. Thus people have claimed immediate knowledge of God, of pardon, of the will of God, of their perfection and security, etc., through their feelings. It is true that God created all nations "that they should seek God, if haply they might feel [Professor Green says the Greek word here means 'to feel or grope for or after, as persons in the dark'] after him and find him" (Acts 17:27). When we see the condition of the heathen nations to whom the revelation of the Bible has not come, we must admit that they are indeed "groping or feeling in the dark after God," as their superstitions and idolatries abundantly testify.

Of course people feel good whenever they follow their conscience, or best conviction of duty; but the feeling of conscience cannot tell them of the gospel of Christ, and of the pardon it makes possible to them. Just as people who trust their "reason," or their "think so's," as the voice of God, naturally reject the Bible as a revelation from God, so those that trust their "feel so's" will naturally have no use for the Bible in conversion, sanctification or as an evidence of pardon. It is easy to become so self-confident about our feelings, or impressions, as to believe them to be axiomatic truths or direct revelations from God. This has been one of the most fruitful sources of strife and divisions in religion, and the handicap that for centuries held the world in medieval darkness. The false prophets of the Old Testament were very religious men. That is, they had strong hereditary religious faculties. But these strong religious feelings, perverted, led them to trusting the imaginations and impressions of their hearts as the will of God instead of following his will as revealed in the Bible (Jer. 23:16, 17, 28, 30-32).

Conscience is a safe guide; but it is not an infallible guide, and it is our duty to perfect it day by day by seeking more truth and obeying it. Our instincts or feelings are safe guides within certain limitations; but they are not perfect guides, and it is our duty to strengthen, guide and restrain them with the knowledge and help that other faculties can supply.

The Intellect.

Let us now see what light we can get concerning the intellect. What are its functions and limitations? Is it safe as a guide? According to the phrenological classification, the intellectual faculties are divided into three classes; viz.: the perceptive, literary and reasoning faculties. The perceptive faculties bring us into relationship with the external world, and through them we learn about the color, size, form, weight, etc., of material

To Infidelity and Back

objects. If the phrenologists are right, then neither those who claim that the mind is like a blank sheet and knows nothing but what it gets from without, nor those who ascribe almost everything to innate, intuitive ideas, are wholly correct. As usual, the truth lies midway between the two extremes. The mind has innate, intuitive powers of perception, selection and discrimination without which material objects, events and thoughts could make no more impression upon us than upon a fence-rail. But these innate powers are subject to improvement by heredity and culture and their dictates must be carefully watched and corrected by other faculties, as they are fallible and most of them subject to perversion and delusion. As the conscience and sentiments although not infallible, are our only guides in their sphere; so our perceptive faculties are good and safe, but not perfect, guides. These perceptive faculties, in a measure, help and correct each other's impressions; and through optical illusions, expectant attention, dreams, etc., we learn that their dictates must be carefully watched and verified. The latest voice of science is that all the sensation produced by physical stimulants can also be produced by the imagination; so that people can feel cold, heat, pain, etc., when there is no physical cause for them. These things should not make us skeptical about our perceptive powers, but rather cautiously critical.

If we turn to the reasoning faculties we find that they have been the cause of most contention and misunderstanding. On the one hand have been the extreme intuitionists, or deductive theorizers, who for centuries limited philosophical thought almost entirely to fruitless, abstract, deductive reasoning based upon premises that had no real foundation in facts. As John Stuart Mill pointed out, the mind may become so accustomed to conceiving of a thing as true that it seems like an axiomatic truth, although facts discovered later may show that it was an error. Thus the time was before modern discoveries, when people could not conceive of persons living under the earth walking with their heads down, or of objects attracted towards each other without some material object to connect them and thus draw them together.

Other extremists have looked upon the mind as a blank sheet, or have become so skeptical of its intuitive impressions that they mistrust its guidance almost entirely, especially in religious matters; although, strange to say, they inconsistently seem to trust it all the more in material things.

It cannot be denied that our "think so's," "feel so's," impressions, prejudices and inherited or preconceived ideas may seem as infallible to us as any so-called axiomatic or intuitive truths. This delusion of the mind has led to multitudes of errors and has held people in bondage to ignorance and superstition in all centuries and in all countries. It has ever been the greatest hindrance to progress. Closely allied to this and reinforcing it is the inertia of the mind, through which it naturally continues to run in the grooves in which it has been running. After awhile the grooves or ruts become so deep and smooth that it seems next to impossible to turn out of them without breaking something or upsetting the mental team. We see on every hand how hard it is to get away from the ideas we have inherited or in which we have lived a long time. When truth, like a vine-dresser, has attempted to trim off these unnecessary and injurious accretions, it has always raised the hue and cry that the foundations of truth were being destroyed.

When Mansel, in his Bampton lectures of 1858, showed that the finite intellect is inadequate and helpless in trying to grasp the truth where *infinity* of any kind is involved, the cry was raised that he robbed reason of its glory and authority, tore away the very foundation of religion and of all truth, and opened the way to all kinds of skepticism. But the very purpose of that marvelous piece of reasoning was to lead people to the truth as revealed in the Bible and to keep them from setting it aside or robbing it of its power because it transcends their finite intellects. Good but misled people, in all ages, have set aside or limited God's Word by their "think so's" or "feel so's," which were mistakingly taken as an infallible test of truth. Just as man by feeling knew not God (Acts 17:27), so man by wisdom knew not God; and it pleased God by the foolishness of a revealed gospel to save such as accept it by faith (I Cor. 1:21). President Schurman voices the highest conclusion of philosophy when he says that the farthest reason can go is to assert that *God is necessary as a working theory*. To this we can add conceptions of God revealed in our moral nature (Rom. 1:19, 20). But what a lifeless skeleton this is compared to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ our Saviour.

To Infidelity and Back

Bacon, Locke, Mill and others have joined in the battle to destroy a false trust in subjective impressions without subjecting them to a fearless test of observed facts as revealed in experience, observation and testimony. This is not intellectual skepticism that destroys all the authority of reason and leaves us to imbecility. Just as the conscience, sentiments and perceptive faculties are our safe, proper and necessary guides, although not infallible, so our logical reason is our safe and necessary guide to truth, although helpless to grasp and understand infinite truths and likely to deceive us unless we carefully test its impressions or conceptions by experience and facts. Reason is the eye of the intellect as conscience is of the moral nature. But as the eye is helpless as a guide without light, and the conscience without love, so reason is helpless and worthless as a guide without facts. There is no conflict between theory and practise if the theory takes into consideration all the facts. For example, if from the fact that a horse can trot a mile in three minutes on the race-track, one should conclude that he can trot from one city to another five miles away in fifteen minutes, the theory would be false, because it did not take into consideration the condition of the road and the fact that a horse cannot keep up the same speed for a long distance. Whatever impressions or conceptions of the mind may be self-evident or axiomatic truths, it is certain that our highest conception of truth must be taken as our only and necessary guide; but, knowing the variable part of our judgment, and knowing how very likely we are to be mistaken in our “think so's” and “feel so's,” we should ever be on the alert to verify or rectify our convictions by the help of experience and facts. The question as to how much of our intellectual power is intuitive and innate, or how much is acquired and dependent upon truth learned by induction, is not so important after all. For the powers of the mind which enable it to learn truths through induction from facts observed and experienced come from God just as much as the powers that enable us to see truth intuitively.

If we take the consensus of all the mental faculties, we have the wonderful human intelligence created but little lower than the angels and crowned with glory and honor (Ps. 8:5). Created in the very image of God himself (Gen. 1:27), man is an intelligence with the threefold guidance of intellect, conscience and sentiments which give him abundant light for his daily walk in the fear of the Lord. But even our so-called “consciousness,” including all these powers, is fallible and subject to deception, perversion and delusion and therefore it needs the help of the truth revealed in the Bible and the help of all the truth we can learn from life and science to enable us to fulfill our highest destiny and to continue to progress Godward and heavenward.

Let us remember that love is the arch that unites and supports all the mental faculties and all the operations of the mind. On it hang all the law and prophets, and the gospel as well. Let us rejoice and glory in our wonderful heritage of intelligence, but, knowing the limitations of our finite minds, let us walk humbly before God and our fellow-men.

CHAPTER IV. LOOKING THROUGH COLORED GLASSES.

Differences of Opinion; the Cause and Cure. What Should Be Our Attitude Toward Those Who Differ from Us?

The above headings will give you some idea of the matter I wish to bring before you in this chapter. From the previous chapters you will learn that it was through years of bitter experience that I was prepared to write this chapter. I write it in love and humility and pray that it may be blessed in warning many of pitfalls in searching for truth and may lead to more charity in dealing with those who differ from us.

I have spoken of the sad and lamentable differences of opinion among the best people on earth during all times and on all subjects. What was said in the previous chapter about the fallible, variable voices of the different parts of the mind blazes the way for a more detailed study of these factors in leading people to error and therefore into divisions. Learning of these weaknesses of the mind, that so easily lead to a perversion of truth, one might hastily conclude that there is no norm of truth and therefore that people cannot see alike. Indeed, the differences of opinion in religion and other matters are often condoned by the assertion that “people cannot see alike.” Is this true, and, if so, how far?

To Infidelity and Back

Over against the statement that people cannot see things alike, I put the indisputable statement that they cannot possibly see things *unlike* if they see them at all. Every person on earth sees red as red, unless, indeed, he is color blind, and then he does not see it at all, in the proper sense of the word. Two and two make four to every mind in the universe. Given the same premises, every logical mind will come to the same conclusion and cannot possibly come to any other conclusion. The whole law and order of the universe is based upon this fact, and without it no science or order would be possible.

We will discover that the differences of opinion among men are not to be ascribed to the intellect so much as to the will and sensibilities. We wish to refer now to a chief cause of division of opinion, and the only one that involves blame; viz.: the human will. Multitudes of people are divided who see things alike and are of the same opinion so far as the intellect is concerned, but the trouble lies in the will power. They deliberately do that which they know is not right, for selfish reasons. If this were the only cause of division, our problem would be an easy one. For then the only proper attitude of the righteous towards those who differ from them, would be that of unqualified opposition. Indeed, we are always tempted to act on this basis by trusting in ourselves that we are right, and treating those who differ from us as wrong and guilty and as deserving nothing but our condemnation. If guilt were the only cause of division, we would have but two political parties, the one containing all the righteous and the other all the wicked. From a religious standpoint there would be but two classes; viz., saints and sinners. But the problem before us is not such an easy one. The causes that lead to differences of opinion are numerous and complex. It is not an easy matter to get at the truth, although we might think at first thought that it is. Every one seems to be surrounded by an atmosphere that reflects, refracts, bends, twists, distorts and colors the rays of truth as they come to him.

Neither age, talent, experience, education, piety nor honesty make a man error-proof; as may be readily discovered even by a child. For the people around us who possess these qualities are divided among all the different religious and political parties. And when people are divided into different parties, that teach contradictory doctrines, they cannot possibly all be right, although they may all be wrong.

Inquiring more particularly into the causes of division of opinion, aside from guilt, we shall discover the following to be among them: finite, limited faculties, limited and false ideas, obtained through heredity and ignorance, preconceived ideas and prejudices.

In the search for truth, as in almost everything else, there are two extremes, both of which should be avoided. On the one hand are those who are too ready to accept new ideas without proper examination. They are “tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine.” At the other extreme stand the narrow, self-righteous bigots who absolutely refuse to even examine the claim of any truth they do not already possess. They know it all without finding it out. It matters not whether you speak of politics, religion or anything else, they know all about it without investigation. They never read any but their own party papers and books and never hear any but their own speakers and preachers.

It is said that a father and son got into a religious discussion. The father was an infidel and the son tried to convert him to Christianity. They argued and argued until midnight. Finally the father said, “Son, there is no use talking, you can’t convert me if you argue all night; I am established.” The next morning they went for a load of wood, and as they left the woods the horse got balky and wouldn’t move an inch. “What is the matter with this horse, anyway?” asked the father. “Why,” replied the son, “he is established.” The Bible says, “Be ye not as the horse or as the mule, which have no understanding.” It is bad enough for a mule to get balky, but what a pity that man, created in the image of God, should become balky and refuse to learn the truths that make for his peace and progress and for the enlargement of the kingdom of heaven.

An Arabic proverb says: “Mankind are four. He who knows not and knows not he knows not; he is a fool, shun him. He who knows not and knows that he knows not; he is simple, teach him. He who knows and knows not that he knows; he is asleep, wake him. And he who knows and knows that he knows; he is wise,

To Infidelity and Back

follow him." The trouble is to know who "knows not and knows not that he knows not," and who "knows and knows that he knows." For they both speak with absolute assurance that they are right.

Illustrations of how blissfully ignorant of truth we can be are found in the facts that Capt. John Smith sailed up the James River to reach India and that the Indians planted gunpowder.

It is said that on Lookout Mountain there is a building with windows so constructed that if you look out through the one you see a snowstorm; through another, you see it raining; while through a third, the sun is shining. Thus it is that we look at truth through the colored glasses of prejudice and selfish interests, and see what is not.

Probably you have heard about the two Irishmen who get into a fist-fight over a soap sign. One insisted that it read "Ivory Soap," and the other, "It Floats." They saw it from a different angle, and that often accounts for differences of opinion.

How expectant attention can deceive us was illustrated a few years ago when Crystal Palace, London, was on fire. A large throng of people were in distress because they saw a favorite monkey burning on the roof. The monkey was later found safe in an adjoining building. It was an old coat that the imagination of the crowd had transformed into a monkey. Thus it is that people see ghosts, and almost anything they are looking for, through a vivid imagination.

In multitudes of cases people are divided because they use words in a different sense, or misunderstand their significance. Years ago, when I was keeping my father's books, there used to come into the office a bright young man who had more natural ability than education. We were both fond of discussion, and often had informal debates. One day we debated on "Woman suffrage." I opened up on the subject and as I proceeded my opponent got restless to reply. When he took the floor he exploded something as follows: "I am opposed to 'Woman Suf-fer-age' with every drop of vitality within my skin. I will use hand, tongue and purse against 'Woman Suf-fer-age.' In short, I am so bitterly opposed to 'Woman Suf-fer-age' for the all-sufficing reason that I don't want women to suffer." I said, "Amen!" and we were agreed for once. You smile, and yet three-fourths of our differences would vanish if we patiently conferred together long enough to understand each other clearly.

The courts recognize that the best of people are blinded when their own interests are involved, and reject jurymen on this basis. Who expects parents to be perfectly impartial in their judgment when their own children are involved?

The difference of opinion on the slavery question was largely a matter of geographical location, and 90 per cent, of us belong to the political or religious party to which our parents belonged or to the one to which our associations or environment drew us. Had we been born in the Catholic Church most of us would be good, faithful Catholics, as all history demonstrates, and as our own lives in other directions abundantly prove. In a series of articles entitled "Why I Am What I Am," one of the most noted preachers in this country candidly admits that his church relationship is a mere matter of birth. This truth is not very congenial to our boasted independence of thought and investigation, but it is the truth nevertheless. The power of the above-named fetters to hold us in bondage to error is illustrated in all history, sacred and secular. It took Peter about ten years after Pentecost, with special miraculous manifestations, to see that Gentiles were *creatures* as well as Jews, and that therefore he was commissioned to preach to them also. Paul, the pious, earnest and conscientious, "verily thought he was doing God service" in persecuting the Saviour who had been pointed out as the Christ by many infallible proofs. The Jews crucified the Lord of glory largely through ignorance, due to their being blinded by their traditions, or inherited religious ideas, and therefore Jesus prayed on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Luther was mighty in throwing off his inherited ideas, and yet he retained so many of them that any church that would to-day practise and teach just as Luther

To Infidelity and Back

did, would be considered very near to the Roman Catholic Church. Cotton Mather, one of the most enlightened men that ever lived, believed in witches and hung them, and many of the pious and enlightened people of New England shared this belief with him. Good, pious neighbors will give testimony in court, as to what they saw and heard, of the most contradictory character. In nine cases out of ten, we find in the Bible just what we bring to it; and thus the most pious and best educated see the most contradictory doctrines in the same passages of Scripture and fight for them with the greatest tenacity, all in the name of conscience. And the saddest thing about it all is that all these people show by their consecrated lives that they love God and are sincerely trying to serve him. In politics, we see the same pitiable state of affairs. In 1896 about one-half of our good Christian men voted for the free coinage of silver to save their country, and the other half voted for a gold standard for the same reason. It does not require any argument to prove that at least half of these voters were so blinded by ignorance and party bias that they did not see the truth, and possibly all of them were. What a great pity that the good Christian people should be thus divided through party bias and prejudice and go to slaughtering each other, like the enemies of Israel; so that they simply neutralize each other's influence and power, while the enemy of right runs off with the victory and spoil. It is this mixture of the good with the bad in two political parties that enables evil to hold its own; while if all the good were united, through the truth, into one political party, arrayed against all the bad in another political party, they could carry this country for Jesus Christ at every election.

Having considered the causes that lead to differences of opinion, how, in the light of these facts, should we treat those who differ from us?

In the first place, we should deal with them in humility. When we see how the great and good men of all history have been hindered from seeing the plainest and simplest truths by their inherited and preconceived ideas, it should take the conceit out of us and make us very fearful lest we are suffering with the same dread disease. For it is to be noted that hardly any one who suffers from this malady is aware of it. Cromwell's words to Parliament will bear a universal application, when he said, "I beseech you, by the bowels of the Lord, that you conceive it possible that you may be mistaken." Not only is it possible, but it is probable, that we are mistaken in a great many of our ideas. Therefore we should approach others in an humble, teachable spirit. Let us not imagine that we know it all, and treat those who differ from us with self-righteous scorn and contempt.

And that leads me to say that we should treat those who differ from us, with love, respect and sympathy. I believe that more reformers have been crippled in their efforts by failing in this than in any other way. We are likely to attribute all our failures to the sin and bad character of others, when the fault often lies in ourselves. God gives a vision of some great truth or needed reform; as, for example, the prohibition of the liquor traffic, or the union of God's people on the primitive gospel. The message is sweet to us, and so we go on our way with great joy, feeling sure that we will soon convert everybody to our righteous cause. But, alas! we soon discover that people will not convert very fast. Our argument seems to us more clear and infallible every time we repeat it, and yet the people fail to come to our position. And so we are likely to lose faith in the people, and come to the conclusion that it is nothing but sin and guilt that causes them to reject our message. The next step is to forget our own weaknesses, trust in ourselves that we are right, and treat with hate and contempt those who differ from us. Treating our opponents with hate and scorn, we lose both our humility and Christian character, and develop into the most hideous and ungodly characters on earth, self-righteous Pharisees. And so it happens that we reformers often need reformation worse than those whom we seek to reform. But you say, did not Jesus and the Apostles severely denounce sinners? Yes, but they always first made sure that they were sinners. Jesus could read men's hearts and, therefore, made no mistake, while Paul always reasoned with his opponents out of the Scriptures in love and humility, and only condemned them after clear and positive evidence that the fault was in their motive. Paul says, in writing to Timothy, "the servant of the Lord must not strive; but must be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." And, where he exhorts to "reprove" and "rebuke," it is with "all longsuffering." James says, "The wrath of man worketh not

To Infidelity and Back

the righteousness of God” We are never commanded to despise, hate or denounce any man; but, on the other hand, we are to love every one, even our enemies.

We are all human, and when it is as clear as daylight to us that we have the truth and argument on our side, it is a great temptation to cut to pieces and roast our opponents. But is it Christ-like to do it? Do we forget how long it took us to come to the position that now seems so clear to us? Some one has said that, in dealing with children, “we should remember that they are left-handed,” and this is certainly true of people in their relation to truth. The slowness with which people take up new ideas is a merit as well as a fault. We could have no stability and progress anywhere if it were not for this inertia in convictions. “The Athenians and strangers sojourning there spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing,” and if we would all be occupied in that way, not much would be accomplished in the world. If we would become disciples of every propagandist whose arguments we cannot answer on the spur of the moment, there would be nothing but change and confusion. Realizing the difficulties in the way of finding truth, and observing how even the wisest and best have been deceived and ensnared in error, naturally ought to make people conservative in accepting new ideas, and the same reasons should make us patient with those who differ from us. They usually need our patient and sympathetic instruction more than our contempt, hatred and denunciation.

All this being true, we should never forget, however, that it is our sacred duty to treat those who differ from us, *in truth*. There are two attitudes that are very easy to take. The one is to treat our differences with childish sentimentalism, saying, “Peace, peace,” when there is or ought not to be any peace. The other is to hate and abuse those who differ from us, and to treat their opinions as beneath our contempt. But the difficult thing to do is to tell the whole truth, as we see it, and to do it in love and humility. We are under obligation to tell the truth boldly whatever the outcome may be. To those who threaten us and command us not to tell the truth, we must reply in the language of Peter and John: “Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.” When people cry, “Peace, peace,” at the expense of truth and right, and want us to speak “smooth things” instead of God's Word, we must take warning from God's words to Ezekiel, which apply to every preacher of truth, “When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life: the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand.” Paul went into the Jewish synagogues repeatedly to lead them into the full truth, although he raised strife and contention in so doing, and even suffered violence at their hands. Unfortunately, a large per cent. of Christians have formed a conspiracy of silence on matters in which they differ. We have so little of the Spirit of Christ that we cannot even talk over our differences without getting angry and exhibiting the fruits of the flesh. And so we say, “We will agree to disagree,” and we continue to nourish, pet and worship our differences as if they were gods. This puts a mighty padlock on the growth into the unity of the faith and knowledge and judgment which Christ and the Apostles enjoined upon us. We need to get the New Testament conception of the hideousness and sinfulness of all divisions among God's people. And while we recognize the fact that there will always be differences of opinion as long as we are ignorant and sinful and weak, nevertheless it is our Christian duty to use our utmost effort to diminish and remove these differences. There always will be sin in this world but we dare not be satisfied with it or abide in it; but, on the other hand, we must fight it with all the power we possess. The same is true with divisions and differences of opinion.

We must, however, not overlook the important differences between matters of faith and of opinion. Matters of faith are directly revealed in the Bible, and upon these all Christians can and must agree as soon as they get a fair look at them. While matters of opinion, which are not directly revealed in the Bible, but are inferred from things revealed, are important, they are not all important, like matters of faith. But the more we overcome the hindrances to finding truth, of which we have spoken, the more we will be of the same mind and judgment in all things. For truth is not divided, and we will all see it alike in so far as we see clearly. As a rule, we can readily unite on the most important truths, and therefore on those we need to unite on for our present duty. While, if, through lack of faith, we turn away from the clear duty to seek one that is easier, and requires less sacrifice, we usually become hopelessly divided and thus fail in our effort.

In conclusion, having a clear conception of the baneful and ruinous effect of differences of opinion, and being aware of the powerful causes which hinder us from getting at the truth and thus divide us, let us strive day and night, in prayer and labor, to get the truth ourselves and to lead others into the truth. For in and through the truth, we shall, with “one mind” and “one soul,” go conquering and to conquer, in the name of King Jesus, for the enlargement of his kingdom of love, peace and joy.

PART II. HOW I FOUND CHRIST'S CHURCH

CHAPTER I. SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM.

One of the chief things that led me to identify myself with the people working for Christian union, was my experience with regard to baptism. Indeed, I am more and more convinced that baptism is the main key to the question of Christian union. We can differ on questions of theoretical theology and still work together in harmony in practical Christian activities. But if we differ on the question of baptism, we cannot take the first step in preaching the gospel and in leading souls to Christ, in the New Testament way, without getting into conflict. The only way that union meetings of different denominations have been at all possible, has been by ignoring the plain teaching and practice of the Apostles on the question of baptism. We never can have Christian union in the authority of Christ, which is the only union which will satisfy his prayer and demand, until we agree on the two simple ordinances which are the forms in which the gospel embodies itself to bless our souls. And, fortunately, these are the easiest things to unite on. When free from prejudice, there is no question on which Christians can more easily agree than that of baptism, as the testimony of the scholars and churches that follow in this chapter abundantly demonstrate. The consummation of Christian union will have to patiently wait until inherited and acquired prejudices become sufficiently allayed so that all Christians can look at the question of baptism dispassionately. Then it will be discovered that we all agree on this question and the main barrier to Christian union will be removed. In our weakness we want to procure Christian union without giving up our sectarian ideas that have been superadded to the New Testament teaching, and that have caused our division. And so we try to compromise by “agreeing to disagree” or by ignoring the teachings of the New Testament. But such efforts must be futile and disappointing. We can never unite on the gospel until we agree in the gospel teaching. We can never unite in obeying the Master until we unite in our opinions as to what the Master has commanded us to do. But, thank God, the field is rapidly ripening for this agreement and consequent union.

As is usually the case, I received my early ideas on baptism by heredity and environment, so far as I had any ideas on the subject. The religious people with whom I was associated in my early life taught and practiced sprinkling and infant baptism, and, of course, I assumed that they must be right in the matter. Although I read the Bible through several times, I did not see its teaching on this subject, as I was not particularly interested in it. For reasons explained in previous chapters—that we look through colored glasses—multitudes of people daily read their Bible who never see what is in it; but imagine, as a matter of course, that it teaches what they bring to it through hereditary and preconceived ideas.

As already stated, I was first led to think on this subject while I studied New Testament Greek under President Cary, of the Meadville Theological School. When we came to the word *baptizoo*, Dr. Cary told the class that all Greek scholars of note agree that the meaning of the word in the mouth of Jesus was *to immerse*. This statement was a great surprise to me, and I decided to discover for myself whether this was the fact or not. This was the beginning of my investigation of the subject of baptism. I found that Dr. Cary was correct in his statement. What influenced me greatly was the fact that the German rationalists, who are recognized as among the best scholars of the world, and who are perfectly impartial on this subject, as they do not care what the Bible teaches about baptism, all say that baptism is immersion, without ever hinting at a possibility for difference of opinion. I investigated the matter for several years, as I found opportunity, until there was not the shadow of a doubt left in my mind that immersion is New Testament baptism.

To Infidelity and Back

While a student at Oberlin Theological Seminary, I found that all the authorities they used in New Testament Greek, taught immersion, while their churches practise sprinkling. In studying Hebrews in the Greek, we used Dr. Westcott's commentary. When we came to Heb. 10:22, "having our bodies washed with pure water," Dr. Westcott said this referred to the "laver of regeneration" or the primitive practice of immersion. When we studied Romans in Greek, we used Dr. Sanday's International Critical Commentary. The professor told us it was the very best and probably would be for years to come. When we came to Rom. 6:4, "buried with him through baptism," Dr. Sanday never raised a doubt about the meaning, but in eloquent words spoke about the beautiful representation of burial and resurrection with Christ in baptism. This astonished me very much, as Drs. Westcott and Sanday were noted Episcopalian scholars, and the Episcopal churches practise sprinkling. We used Dr. Thayer's New Testament Greek lexicon, which the professor informed us was the very best in the English language. This lexicon defined *baptizoo* as meaning *to dip*, and never hinted that sprinkling or pouring might be its meaning. As I said above, I found Dr. Cary correct in claiming that all Greek scholars of note agree that the meaning of the word in the mouth of Jesus was *to immerse*, and I have never been able to get hold of a single New Testament lexicon that defines *baptizoo* as ever meaning to sprinkle or pour.

The following chart and facts will help us to get at the truth about the meaning of the Greek word *baptizoo* without quoting from a long list of lexicons:

[Illustration: A STUDY IN MEANING OF WORDS.]

You notice in the chart that we have three separate and distinct words in the Greek for immersion, sprinkling and pouring; and these words have their primary or proper, secondary or tropical meanings, all of which must be differentiated. The primary or proper meaning has reference to specific acts, the secondary meaning refers to things done by means of these specific acts, while the tropical or metaphorical meaning departs from the specific meaning of the words and therefore cannot have reference to the specific outward acts indicated by the words. For this reason it is a law of language, recognized by all scholars, that you must give a word its primary or proper meaning when it is employed in commanding an outward act, unless the context demands another meaning.

Notice the English words *shoot*, *hang* and *poison*. These express specific outward acts; and, then, in their secondary meaning, they mean to kill, but always to kill in the way indicated by the primary meaning of the word. A man can be hung, shot or poisoned without being killed; but if it is reported that he was hung, shot or poisoned, we would all understand that he was killed. However, you cannot conceive of words so changing their meaning, that when it is said a man was hung, it means that he was shot, or when it is said he was poisoned, it means he was hung. No more is it conceivable that when the Greek word *baptizoo* (to immerse) was used, it meant to cleanse by sprinkling (*rantizoo*), or when the word *rantizoo* (to sprinkle) was used, it meant to cleanse by immersing (*baptizoo*). These words refer primarily to separate and distinct outward acts. It is true they may meet in their secondary meaning in the idea *to cleanse*; but they always refer to cleansing in the way indicated by the primary meaning of the word used. When they travel so far from their primary or proper meaning, which has reference to specific outward acts, that their meaning is said to be tropical or metaphorical, they lose their specific idea and have no longer any reference to the specific acts denoted by the words.

It is true that words can and do often change or enlarge their meaning. But this is always to supply a need created by the lack of a proper word to express an associated idea. Now, both the specific and general ideas with reference to the application of water are so copiously supplied with words in the Greek, that they preclude the necessity of changing the meaning of a word like *baptizoo* to supply such a need. We have *louoo*, to wash or bathe the body; *niptoo*, to wash a part of the body, as the hands, feet, face, etc.; *plunoo*, to wash clothes; *brechoo*, to wet, to rain; *katharizoo*, to cleanse; *ekcheoo*, to pour; *rantizoo*, to sprinkle; *baptizoo*, to immerse, etc.

To Infidelity and Back

Thus we have a threefold guard to keep *baptizoo* to its primary or proper meaning of *to dip* or *immerse*. First, an abundance of Greek words to express every general and specific idea about the application of water, except that of immersion; second, the fact that a tropical meaning of a word cannot refer to the specific outward act indicated by the word; and third, the law of interpretation which demands that a word be given its primary or proper meaning in commandments, or plain narrative, unless the context expressly demands a different meaning.

The above definitions of the word *baptizoo* are taken from Dr. Thayer's "New Testament Greek Lexicon." In reply to letters inquiring about Dr. Thayer's "New Testament Greek Lexicon," the following answers—were received. It is the "best" (Professor Hodge, of Princeton); it is the "very best" (Dr. Alexander, of Vanderbilt University); "nothing can compare with it" (Dr. Hersman, president of the Southwestern Presbyterian University). This opinion is practically made unanimous from the fact that Dr. Thayer's Lexicon is used at all of the leading schools in the country.

A request for an authoritative lexicon that gives "sprinkle" or "pour" as a meaning of *baptizoo*, elicited the following answers: "There is no such lexicon" (Professor Humphreys, of the University of Virginia, and Professor D'ooze, of Colby University); "I know of none" (Professor Flagg, of Cornell); "I do not know of any" (Professor Tyler, of Amherst). "*Baptizoo* means *to immerse*. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this."—*Dr. Moses Stuart*.

Thus we learn, through the testimony of experts, without consulting all the numerous Greek lexicons, that they define the word *baptizoo* as meaning *to immerse* and that none of them say it means *to sprinkle* or *to pour*.

The great mass of Christians know nothing about the Greek experts who make the lexicons, but are much better acquainted with and influenced by the great church leaders and church standards. Therefore we present the following quotations:

Scholars and Churches Admit that Christ Taught Immersion.

NOTE.—These quotations are taken from a tract of mine on baptism.

1. *Council of Toledo*, 633 (Catholic): "We observe a single immersion in baptism."
2. *Council of Cologne*, 1280 (Catholic): "That he who baptizes when he immerses the candidate in water," etc.
3. *Martini* (Roman Catholic): "In all of the pontificals and rituals I have seen (except that of Madeleine de Beulieu), and I have seen many, ancient as well as more recent, immersion is prescribed."
4. *Dollinger* (Roman Catholic): "Baptism was administered by an entire immersion in water." (Chu. History, vol. 2, p. 294.) "A mere pouring or sprinkling was never thought of." (First Age of Chu., p. 318.) "Baptism by immersion continued to be the prevailing practice of the church as late as the fourteenth century." (Hist. Ch., vol. 2, p. 295.)
5. *Ritual of Greek Catholic Church*: "The priest immerses him, saying the servant of God is immersed, in the name of the Father," etc.
6. *Russian Catechism* (Greek Catholic): "This they hold to be a point necessary, that no part of the child be undipped in water," etc.

To Infidelity and Back

7. *Alex. De Stourdza* (native Greek): “The verb baptize, *immergo*, has, in fact, but one sole acceptation. It signifies, literally and always, to plunge. Baptism and immersion are, therefore, identical, and to say baptism is by aspersion is as if one should say, immersion by aspersion, or any other absurdity of the same nature.” (Con. sur LaDoc. et L'Esprit, p. 87.)
8. *Dr. Kyriasko*, of University of Athens, Greece: “The verb baptize in the Greek language never has the meaning of to pour or to sprinkle, but invariably that of to dip.” (Letter to C. G. Jones, Lynchburg, Va.)
9. *Syrian Ritual* (Nestorians): “The priest immerses him in water, saying such a one is baptized in the name of the Father,” etc.
10. *Martin Luther*: “Baptism is a Greek word. In Latin it can be translated immersion, as when we plunge something into water, that it may be completely covered with water; they ought to have been completely immersed.” (The Sacrament of Baptism.)
11. *Lutheran Catechism*, p. 216: “In what did this act (baptism) consist?” Answer: “The one to be baptized was first immersed in water, signifying death, and then he was drawn out again and was dressed with a new dress, as if he now were a different new being.”
12. *John Calvin* (Presbyterian): “The word baptize signifies to immerse, and it is certain that the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient church.” (Inst. Book 4, c. 15.)
13. *Richard Baxter* (Presbyterian): “It is commonly confessed by us to the Anabaptists, as our commentators declare, that in the Apostles' time the baptized were dipped over head in the water.” (Dis. Right to Sac., p. 70.)
14. *Dr. W. D. Powell*, while in Athens, Greece, wrote: “I found that all churches in Greece—the Presbyterian included—are compelled to immerse candidates for baptism, for, as one of the professors remarked, 'the commonest day laborer understands nothing else for *baptizoo* but immersion.’”
15. *Zwingle* (Reformed): “When ye were immersed into the water of baptism, ye were engrafted into the death of Christ.” (Com. Rom. 6:3.)
16. *John Wesley* (Methodist): “We are buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.” (Notes on N. T., Rom. 6:4.) “Baptized according to the custom of the first church and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion.” (Journal, vol. I, p. 20.) In Savannah, Ga., Sept., 1737, Wesley was found guilty of breaking the laws of the realm, among other things “by refusing to baptize Mr. Parker's child otherwise than by dipping.” (Jour., vol. I, pp. 42, 43.)
17. *The Methodist Discipline* of 1846, and the old Discipline compiled by Wesley himself, assert that “Jesus was baptized in the river of Jordan, and that the sixth of Romans means simply a burial in water.”
18. *Adam Clark* (Methodist): “As they received baptism as an emblem of death, in voluntarily going under the water, so they received it as an emblem of the resurrection into eternal life, in coming up out of the water.” (Com., vol. 4, N. T.)
19. *Prayer Book* (Church of England): “The priest shall dip him in the water, discreetly and warily.”
20. *Conybeare and Howson* (Episcopalians): “It is needless to add that baptism was administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism has rendered obscure to

To Infidelity and Back

popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture.” (Life of St. Paul.)

26. *Prof. L. L. Paine* (Congregational): “It may be honestly asked by some, Was immersion the primitive form of baptism? As to the question of fact, the testimony is ample and decisive. It is a point on which ancient, medieval and modern historians alike, Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Calvinist, have no controversy. No historian who cares for his reputation would dare to deny it, and no historian who is worthy of the name would wish to.”

27. *Dr. George Campbell* (Presbyterian): “I have heard a disputant of this stamp, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the N. T. baptize means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge. One who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend; and though in respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments, sometimes better, yet a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood even in support of the truth.” (Lect. on Pul. El. Lect, 10, pp. 294, 295.)

28. *Philip Schaff* (Un. Theo. Sem.): “The baptism of Christ in the river Jordan, and the illustrations of baptism used in the N. T., are all in favor of immersion rather than sprinkling, as is freely admitted by the best exegetes, Catholic and Protestant, English and German. Nothing can be gained by an unnatural exegesis.” (Teaching of Apostles, pp. 55,56.)

29. *Paul*: “We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” (Rom. 6:4.)

30. *Peter* says our bodies are washed in baptism, (1 Pet. 1:23.)

31. *Mark*: “Jesus—was baptized in [Marg., Greek, *into*] the Jordan” (Mark 1:9, A. R. V.). He could not have been baptized *into the water* without being immersed.

Churches Have Changed Immersion to Sprinkling.

1. The first record of sprinkling for baptism is that of Novatian, A. D. 250. It was thought he was dying and, as he could not be immersed, they sprinkled water on him. Thus originated what was called *clinic* or *death-bed* baptism. Its introduction was vigorously opposed for centuries and clinics were not admitted to sacred orders, many doubting their baptism.

2. *Pope Stephen III*. In 754 the monks of Cressy asked Stephen III.: “Is it lawful, in case of necessity, occasioned by sickness, to baptize an infant by pouring water on its head from a cup or the hands?” The Pope replied: “Such a baptism, performed in such a case of necessity, shall be accounted valid.” Basnage says:” This was accounted the first law against immersion.”

3. *The Council of Ravenna*, 1311, decreed: “Baptism is to be administered by trine aspersion or immersion.” This was the first authority for sprinkling except in case of sickness.

4. *Cardinal Gibbons* (R. Catholic): “Since the twelfth century the practice of baptizing by affusion has prevailed in the Catholic Church, as this manner is attended with less inconvenience than baptism by immersion.” (Faith of Our Fathers, p. 275.)

5. *Bishop of Bossuet* (R. Catholic): “The case (communion under one kind) was much the same as that of baptism by immersion, as clearly grounded on Scripture as communion under both kinds could be, and which, nevertheless, had been changed into infusion, with as much ease and as little contradiction as communion under one kind was established, so that the same reason stood for retaining one as the other. It is a fact most

To Infidelity and Back

certainly avowed in the Reformation, although some will cavil at it, that baptism was instituted by immersing the whole body in water. This fact, I say, is unanimously acknowledged by all the divines of the Reformation: by Luther, by Melancthon, by Calvin, by Casaubon, by Grotius, by all the rest.” (Varia. Protest., vol. 2, p. 370.)

6. *Archbishop Kenrick* (R. Catholic): “The change of discipline which has taken place as to baptism should not surprise us, for, although the church is but the dispenser of the sacraments which her Divine Spouse instituted, she rightfully exercises a discretionary power as to the manner of their administration. Immersion was well suited to the Eastern nations, whose habits and climate prepared them for it, and was, therefore, practiced in the commencement, whenever necessity did not prevent it. Cases, which at first were exceptional, gradually multiplied, so that, at length, the ordinary mode of baptism was by affusion. The church wisely sanctioned that which, although less solemn, is equally effectual. The power of binding and loosing, which she received from Christ, warrants this exercise of governing wisdom. It is not for the individuals to question a right which has been at all times claimed and exercised by those to whom the dispensation of the mysteries is divinely intrusted.” (Kenrick on Bap., p. 174.)

7. *Haydock, Endorsed by Pope Pius IX.*: “The church, which cannot change the least article of faith, is not so tied up in matters of discipline and ceremony. Not only the Catholic Church, but also the pretended reformed churches, have altered the primitive custom in giving the sacrament of baptism and now allow of baptisms by sprinkling and pouring water upon the person baptized.” (Notes on Douay Bible, Matt. 3:16.)

8. *Lutheran Catechism*, p. 208: “What is baptism?” Answer: “To dip under water.” “Do we still baptize in that way?” Answer: “No; because of the rough climate, the subject now is only sprinkled.”

9. *John Calvin* (Presbyterian): “Wherefore the church did grant liberty to herself, since the beginning, to change the rites somewhat, excepting the substance. It is of no consequence at all whether the person that is baptized is totally immersed, or whether he is merely sprinkled by an affusion of water. This should be a matter of choice to the churches in different regions.”

10. *Westminster Assembly* (Presbyterian), 1643: “In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted; 25 voted for sprinkling, and 24 for immersion; and even that small majority was obtained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in that assembly.” (Edinburgh Ency., vol. 3, p. 236.)

11. *Dr. Wall* (Episcopalian): “One would have thought that the cold countries should have been the first that should have changed the custom from dipping to affusion. But by history it appears that the cold climates held the custom of dipping as long as any; for England, which is one of the coldest, was one of the latest that admitted this alteration of the ordinary way. . . . The offices or liturgies for public baptism in the Church of England did all along, so far as I can learn, enjoin dipping, without any mention of pouring or sprinkling. The Prayer Book, printed in 1549, adds: ‘And if the child be weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it’” (Wall’s Hist. Inft. Bap., vol. 3, pp. 575, 579.)

12. *Dean Stanley* (Episcopalian): In speaking of immersion, he says: “The cold climate of Russia has not been found an obstacle to its continuance throughout that vast empire. Even in the Church of England it is still observed in theory. The Rubric in the public baptism for infants enjoins that, unless for special causes, they are to be dipped, not sprinkled.” (Institutes, pp. 18, 19.) The Church of England has changed to sprinkling, but its creed teaches immersion.

13. *Sir John Floyer*: “I have now given what testimony I could find in our English authors, to prove the practice of immersion from the time the Britons and Saxons were baptized, till King James’ days, when the people grew peevish with all ancient ceremonies, and through the love of novelty and the niceness of parents,

To Infidelity and Back

and the pretense of modesty, they laid aside immersion.” (History of Cold Bathing, p. 61.)

14. *Bishop A. C. Coxe, editor of Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Episcopalian): “The word (*baptizo*) means to dip. In the Church of England dipping is even now the primary rule. But it is not the ordinary custom. It survived far down into Queen Elizabeth's time, but seems to have died out early in the seventeenth century. I ought to add that in France (unreformed) the custom of dipping became obsolete long before it was disused in England. But for this bad example, my own opinion is, that dipping would still prevail among Anglicans. I wish that all Christians would restore the primitive practice.” (In a letter to J. T. Christian.)

Thus we have the testimony of all the scholars in all the churches, who are recognized as Greek experts outside of their own party, that the New Testament teaches immersion and that it has been changed to sprinkling and pouring by human authority. We do not believe that this change was made with a bad motive. It was evidently done in sincerity and in the honest belief that it was the right thing to do. We must accept the honest testimony of these scholarly experts that the New Testament teaches immersion, but we certainly believe they were mistaken in taking the liberty to change Christ's command. If we take such liberties, all of the commandments of Christ will soon be set aside and confusion will be worse confounded. Indeed, it is this very liberty of substituting what men thought best for the things revealed in the New Testament, that has caused our present sectarian divisions by adding human names, creeds, customs, etc., to the primitive gospel.

Scriptures to Show It is Wrong to Change Christ's Commands.

“They have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant” (Isa. 24:5).

“Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandments of God, ye hold the tradition of men. Ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition. Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered; and many such like things ye do” (Mark 7:7–9, 13).

“Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto” (Gal. 3: 15).

“Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry” (I Sam. 15:22,23).

“He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination” (Prov. 28:9).

“Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell; and great was the fall of it” (Matt. 7:24, 26,27).

“If ye love me, keep my commandments. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. If a man love me, he will keep my words. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you” (John 14: 15,21,23; 15:14). “Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say” (Luke 6:46).

“And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him” (Luke 7:29,30.)

“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” (I John 2: 3,4).

To Infidelity and Back

But, after all, the very best way for ordinary people to learn the meaning of baptism, is to go to the English Bible. Although human authority and prejudice have hindered the translators from translating the Greek word, and thus telling us what it means in English, the contexts and sidelights on the subject make its meaning so plain that all can readily see it if divested of prejudice and preconceived ideas.

By reading the introduction to the English Revised Bible, you will learn that the translators of the Authorized Version were forbidden to translate the word. Other translators have followed their example; so that it is neither translated to *sprinkle*, *to pour* nor *to immerse* in our standard English Bibles. The Greek word *baptisma* has simply had the last letter dropped and been carried over into English bodily. But the word has been translated in numerous editions in various languages, and whenever it has been translated, it was always by the word *immerse* or an equivalent term. No scholar, in any language, has ever had the temerity to translate it *to sprinkle* or *to pour*. Even our English translators translate it when it is not used as an ecclesiastical term. And when they translate it, they say it means *to dip*. In 2 Kings 5:14, we read of Naaman, “He went down and *dipped* [*baptizato*] himself seven times in Jordan.” We may not have a sufficient knowledge of Greek to determine what Jesus meant when he commanded us to be baptized. But the Apostles certainly understood him; and if we can find out what they did when they baptized, and we do the same thing, then we know we are right, and have done what Christ commanded.

Let us turn to the Sacred Record and see what they did when they baptized.

We read: “And there went out unto him all the country of Judaea, and all they of Jerusalem, and they were baptized of him *in the river Jordan*, confessing their sins. . . . And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John *in* [Greek *into*, marg. of A. R. V.] *the Jordan*. And straightway *coming up out of the water*, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him” (Mark 1:5,9,10). “John was baptizing in AEnon near to Salim, *because there was much water there*” (John 3:23). “And they *both went down into the water*, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him. And when *they came up out of the water* . . . he went on his way rejoicing” (Acts 8:38,39). “We are *buried with him by baptism*,” “*planted in the likeness of his death*,” “and *raised in the likeness of his resurrection*” (Rom. 6:4,5). “Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and *our bodies washed with pure water*” (Heb. 10:22). “Except a man be *born of the water* and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven” (John 3:5). The italics are mine.

The following chart summarizes our study of baptism in the English Bible:

BAPTISM IN THE ENGLISH BIBLE

THE BIBLE AND IMMERSION SPRINKLING AND POURING REQUIRE: REQUIRE:

1. Water. Acts 8:36; 10:47 1. Water
2. Much water. John 3:23 2. Little water
3. Going to water. Mark 1:9 3. Bringing water
4. Going into water. Acts 8:38 4. Staying out of water
5. Putting into water. Mark 1:9 5. Putting water on
(Margin of A. R. V)
6. Form of burial. Col. 2:12 6. No form of burial

To Infidelity and Back

7. Form of planting. Rom 6:5 7. No form of planting
8. Form of birth. John 3:5 8. No form of birth
9. Form of resurrection. 9. No form of resurrection
Rom. 6:4
10. Form of doctrine. Rom. 6:17 10. No form of doctrine
11. Bodies washed. Heb. 10:22 11. Head wet
12. Coming up out of the water. 12. No getting out
Mark 1:10

We thus learn that in being baptized they *went to water*, to *much water*, *went into the water*, were *put into the water*, were *buried in the water*, *planted in the water*, *born out of the water*, *raised out of the water*, had their *bodies washed* and *came up out of the water*. If we do these things, we are Scripturally baptized and have been immersed.

The following passages are the only places where sprinkling and pouring are found in the New Testament:

Sprinkling and Pouring in the New Testament.

1. Heb. 9:13.—Blood.
2. Heb. 9:19.—Blood.
3. Heb. 9:21.—Blood.
4. Heb. 10:22.—Hearts.
5. Heb. 11:28.—Blood.
6. Heb. 12:24.—Blood.
7. 1 Pet. 1:2.—Blood.
8. Matt. 26:7,12.—Ointment.
9. John 2:15.—Money.
10. Acts 10:45.—Spirit.
11. John 13:5.—Water.
12. Luke 10:34.—Oil and Wine.
13. Rev. 14:10.—Wrath.

You will notice that none of these Scriptures refer to baptism and that none of the Scriptures that do refer to baptism hint at sprinkling or pouring as the action. Sprinkling and pouring for baptism must come from some other source. We have already learned whence they came.

Some people will argue against immersion for hours, and when they are driven into their last trenches, and about to be caught, they try to escape by saying, “Baptism doesn't amount to anything at any rate, it's a mere form. The great thing is Holy Spirit baptism.”

To begin with, Holy Spirit baptism is not baptism at all, strictly speaking. It is only figurative baptism. It is not always called baptism. It is called *an anointing* (Luke 4: 18), *a drinking* (1 Cor. 12: 13), *an enduing* (Luke 24:49), *a filling* (Acts 2:4), and a *sealing* (Eph. 1 : 13). No person can be literally sprinkled or poured with the Holy Spirit, or immersed into Him, as the Holy Spirit is a person. The figurative meaning of baptism is to overwhelm, and to be baptized with the Holy Spirit is to be submerged or overwhelmed in His power, or to come completely under His control. Holy Spirit baptism is not a command to obey, but a promise to enjoy. It

To Infidelity and Back

can only be administered by Christ himself (John 1:33). Therefore, whenever in the New Testament baptism is commanded for preachers to administer or sinners to obey, it can never refer to Holy Spirit baptism, but must always refer to water baptism.

In the light of New Testament teaching and practise, it is marvelous that any one who claims to follow its guidance, can make light of baptism. “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why did Christ walk eighty miles to be baptized of John, and insist that it was necessary for him to be baptized “to fulfil all righteousness”? (Matt. 3: 13–17). “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why, in giving his commission to all gospel workers, did Christ say, “Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them”? (Matt. 28: 19). Those who neglect to baptize their converts have certainly not wholly obeyed their Lord. “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why did Jesus say, “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved”? (Mark 16:15, 16). Not only is every preacher commanded to baptize every convert, but every convert is also commanded to be baptized; and baptism is made one of the conditions of salvation with every proper gospel subject. “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why did Jesus say to Nicodemus, “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except one be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot inherit the kingdom of God”? (John 3:5). All church standards refer this to baptism. “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why did Peter, on Pentecost, when he used “the keys of the kingdom,” revealed Christ's will and testament for sinners, and thus proclaimed the conditions of salvation, or of forgiveness, to all whom the Lord should call through the gospel, say to penitent seekers, “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit”? (Acts 2:38). And why is it said, “They then that received his word were baptized”? (Acts 2:41). Will not the same follow to–day if people will receive the Word of God without any subtractions? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why is it said of the Samaritans that “when they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women”? (Acts 8: 12). Will not the same follow to–day when people believe the whole gospel? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why is it said of the eunuch that when Philip “preached unto him Jesus,” he said, “Behold, here is water; what does hinder me to be baptized”? And why did he not go “on his way rejoicing” before he “came up out of the water”? (Acts 8:35,39). If our converts do not ask for baptism, and we send them away as finished products without going down into the water with them, are we preaching and practising the same gospel as did the primitive evangelists under the guidance of the Holy Spirit? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why did not even Christ himself speak peace to the soul of Saul, but sent him to Damascus and directed Ananias to tell him what he must do, who said to him, “And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord”? (Acts 9: 6, 7; 22: 16). Does not the Lord send his servants to–day with the same message to those who put off their obedience to him in baptism? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why was there a special miraculous demonstration to avoid objections to the baptism of the household of Cornelius, the first Gentile converts; and why did Peter command them to be baptized with water, after they had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit? (Acts 10:44–48). Does not this show that Holy Spirit baptism was not to displace water baptism? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why was Lydia baptized as soon as she gave “heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul”? (Acts 16: 14, 15). If properly instructed, will not all people be baptized as soon as they are willing to give heed unto the word of the Lord? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why, when the Philippian jailor was told by Paul and Silas what he “must do to be saved,” was he baptized “immediately,” “the same hour of the night”? (Acts 16: 29–33). Will not the same gospel, if preached in the same way, have the same effect to–day? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why is it said that “many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized”? (Acts 18:8). Will not those who hear and believe in sincerity to–day also be baptized? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why is it said by the Holy Spirit that Priscilla and Aquila expounded unto Apollos “the way of God more accurately,” after “he was mighty in the scriptures” and “had been instructed in the way of the Lord,” and “taught accurately the things of Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John”? (Acts 18:24–26). If the Lord was then concerned to have preachers set right on water baptism, even when their gospel knowledge was accurate in every other particular, does he not have a similar concern now? and if our hearts are in perfect accord with his, will his concern not be our concern? “Baptism a mere form?” Then, why was it Paul's first concern, when he came to Ephesus, to set the

To Infidelity and Back

brethren right on water baptism, even though they were called “disciples,” and had already been baptized (immersed) once? (Acts 19: 1–7). This shows that baptism is not a mere outward act, but is important because of its relation to the Lord Jesus, an obedient heart, and to the Holy Spirit. If the Lord, through the Apostle, directed these disciples to be baptized a second time, when they found they were not Scripturally baptized, are not these his directions for to-day also? and should not his preachers show people the truth if they have not been Scripturally baptized, and, if possible, induce them to obey the Scriptural baptism, even when they thought they had been Scripturally baptized?

It is true that Paul said to the Corinthians, “I thank God that I baptized none of you, save Crispus and Gaius; *lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name.* And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel” (1 Cor. 1: 14–17). In the words I have placed in italics, we are told why he was glad he baptized only a few of them. It was lest they should be his partisans, as they were divided on human leaders. We certainly dare not so interpret the words, “for Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel,” as to contradict the commission of Christ and all the numerous clear Scriptures we have just quoted. He evidently meant that he himself did not do the baptizing, but had others do that part of the work, while he gave his time and strength to the preaching of the gospel. The same was true of Jesus himself, as we learn from John 4:1, 2: “When therefore the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John (although Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples).” He baptized them and he didn't baptize them. That is, he commanded them to be baptized and had his disciples perform the act. So evidently with Paul. If he meant that his converts were not to be baptized, then he would certainly not have baptized any of them.

That Paul was zealous in seeing that all his converts were baptized, is apparent from the cases already quoted, especially the baptism of the Ephesians. For when he discovered that their baptism was not Scriptural, he, first of all, insisted that they be baptized again. It is further apparent from his teaching in his Epistles. In 1 Cor. 12:13 we read, “For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body ... and were all made to drink of one Spirit.” In Gal. 3:26, 27, we read, “For ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.” In Rom. 6:3, 4, we read, “Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life.” In Col. 2: 12, we have similar language, “having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who also raised him from the dead.” In Heb. 10:22, it is said, “Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience: and having our body washed with pure water.” After reading these Scriptures, no one can doubt that Paul had all his converts baptized, and believed in baptism just as strongly as Christ and Peter.

That Peter had the same opinion about baptism near the end of his life, as at Pentecost, is evident from his words in I Pet. 3:21: “Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ.”

That to refuse to be baptized after knowing that Christ has commanded it is to disobey him and to rebel against his authority, is clear from the words of the Holy Spirit recorded in Luke 7: 29, 30: “And all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him.”

And yet, despite all these Scriptures, many pious saints are so blinded by their prejudices and traditions, that instead of encouraging and exhorting people to obey this command to be baptized, that is given to test the soul's complete surrender to Christ, and is called the “obedience of faith” or of the gospel, they encourage people to live in disobedience to Christ by affirming that baptism is “a mere form” or “non-essential.” If subordinates in an army or earthly kingdom act thus and use their influence to induce others to disobey the

To Infidelity and Back

orders of those over them, they are punished for treason. Any army that is thoroughly united in the authority of its commander and cheerfully and promptly obeys his orders, is usually successful; while the largest and best army on earth would be doomed to defeat the moment its officers and men would disobey orders and each do as he pleases, or as he thinks best. The reason Christ's, army on earth to-day is weak and constantly defeated and retreating is because his orders are disregarded and the "think so's" and traditions of men are followed instead. Implicit obedience to the few simple commands of Christ would at once unite all his followers into one invincible army that would enable the world to believe and know that he is the Christ of God (John 17:20, 23).

If anything is clear, it is that Christianity is a personal matter. That each individual must meet and accept for himself the claims of Christ. No one can be saved by proxy. No one can go to heaven because of the faith, obedience or prayers of a parent, wife, husband, sister or brother. This being true, as Christ has commanded every creature to be baptized (Mark 15: 15, 16; Acts 2: 38, etc.), it is evident that infant baptism is not valid. The parents cannot obey for the child, however good their intentions. The child, when it reaches the age of accountability, must face the commandments of Christ for itself, and either deliberately obey or disobey and reject him. If infants remained infants, they would do no harm in the church, even if they could do no good. But they will grow into accountability and then the church is full of unconverted people.

May we prayerfully do all in our power to hasten the day when all of Christ's followers will forsake the traditions, in which men have changed Christ's teaching on baptism, and will gloriously reunite in his will on this command which is so clearly revealed in the New Testament.

CHAPTER II. THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.

"See that thou make all things according to the pattern that was showed thee."—Heb. 8: 5.

Introduction. My early ideas of the church, its doctrines, and of the teachings of Christ as revealed in the New Testament, were rather general and vague. As is usual, it was chiefly a matter of hereditary traditions. After I found my way back to Christ and to belief in the Word of God, the question naturally arose, which church shall I join, if any? Sectarian divisions had a hand in driving me into infidelity and confusion, and I was now compelled to investigate more closely this strange puzzle. As I have already intimated, what I learned at Meadville about baptism and the teachings of the various religious bodies, had directed my attention to the people generally known as "Disciples of Christ" or "Christians," who are working for Christian union through the restoration of the primitive church. I will now give the result of my study of the model church as revealed in the New Testament.

NOTE.—Most of this and the following chapter are taken from my booklet on "The Church of Christ: What It Is, and Why It Exists."

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

The primary meaning of the word *church* is a local body of Christians organized for work and worship (Acts 14:27). From this its meaning enlarged so as to apply to the members of all the churches (Eph. 3:10), and finally to all the saints in heaven and on earth (Heb. 12:23).

Of Christ expresses the church's relationship to Christ. It is Christ's church. He bought it (Eph. 5:25), built it (Matt. 16:18), and is its foundation (1 Cor. 3:11). It is his body (Rom. 12:5), of which he is head (Col. 1:18) and which is so identified with him that it is called Christ (1 Cor. 12:12); it is his kingdom over which he is king (Matt. 16:19); it is a fold of which he is the shepherd (John 10:16); he is a vine of which the members are branches (John 15:5); it is his house (Heb. 3:6); it is his dearly beloved wife (Eph. 5:25; 2 Cor. 11:2). Christ so loves the church and identifies himself with it because of the sweet, loving, spiritual fellowship there is

To Infidelity and Back

between himself and it; and because it is his visible representative here on earth, and the instrument through which the Holy Spirit's work in the conversion of the world and the sanctification of believers, is carried on.

Other names given to the church are "church of God" (I Cor. 1:2), "churches of God" (I Thess. 2:14), "churches of saints" (I Cor. 14: 33), "temple of God and of the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 3:16), and "the pillar and ground of the truth" (I Tim. 3:15). All these names are Scriptural and proper when used in the proper way.

Church—members.

The members of the church or churches of Christ are called "Christians" (Acts 11:26; I Pet. 4:14, 16), "disciples" (Acts 9:1), "saints" (Rom. 1:7), "brethren" (I Cor. 15:6), "members" (Rom. 12:5), etc., all of which names are right when used to express the proper idea or relationship.

The Greek word for church is *ekkleesia* and comes from *ekkaleoo*, which means *to call out* or *summon forth*; and members of the church are the ones who have been called of God (2 Tim. 1:9) through the gospel (2 Thess. 2:14) from a life of sin to a life of holy service (Acts 26:16–18). Church—members or Christians are said to be "saved," "elected," "washed," "sanctified," "redeemed," "recreated," "regenerated," "translated," "espoused," "converted," "reconciled," "adopted," "quickenened," "resurrected," etc. This gives us an idea of the radical change that must take place before a person can become a true church—member. It will be noticed that the change expressed by these terms is twofold. The one is subjective, and the other objective. The one is a change of heart or character, and the other is a change of state or relationship to God. The heart is changed by the Holy Spirit (John 3:5), through the preached gospel (1 Pet. 1:23), which leads to faith (Rom. 10:17; Acts 15:9) and repentance (Acts 2:38); while the attitude toward God is changed by confession (Rom. 10:9), obedience in baptism (Acts 2:38) and by God's pardon to the sinner (Acts 2:38). The necessity of this twofold change is manifest from Christ's teaching when he says, "Make disciples of all nations, baptizing them" (Matt. 28:19), "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16), and "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). Also by the teaching of the Apostles when they say, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:38), "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts 22:16), "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. 3: 5), "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3:26, 27), "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body...and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13), "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 Pet. 3:21), "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. 6:3, 4).

If it were God's purpose to simply save individuals, privately and without human agency, the subjective change of heart is all that would be necessary. But a home must be provided for the nurture of the new—born spiritual babes and a church organized to herald the gospel to every creature; therefore, a definite act of open committal or enlistment is required in baptism. When this becomes thoroughly understood, the emphasis the New Testament puts on baptism will be appreciated, and people will no longer avoid the passages that refer to it, or try to explain them away. Neither faith, repentance nor baptism have any saving virtue in themselves. They are important only because of their relation to Christ and the sinner. As Christ has made them conditions of salvation to those who have heard the gospel, they must either obey or be rejected because of a rebellious heart (Luke 7:29, 30).

To Infidelity and Back

We learn that to be qualified for membership in Christ's church a person must know the Lord (Heb. 8:11), must believe in him (Acts 8:37), must repent of his sins (Acts 2:38), must confess him as Christ (Rom. 10:9), and must obey him from the heart in baptism (Rom. 6:17). All these are conscious, personal acts that must be performed by the person becoming a member. No one can become a member by purchase, fleshly birth, or the obedience of parents or other persons. It will also be noticed that according to the teaching of the New Testament the conditions of salvation and church membership are the same. The New Testament never speaks of persons as saved or Christians who are not members of the church of Christ where they live.

Church Officers.

On the divine side the church of Christ is a kingdom with a constitution and an absolute ruler. But the administration of this kingdom, as it comes in contact with the varying conditions that confront it in the world, is left to the local church with its officers. Officers are elected to increase the efficiency of the church in service (Acts 6:1–7). In Eph. 4:11, 12, we learn what the officers of the church of Christ are and why they are appointed. “And he gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” Deacons were also appointed to serve tables and assist in other ways (Acts 6:1–7; Phil. 1:1). The Apostles were personally commissioned by Christ (John 20:21–23; Acts 26: 16), miraculously inspired to teach (1 Cor. 2:12, 13; 1 Pet. 1:12) and endowed to perform miracles (2 Cor. 12: 12) and to confer miracle-working power on others (Acts 8:17, 18). After the church was thoroughly established and the New Testament written the apostolic office with its miraculous accompaniments ceased (Heb. 2:3, 4; 1 Cor. 13:8). Prophets were appointed by miraculous endowment and ended with the same. Evangelists, elders and deacons are the permanent officers of the church of Christ. The special work of evangelists or preachers is to make disciples and to organize and strengthen churches. Elders, or bishops, or pastors are local church officers, a plurality of which was appointed in each church (Acts 14:23). Their function is concerned with the spiritual welfare of the church. The work of deacons has already been indicated. The qualifications of evangelists, elders or bishops and deacons are given in the epistles to Timothy and Titus. The church officers are selected by the members (Acts 6: 1–7), and important matters of discipline are decided by a majority vote of the church (2 Cor. 2:6, see Greek). The local church government then is administered by a majority vote of its members and by the officers authorized by such a majority. Outside of Christ and the Apostles the New Testament does not recognize any authority higher than that vested in the local churches. General ecclesiastical organizations and church dignitaries with high-sounding titles are human inventions that were added later. Where there is no organized church to act, individual Christians have authority to administer the affairs of the church or kingdom (Acts 8: 4; 9: 10–18; ii: 19–21). The only apostolic succession endorsed in the Bible is that which results from following the example of the Apostles in teaching and practice.

A Christian's work in the local church is obligatory under Christ. In addition to the local church work, early Christians co-operated in work covering a large territory and scope; and formed a simple organization for this purpose (1 Cor. 16:3; 2 Cor. 8:18, 19, 23). This example shows that voluntary organization of individual Christians for general co-operative work is proper and Scriptural. Of this nature are missionary societies and benevolent associations which are formed to carry on general work, but have no ecclesiastical authority.

The Mission of the Church.

The mission of the church is to perpetuate and perfect itself and to add to its membership, through evangelization, the entire world as far and as fast as possible. The fundamental means adopted to carry out this mission is the church service. Our word *church* is not derived from the New Testament word used in speaking of the body of believers, and it has a tendency to hide the real idea of the New Testament. It primarily refers to a church building, then to the body of believers worshipping in the building, and finally to believers in general. The inspired writers use the word *ekkleesia*, which means a gathering of people called from their homes into some public place. A correct translation would be “*assembly*” or “*congregation*,” as it has reference

To Infidelity and Back

primarily to a local body of Christians assembled for work and worship. If this primary idea were restored, it would make mightily for the strengthening of Christ's kingdom. We usually put the emphasis on the church *in general, universal and invisible*, while the Holy Spirit puts the emphasis on the *local, visible and tangible* church. Our practical duties are connected almost entirely with the local church to which we belong and through which we chiefly help to build up the general and invisible church. The church is the assembled Christians first of all, and the first duty of Christians is to assemble (Heb. 10:25). For people to say that they belong to the church (assembly), who do not assemble or attend the church services, is an anomaly, strictly speaking.

The purpose of the assembly or church services is revealed to us in Acts 2:42, where we have a record of the practice of the first church of Christ. We read, "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Here are four things mentioned as belonging to the service of the church. The first has reference to teaching the Word of God or, more especially, the teachings of Christ as revealed through his Apostles in the New Testament. The Apostles received their teaching through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit who revealed in the New Testament all things necessary for our guidance and edification (2 Pet. 1:3; Jude 3). Christ gave his Apostles commandments before his ascension (Acts 1:2), which they were to teach to the church (Matt. 28:20), and the church is exhorted to give heed to these commandments (2 Pet. 3:2). Not all the commandments that Christ gave while on earth are for the church, but only those he instructed the Apostles to teach after the descent of the Holy Spirit and the establishment of the church on Pentecost. Paul exhorts Timothy to commit unto faithful men, who are able to teach others, the things he had heard from him (2 Tim. 2:2), and further exhorts him, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15); "I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word, be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine" (2 Tim. 4:1, 2). Alas! how often this last solemn charge of Paul goes unheeded. We preach in season and out of season, but do we preach the Word of God as we ought? The emphasis the New Testament puts on the Word of God can scarcely be overestimated. It is the incorruptible seed (1 Pet. 1:23) employed by the Holy Spirit to beget the Christian (Jas. 1:18; 1 Cor. 4:15); it is the sword of the Spirit (Eph. 6:17) by which he pierces the sinner's hard heart (Heb. 4:12) and brings conviction to his soul (John 16:8,9); it is the nourishment for the new-born spiritual babe (1 Pet. 2:2); it is the means used by the Spirit to strengthen, sanctify and build up the members of the church (1 Thess. 2:13; John 17:17; Acts 20:32); it "is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3:16,17). No other books were used in the early church as authoritative and all efforts to replace it or to supplement it with human creeds, catechisms or disciplines is an unwarranted effort to steady the ark of the Lord.

The second item of the public services is *fellowship*. The original word here is *koinoonia*, which, according to Dr. Thayer, means "joint participation," "a benefaction jointly contributed, a collection." The word sometimes refers to joint participation in religious privileges and sometimes to joint collections or contributions made for gospel work. It seems to have the latter meaning here, as spiritual communion is embodied in the next item. That this was a feature of the public service is apparent from the words of Paul in I Cor. 16:2, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." The Emphatic Diaglott translates thus, "Every first day of the week let each of you lay something by itself, depositing as he may be prospered." While Paul gives these directions in reference to a particular collection taken for the poor saints in Judea, it is evidently given because it embodies the divine wisdom as to the best way of raising church money. It teaches that *each* church-member is to give *weekly, according to his ability*. When this precept is practiced and we restore the liberality of the primitive church (Acts 2:44, 45; 4:32, 35), there will be no financial problem in the church.

The third item in church worship, according to Acts 2: 42, is the "breaking of bread," or the Lord's Supper. This was the most important thing in the early church service. It was to commemorate the death of Christ and

To Infidelity and Back

to point forward to his second coming (I Cor. 11:26). Every Christian is under obligation to partake of the Lord's Supper (I Cor. 11:24), but each must examine himself before eating lest he eat condemnation to his soul (I Cor. 11:28, 29). The greatest thing in the Lord's Supper is a spiritual eating or communion (John 6:32–58), and this is needed frequently. The primitive churches of Christ observed the Lord's Supper whenever they met for worship (I Cor. 11:20), and this we learn was every first day of the week. "Upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread" (Acts 20:7). The Greek article "tee" here indicates that it was on *every* first day of the week that they met to break bread and this is confirmed by I Cor. 16:2. The early churches never met for worship on the seventh day of the week or on the Sabbath, but always on the first day of the week, or on the Lord's Day, in commemoration of Christ's resurrection from the dead. It was the practice at first to have a meal in connection with the Lord's Supper, but as this led to abuse it was abolished by Paul (I Cor. 11:20–22, 34). The feet-washing which is commonly supposed to have taken place at the time Christ first broke bread with his disciples, was simply a custom in vogue in that country, which Christ used to teach a lesson on humility. We have no record that the Apostles ever washed feet as a church ordinance or desired others to do so. When Christ washed feet it was not at a public church meeting, but at a private feast.

The fourth item in church worship, as mentioned in Acts 2:42, is "prayers." The primitive church believed profoundly in prayer. In fact, the entire New Testament is the record of a prolonged prayer-meeting. Paul, in writing to Timothy, says, "I exhort therefore that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men" (1 Tim. 2:1), and Christ admonishes his disciples to "watch and pray" (Matt. 26:41).

Self-preservation is the first duty, upon which all our helpfulness to others depends. So it is with the church. Its first duty is to perpetuate and strengthen itself through the means of grace God has provided; but it will become sick and soon die, if it does not reach out in loving services to others. It is commissioned to "make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:18), but it cannot do this by merely proclaiming the gospel to all people. Paul preached the gospel in many lands, and a few missionaries could soon evangelize the entire world if this were all that is necessary. God spent thousands of years to prepare the soil for Paul's preaching and confirmed his message with miracles. We cannot evangelize the world by giving a few dollars to send a few missionaries to preach a few sermons. Most of the work of missionaries is educational and philanthropic, or, in other words, preparatory. It will require the best and united efforts of all Christians to entirely open the door of faith among the heathen. Christ says, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16). Peter exhorts Christians, "Having your behavior seemly among the Gentiles, that, wherein they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works which they behold, glorify God" (I Pet. 2:12). The churches need the miracle of good works, through the power of the Holy Spirit, to confirm the message of our missionaries. The acts that emanate from so-called Christian nations and people do more to hinder than to help the missionaries. If Christians will, by the power of the Spirit, live the life of Christ in the home, in business, in politics and everywhere, the heathen will soon glorify God in Christ because of the good works which they behold. "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit" (John 15:8).

It is the mission of the church to bring heaven down to earth. If this is the high and holy calling of the church, is it a wonder that Christ so loved it as to give his life for it? The church is the "pillar and ground of the truth" or the material organization through which heaven is bearing its message of love to this sin-cursed world. Speaking of the church, Paul says, "If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy" (I Cor. 3:17). All who attain unto the mind of Christ will love the church and give themselves for it.

The Unity of the Church.

It was God's eternal purpose to unite all things in Christ (Eph. 1:9, 10). Christ declared that he would establish but one fold (John 10:16); he prayed that all his followers might be perfectly united and put that union as a

To Infidelity and Back

necessary condition for the conversion of the world (John 17:20–23); he died to unite all in one body (Eph. 2: 14– 16), of which he is the head (Col. 1: 18).

If we turn to the book of Acts, we discover that the Holy Spirit, through the Apostles, did establish but one church, and that it was thoroughly united in love, teaching and practice.

If there ever was an excuse for different Christian denominations, it was for a Jewish Christian denomination and a Gentile Christian denomination; but the Holy Spirit did not establish such denominations and Paul put forth the effort of his life to prevent such a breach. Where in all history can you find twelve men more radically different mentally and temperamentally than the Apostles? Yet the Holy Spirit did not establish separate churches to cater to and further develop these temperamental eccentricities. All were united in one church so they could counterbalance and complement each other and thus perfect their own character and give greater symmetry to the church. “And when the day of Pentecost was fully come they were all with *one accord in one place*” (Acts 2:1). After three thousand were added unto them we read, “They continued daily with *one accord* in the temple” (Acts 2: 46), while farther on we read, “And the multitude of them that believed were of *one heart* and of *one soul*” (Acts 4: 32). From the Epistles of Paul we learn that there was but one church in each community. Christ's relation to the church makes it impossible for Christians to be loyal to him and at the same time divided. All must be perfectly united in allegiance to him as king, lie is the head of the body of which his followers are members. All the members of the body are perfectly united to each other and to the head; and, although the members may differ in function, they are all directed by the same commandments, motives and purposes. As soon as a tendency toward division became manifest it was severely rebuked and ascribed to the carnal nature. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, says, “Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same things, and that there be no division among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment” ... “For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men?” (I Cor. 1: 10; 3:3).

The seven landmarks of Christian union are revealed by Paul in the first six verses of the fourth chapter of Ephesians: “I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech you to walk worthily of the calling wherewith you were called, with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.”

As long as these seven unities—one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one Father—are maintained, it will be impossible for a divided church to exist.

On the other hand, divisions will speedily disappear as soon as these seven unities are restored.

I add the following chart of the New Testament church, which will serve as a summary and as a guide in the further study of this important subject:

[Illustration: THE CHURCH THAT JESUS ESTABLISHED]

CHAPTER III. THE CHURCH SINCE THE APOSTLES.

The Apostasy of the Church.

The apostolic unity of the church was maintained for about three hundred years. During this period the church endured the ten great, general persecutions directed against it by the world–ruling Roman Empire, which resulted in the martyrdom of almost all of the Apostles and multitudes of other Christians. Despite the

To Infidelity and Back

opposition of the mightiest powers on earth, the church scored the most marvelous victories and was on a fair way to conquer the whole world for Christ. Satan, perceiving that his opposition to a united church under the leadership of Christ was fruitless, now tried to get within the church and to shear it of its power by confusing its counsels and dividing its forces. Christ said, "Every city or house divided against itself shall not stand" (Matt. 12:25), and Satan knew that if he could get Christians to exhaust their energies by contending with each other, their conquest of the world would be at an end. He filled the church with speculative philosophy, heathen idolatry and the worldly spirit in general. As always, he used the pride, vanity and ambition of individuals to accomplish his purpose. If fallible human leaders and their opinions could be put in the place of the infallible Christ and his teachings, the work would be done; because this would arouse the opposition of other ambitious human leaders and thus the church would be torn asunder and exhausted with internal strife and divisions. Alas that the church did not heed the earnest warning of Paul, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple" (Rom. 16:17, 18). The selfishness of leaders and the lazy, careless indifference of the masses who blindly follow on, is what makes the creation and perpetuation of divisions among Christians possible. Perceiving that the division of the church would destroy its power, its leaders strove with might and main to preserve its unity. Had they exalted the Christ and used his Word, the sword of the Spirit, they would have succeeded. But they were ambitious and worked for a united church so they could use its power to exalt themselves and their opinions and crush those opposed to them. Human creeds, as standards of orthodoxy, were invented, and more stress was put on correct speculative opinions than on faith in Christ and Christ-like living. Persons who would not subscribe to the speculative opinions of man-made creeds were persecuted and anathematized. The church formed a league with worldly rulers and used the strong arm of the law to crush those who would not accept its human standards of orthodoxy. The Inquisition, with the dungeon, stocks, guillotine and other diabolical means of torture, was called into requisition. It is claimed that no less than fifty million human beings were martyred in this effort of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, calling itself the church, to maintain unity on a human creed. Although this effort at union was largely successful, it was not Christian union. Paul says that Christian union is where Christians are of the same mind and judgment and all speak the same things (1 Cor. 1:10), while this union was maintained by suppressing conscientious convictions and their utterance.

The Reformation of the Church.

The effort at a forced union on a speculative human creed was never entirely successful. In the fastnesses of the mountains the Waldenses, Albigenses and others, maintained their religious freedom. The fire of religious liberty was smouldering, but not extinguished. It was covered with the black coals of ecclesiastical ignorance, brutality and tyranny; but by and by it worked its way to the light and illuminated the darkness of the age. The great Reformation burst forth into a mighty inextinguishable flame all over Europe, and, overleaping great barriers, it blazed forth in America. The ecclesiastical shackles were torn asunder and the people were set free. I speak of the ultimate outcome, for this end was only attained after centuries of effort. Hereditary religious ideas, prejudices and customs become petrified, and it is only with the most desperate and long-continued efforts that individuals and bodies of people can free themselves from them. Failing to recognize how they are blinded through hereditary bias, environment and limited ideas, people imagine they have attained unto the ultimate truth, and thus their growth in knowledge ceases and they become fossilized into a sectarian party. People imagine that they are free when they are delivered from religious and political tyrants that persecute and oppress them; but their greatest bondage, and the one that makes the others possible, is the hereditary and acquired prejudice, bias, bigotry and ignorance within themselves. The struggle of the Reformation was for religious freedom. This struggle was by no means always unselfish and consistent. Protestants as well as Roman Catholics used force to crush those that would not submit to their creeds. Both in Europe and in America men's bodies were tortured and destroyed with the hope of saving their souls and in the endeavor to maintain the unity of the church. Even where the church and the state were separated so that the church could not use the civil law to persecute its opponents, other means of coercion were used, such as boycotting,

To Infidelity and Back

ostracism, excommunication and anathemas. The idea of the Roman Catholic Church is that you cannot trust the people to interpret the Bible for themselves; the Pope and the church must do it for them.

The idea of Protestant sectarian creeds is largely the same. The members cannot be trusted to interpret the Bible for themselves, so the creed-makers have to do it for them. The difference is in degree and power of oppression rather than in kind. The entire idea is fundamentally wrong. Speculative theology cannot save any one and sectarian creeds are harder to understand than the Bible itself. The people need the living, loving, personal Christ, and not the dry husks of speculative theology. We want uniformity in matters of faith that are clearly revealed and in allegiance to Christ, but do not need it in speculative opinions based on inferences as to what the Bible teaches.

Freedom is absolutely necessary to progress and civilization. But freedom may be turned into a curse as well as a blessing. Criminals want freedom to gratify the lusts of the flesh (Gal. 5:13). Those in bondage to their own carnal nature must be put under restraint by those governed by moral principles. Even Christians need to be guided and governed in spiritual matters, and have always felt this need. The trouble has been that mortal men have been accepted as authoritative spiritual guides, or have tried to control the religious convictions and practices of their fellow-men by force. Christ is the Christian's only safe and proper guide. As a final result of the Reformation the Christian people in America and parts of Europe were set free from religious tyranny and left to choose their spiritual guides. Although they professed that the Bible was their only authority, they accepted human leaders and their opinions as guides and permitted these to interpret the Bible for them. Thus the freedom of the Reformation was turned into the curse of division and sectarianism. Divided Protestantism is better than the religious tyranny of the Dark Ages; but it is bad, and will be replaced with the Christian union of the New Testament when loyalty to Christ and his Word is substituted for loyalty to human leaders and their opinions embodied in creeds. Christ said, "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation" (Matt. 12:25). The truth of this has been sadly demonstrated in our divided Christianity. In how many homes has sectarian division wrought havoc with its religious life! How many husbands and wives have been lost to active service for the Master because of the chilling effect of indifference or opposition through sectarian differences! How many children have become indifferent or disgusted with religion, because their parents differed in their religious convictions! Again, look at the effect of sectarian division in a community. Five church buildings and preachers where one could do the work, while the balance could be devoted to the evangelization of the heathen. But the financial loss is the least. Preachers are poorly supported and therefore poorly equipped for their work, and people are encouraged to join the churches on almost any conditions through rivalry and the need of support for so many churches. Sinners go unrebuked through fear that their financial support will be lost; and, if disciplined, they are often received with open arms into a rival church. When we look at the kingdom of Christ at large, we see how it has come to desolation because of divisions. Millions of dollars are wasted in rival churches, colleges, papers, preachers, books, etc.; while the heathen stand with amazed incredulity before the missionaries of a babel of denominations. Verily the reformed church needs reforming.

A Movement for Christian Union.

Divided Protestantism reached its climax in America at the beginning of the last century. This land of freedom offered a congenial soil for its perfect development and unfolding. Thus were exhibited more fully than ever before the sin and folly of such divisions. The forces of Christ were largely wasted and defeated through sectarian strife, and there was the bitterest feeling even between different branches of the same denomination. Infidelity was rampant in the land and Christianity was at a low ebb. However, the love of the Master was strong in many hearts, and these longed and prayed for better things. As by divine inspiration, a great union movement sprang up simultaneously in different parts of the country. The outcome was what may be called the American Reformation, but is more properly called the Restoration movement. The burning desire of the promoters of this movement was a reunion of the divided followers of Christ. After a thorough and prayerful consideration of the subject, it was decided that the only possible basis of union is the Bible; and so the motto

To Infidelity and Back

was adopted, “Where the Bible speaks we will speak, and where the Bible is silent we will be silent.” It was decided to require a “thus saith the Lord” or an apostolic example for every item of teaching or practice. The reformers expected to bring about Christian union without leaving their respective denominations and forming a separate religious body. But an application of their motto in the study of the Bible led to results that they never dreamed of. They were compelled to give up their sectarian practices one by one, and soon found themselves forced out of the denominational bodies. It now became clear to them that the real cause of the origin and perpetuation of sectarian divisions was the human element, in teaching and practice, added to the church since the days of the Apostles; and that nothing but their removal and the restoration of the primitive church in name, creed and deed, could bring the Christian union of New Testament times. Learning that, aside from the Apostles, there was no ecclesiastical authority or organization in New Testament times, above the local church, they proceeded to organize local churches of Christ after the primitive model, and invited both saints and sinners to unite with them in this work and in protesting against the sin of sectarian divisions.

The Restoration of the New Testament Creed.

In the evolution of the movement for Christian union, it was soon discovered that human creeds, as standards of church or ministerial fellowship, are divisive in their nature and prevent the reunion of God's people. All claim to get their creed from the Bible; but since creeds contradict each other in doctrine, they cannot all be right, although they may all be wrong. Human creeds are responsible for most of the heresy trials and have armed most of the infidelic attacks upon the church. The only way to permanently solve the creed problem is to restore the divine creed given by the Holy Spirit to the primitive church. This is the only true Apostles' Creed and the only one that will never need any revision. This is none other than the *divinity of Christ*, the central truth of revelation and of Christianity. Jesus said, in answer to Peter's confession, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” “Upon this rock I will build my church” (Matt. 16: 16, 18). John declared of his Gospel, “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 20:31). Paul commanded, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved” (Acts 16:31), and said, “Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 3:11). This is what the Apostles preached everywhere, and required as a condition for baptism and church membership; and it is the only creed they ever required. The church is not founded upon a system of speculative theology that even the learned cannot understand, but upon the loving, divine personality of Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. Get Jesus in the heart, and belief in his word and a Christ-like life will inevitably follow. This is the only creed that can reunite divided Christendom. Christians cannot unite on human leaders and their finite opinions, but they can all unite on Christ.

The Restoration of Bible Names.

It was further discovered that human names for God's people were divisive in nature and a barrier to Christian union. There is nothing in a name until it becomes authoritatively attached to a person or thing, but after it becomes so attached, there is as much in the name as in the person or thing. Since the name Andrew Carnegie became attached to him, it is worth as much in money and influence as Mr. Carnegie himself is worth. Thus it is that there is salvation in the name of Christ. “For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12).

The Bible names given to the church and to the followers of Christ, express true ideas and relationships; while the human names since added express false and unscriptural ideas and relationships. The church and its members should be named after Christ because they belong to him; for the same reason it is wrong to call them after any other person or thing.

Paul writes, “Every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?” “For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?” (1 Cor. 1:12, 13; 3:4). “I pray you,” said Luther, “leave

To Infidelity and Back

my name alone, and do not call yourselves Lutherans, but Christians. Who is Luther? My doctrine is not mine. I was not crucified for any one. Paul would not that any should call themselves of Paul, nor of Peter, but of Christ. How, then, does it fit me, a miserable bag of dust and ashes, to give my name to the children of Christ! Cease to cling to these party names and distinctions! Away with them all and let us call ourselves Christians, after him from whom our doctrine comes!" Those engaged in this restoration movement heed the admonitions of Paul and Luther and call themselves "Christians," or "disciples of Christ," while they call the churches, "churches of Christ" or "churches of God." They do not use these names in a sectarian, but in a Scriptural, sense. They do not claim to be the "only Christians," but aim to be "Christians only." We read in Acts II:26, "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." "If any man suffer as a Christian," says Peter, "let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name" (I Pet. 4: 16). Any name used to designate a part of the followers of Christ and to separate them from the rest, is wrong, because it expresses a wrong and unscriptural idea. "Would to God," said Wesley, "that all sectarian names were forgotten, and that we, as humble, loving disciples, might sit down at the Master's feet, read his holy word, imbibe his spirit, and transcribe his life into our own!" John says, "We shall see his face and his name shall be in our foreheads" (Rev. 22:4).

The Ordinances Restored.

In addition to the restoration of the New Testament creed and names, it was found that there can be no organic Christian union, after the primitive type, without a restoration of the ordinances as administered by the Apostles. Protestants all accept two ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they differ greatly in the manner of observing them. Some have open and others close communion. Some observe the Lord's Supper monthly, others quarterly and still others annually. In looking for apostolic precepts and examples, it was found that the early Christians met on every first day of the week to break bread; and that each Christian was commanded by Christ to partake of the Lord's Supper, after examining himself to see that his heart was prepared for this spiritual feast. We have neither the authority to decide the frequency of the service, nor who shall partake of the Supper.

The greatest hindrance to a practical working union of the followers of Christ is the babel of teaching and practice as to baptism. Some hold that the mere baptism of infants will save them, while others belittle baptism or ignore it altogether. Some baptize infants, others only adults. Some sprinkle, some pour, and others immerse for baptism. Some sprinkle, pour or immerse, just as the candidate wishes it. Does the New Testament teach this babel of confusion or has it come from human inventions and additions? It has already been pointed out that only those who had previously been born of the Spirit, or undergone a change of heart through faith and repentance, were baptized by the Apostles. We are told that Jesus never baptized any one (John 4:2), therefore he never baptized any infants. If we examine carefully the cases of household baptism recorded in the New Testament, we will find that in each case infants are necessarily excluded; as those baptized "heard" (Acts 10:33), "believed" (Acts 16:34), "were comforted" (Acts 16:40), "addicted themselves to the ministry" (1 Cor. 16:16), etc. These acts all refer to people who had reached the age of intelligence and accountability and, therefore, cannot refer to infants. Infant baptism is based on two errors that crept into the church—the doctrines of infant damnation and baptismal regeneration. Infants are saved without baptism, for Jesus said "of such is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 19:14), and baptism is of value only because of its relation to Christ and the faith of the sinner (Mark 16:16). The greatest emphasis we can put on baptism is to say that Christ commanded it and made it a condition of salvation to those that hear the gospel and have the opportunity to obey it. To refuse to obey this or any other commandment of Christ, reveals a rebellious heart that cannot be saved.

Of the action of baptism we speak in a previous chapter, therefore we need not treat of it here only to say that all churches agree that the immersion of a penitent believer in water is Scriptural baptism, and this is the only practice on which all can unite. Thousands of those that are contented to be Christians only have given up sprinkling and been immersed after studying the Bible on the subject.

To Infidelity and Back

The Bible Restored.

Christian union on the primitive gospel necessitates the restoration of the Bible to its proper place and authority. Sectarianism has largely displaced it with creeds and other human standards. Recently I read the following in an introduction to a catechism: "This catechism has well been called a Bible for the laity." When we remember how contradictory, and, therefore, erroneous, these human deductions as to Bible teaching are, we can see the need of putting them aside and restoring the Bible as the Christian's all-sufficient and only sufficient guide.

The Bible has also been thrust aside and kept from the people by false theories of conversion and the consequent erroneous practices in evangelistic work. People have been taught that they are totally depraved and can do nothing towards their conversion, that faith is a direct gift of God, that the Holy Spirit converts sinners by immediate miraculous power, that the evidence of pardon is in dreams, visions or feelings, and that sinners have to wait until God by entreaties is reconciled to save them. All these theories are erroneous and logically set aside the entire gospel plan of salvation. The Holy Spirit, through the Apostles, used the truths of the Word or gospel to convict sinners, and taught penitents, out of the New Testament, on what conditions they could inherit the salvation Christ purchased on the cross. The sinners that wanted to be saved accepted this salvation by complying with Christ's conditions of pardon, and went on their way rejoicing, because they had the infallible Word of God for it that they were saved. In other words, the Apostles preached the gospel, and penitent sinners were immediately saved by believing it (Mark 16:16), repenting of their sins (Acts 2:38) and openly committing themselves to Christ in baptism (Acts 22:16).

Finally, the Bible has become a meaningless riddle and uninteresting to most people because it is not rightly divided. It is assumed that all parts of the Bible are addressed to everybody. This is far from the truth. While we must recognize the unity and interdependence of the entire Bible and that each part teaches great spiritual truths for all, we must also remember that its different parts contain specific precepts addressed to different classes of people and only applicable to them. Thus the Mosaic law was for the Jews only, and was superseded by the gospel (Gal. 3:24, 25). Turning to the New Testament, we find that the four Gospels were written to make believers (John 20:31), the Acts of the Apostles, "Book of Conversions," to tell and show people how to be saved or become Christians (see chapters 2, 8, 16, etc.), while the rest of the New Testament is addressed to Christians or church-members as their rule of faith and practice. The churches in this Restoration movement aim to restore the Bible to its primitive place in producing penitents, guiding them unto salvation and in giving all instructions to the churches needed for their edification and guidance.

Restoration of the New Testament Church Government.

We have learned that all sectarian divisions have resulted from exalting human leaders and their opinions. Ambitious ecclesiastics have exalted themselves with the help of misguided people; and, usurping authority, have lorded it over God's heritage. How wide the difference between the simplicity of the primitive gospel and the pompous ecclesiastical organizations and titles of modern times! It is self-evident that Christian union cannot be restored until this ecclesiastical machinery be put aside and the administration of Christ's kingdom be again entrusted to the local churches and their officers as in New Testament times.

It will be noticed that this modern movement for Christian union does not seek to introduce new doctrines into the religious world. It seeks rather the restoration of the old Jerusalem gospel with its doctrines, ordinances and fruits. Its promoters thoroughly believe in all the truths accepted by evangelical bodies and simply strive to remove the sectarian growths that have fastened themselves to the old ship Zion during its course through the centuries. Among its favorite mottoes are these:

No Book but the Bible.
No Creed but the Christ.

To Infidelity and Back

No Plea but the Gospel.
No Name but the Divine.
In Christ—Unity.
In Opinions—Liberty.
In all Things—Charity.

Is One Church as Good as Another?

The mere hint that there might be something in the doctrines of different churches that is erroneous and needs to be dropped or modified, is usually met with a frown of disfavor, by the supersensitive sectarian world. The sectarian sore is grown over with the agreement to disagree, and woe unto the doctor that insists on probing the wound to effect a cure. The effort at probing is usually met with the declaration, "One church is just as good as another, they are all aiming for the same place." Let us try to discover what truth or error is wrapped up in this statement, and what are the religious conditions that inspire such declarations. In the first place, it shows a disposition to apologize for sectarian doctrines rather than to defend them. This is a hopeful sign. All the large denominations in America originated in European countries under the bitter religious controversies and cruel political strife that followed the Dark Ages. It was these stormy and abnormal conditions that gave birth to these sects and largely moulded their peculiar doctrines. One extreme begot another, and while each of these denominations emphasized some neglected religious truth, it emphasized it so strongly as to often twist it into an untruth or out of proper relationship to other truths. The people in free America are not interested in the polemical controversies that resulted from religious and political conditions in the old countries. Thus it has come to pass that scarcely any denomination seriously and persistently urges the ideas that gave it birth, and their creeds have to be revised continually to hold their preachers and church-members. The result is that the great mass of the members of the sectarian churches neither know nor care what the creeds of their churches teach. I say that this is a hopeful sign, but there is also a great danger involved in it. Learning that the doctrines of their own and other denominations are not of saving or vital importance, people are likely to jump to the conclusion that no religious doctrines are of vital importance, and so lose their interest in Christianity. No one can deny that thousands have reached this condition, and are either members of no church or merely nominal, indifferent members. Since all sectarian doctrines are of human origin and of no vital, saving importance, we can endorse the statement that, from a sectarian standpoint, one church is just as good as another.

We will also grant, for the sake of the argument, that from the standpoint of piety, talent, learning and consecration, one church, on an average, is just as good as another. But does this go to the bottom of the subject? The doctor who, through ignorance of medical science, gives your child medicine that cripples it for life or kills it, may be just as good morally and intellectually as other doctors who know their business. His blunder of ignorance may not destroy his hope of heaven; but is that a reason why you would just as soon have him treat your child as another doctor? So sectaries who teach erroneous doctrines may be just as honest, consecrated and learned as those who teach the gospel truth; but does it make no difference to the cause of Christ and the salvation of souls, whether they teach sectarian vagaries that divide and desolate the church, or exalt the Christ and his Word so as to unite all his followers in the conquest of the world? But, you ask, how can good and learned people differ so in their beliefs? We may not understand how it is, but we know it is and ever has been so. Our minds are so constituted that we must see all truths alike, logically, mathematically and in every other way, if we see them at all. The trouble is that our vision is so warped through prejudice and limited ideas and information that we fail to see the simplest truths, and find in the Bible and elsewhere what we bring with us through heredity and environment. The Bible recognizes this truth. Jesus prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" (Luke 23:34). Paul says, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. 1:13), and again, "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30). It may seem paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true, that the greatest hindrance to the spread of the truth of God has come from pious, consecrated and God-fearing souls who were misled by their hereditary prejudices. The majority of those converted under the

To Infidelity and Back

preaching of the Apostles, as recorded in the New Testament, were devout saints who needed to be delivered from their hereditary Jewish prejudices and enlisted in the re-alignment of religious forces for the conquest of the world for Christ and his kingdom. The Pentecostians were “devout men,” the eunuch was a devout worshiper, Saul of Tarsus was a conscientious man, Cornelius was devout and a philanthropist. A large per cent of the Jews were honest and devout people, but were fighting against Christ because they were blinded by hereditary religious ideas. Peter, even after Pentecost, was subject to these influences, for it took ten years, with special miraculous manifestations, before he could see that Gentiles were creatures to whom the gospel was to be preached as well as to the Jews. While sectarian divisions are largely due to selfish and wicked men, most of them are due to devout Christians who are misled by inherited prejudices or simply drift with the tide.

If these things are true, we should tremble lest we are upholding error and opposing the truth unintentionally through hereditary bias. We should make a prayerful and diligent search for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Although we have discovered that none of the sectarian doctrines are of vital importance, let us remember that it is different with “the faith [system of teaching] which was once for all delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3) by the Apostles and for which we are duty bound to “earnestly contend.” Since so many devout and learned preachers are teaching so many contradictory doctrines, which cannot all be true, let us not accept their statements unchallenged, but let us test them (I John 4:1–6) by searching the Scriptures daily to see if these things are so (Acts 17:11). After that we are assured that we have found the truth ourselves, let us “be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves: if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will” (2 Tim. 2:24–26). In view of the fact that at least the great majority of the members of denominational churches must be in error, it should be a crowning glory to change one's religious affiliations through an investigation of the truth. The hope of the cause of Christ lies with those who, hearing the voice of God's truth in their conscience, are ready to obey it, even if it results in breaking the dearest human ties and leads to ostracism and persecution. Almost all the promoters of this union movement have themselves found their way out of sectarianism after heart-rending efforts to rid themselves from their hereditary prejudices and errors. They are simply entreating others to do what they themselves have done,

for the sake of Christ's cause, and help to establish local churches of Christ after the Apostolic model. That they have fundamentally reoccupied the primitive ground is admitted by all who have fairly investigated the subject. If they are yet in error on any points, they are in a position and ready to correct these as fast as they discover them through a further study of God's Word.

The Church Triumphant.

Christ declares that the evangelization of the world is dependent upon Christian union. Therefore, the ultimate triumph of his church necessitates the triumph of Christian union. We praise God for every movement that looks toward a closer union of Christians; but we are sure that nothing short of the removal of every vestige of denominationalism and the complete restoration of the one body or church of New Testament times will satisfy the demands of God's Word. A number of forces such as the Sunday-school, C.E., Y.M.C.A., Evangelical Alliance and Church Federation are destroying the sectarian spirit and the field is getting ripe unto the harvest for the restoration of the unity of the early church with its converting power. The success of this movement for Christian union on the primitive gospel has been phenomenal. In eighty years its adherents have increased from ten thousand to about one and a third millions. The per cent of gain in membership, from 1890 to 1905, in the six American religious bodies that number a million each was as follows: Christians or disciples of Christ, 94 per cent.; Roman Catholics, 73 per cent.; Lutherans, 51 per cent.; Methodists, 40 per cent.; Baptists, 38 per cent., and Presbyterians, 35 per cent. Barring out the Catholics and Lutherans, who get most of their gain by immigration, the Christians or churches of Christ show more than double the gain of the other three bodies. We glory in this growth only as the glory of Christ is involved in it. It is an earnest of what Christian union will do even through very imperfect instruments. What will the harvest be, when the prayer of Jesus is answered and all his followers are united in one “glorious church, holy and without blemish, not

To Infidelity and Back

having spot or wrinkle or any such thing” (Eph. 5:27), going forth to the evangelization of the world “fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners,” “looking forth as the morning” (S. of Sol. 6: 10)! May the prayer of Jesus for the union of his followers be our prayer, and may we do all in our power to bring a speedy answer! Amen.

The following is a splendid statement of the aim of the Restoration movement. I do not know its author:

OUR AIM.

1. The restoration of primitive Christianity and consequent union of all the followers of Christ in one body.
2. To build a church of Christ, without a denominational name, creed or other barrier to Christian unity, whose terms of fellowship shall be as broad as the conditions of salvation and identical with them.
3. To lead sinners to Christ in the clear light of the New Testament teaching and example.

I have summarized the situation as I see it as follows:

ARE THESE THINGS TRUE?

SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES AND SEE. ACTS 17:11.

1. Christ wants all of his followers to be united in one church as they were the first three centuries (John 17:20, 21; 1 Cor. 1:10–13; Eph. 4:1–6; Rom. 15:5–7).
2. Sects and divisions among Christians are wasteful, carnal and sinful and result from exalting human leaders and their opinions above Christ and his opinions revealed through his Apostles (1 Cor. 3:1–4; Rom. 16:17, 18; Gal. 5:20).
3. As soon as we drop human names, creeds and customs and build churches after the divine model, by teaching and practising as the Apostles did, the unity of the primitive church will be restored (Heb. 8:5; 1 Cor. 11:16; Jude 3).
4. Churches on an average are about the same in piety and consecration, but so long as they teach contradictory doctrines they cannot all be right, but may be wrong. *Therefore you should examine for yourself and be sure you are guided by God's Word rather than by inherited traditions which perpetuate sects* (Mark 7:6–13).

The following *guide to salvation*, which I take from one of my circulars used in gospel work, has the merit of being taken entirely from the Word of God, except the word “warning” and the few words in parentheses. If it is in harmony with the context, and we sincerely believe it is, then it is an infallible guide, and those who follow it cannot be mistaken.

“These men are the servants of the most high God which show unto us

THE WAY OF SALVATION”

(Acts 16:17).

“WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED?” (Acts 16:30; 2:37; 9:6).

To Infidelity and Back

“*Believe* (unbeliever) on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved” (Acts 16:31). (See also Acts 8: 12, 37; Mark 16:16; Rom. 10:9– 11, 17; John 3:18; 20:31; 1 John 5:1.)

WARNING.—“He that believeth not shall be damned” (Mark 16:16).

“*Repent* (believers) and be baptized for the remission of sins and ye shall receive *the gift of the Holy Ghost*” (Acts 2:38). (See also Acts 8:22; 26: 20; Luke 24:47; 2 Cor. 7:9, 10.)

WARNING.—“Except ye repent, ye shall all perish” (Luke 13:5).

“*Confess* (penitent believer) with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved” (Rom. 10:9, 10). (See also Matt. 10:32; 16:16; 26:63; 1 Tim. 6:13; 1 John 4:15.)

WARNING.—“Whosoever shall deny me, him will I also deny” (Matt. 10:33).

“*Be baptized* (confessor) and wash away thy sins” (Acts 22:16). (See also Acts 2:38; Mark 16:16; Gal. 3:26, 27; 1 Pet. 3:21.)

WARNING.—“Rejected the counsel of God, being not baptized” (Luke 7:30).

“*Walk in newness of life*” (those buried with Christ in baptism) (Rom. 6:4).

WARNING.—“Walk not after the flesh,” “For to be carnally minded is death” (Rom. 8:1, 6).

“Then they that *gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them (joined church) about three thousand souls. And they*

CONTINUED STEADFASTLY

in the *apostles' doctrine* (no human creed) and *fellowship* (weekly collections, 1 Cor. 16:1, 2), and in *breaking of bread* (weekly communion, Acts 20:7), and in *prayers*” (attending prayer-meetings, Acts 2:41, 42).

“The disciples were

CALLED CHRISTIANS” (Acts 11:26).

“For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; *are ye not carnal?*” (1 Cor. 3:4). “If ye are reproached for the *name* of Christ, blessed are ye... if a man suffer as *a Christian*, let him glorify God in *this name*” (1 Pet. 4:14–16, R.V.).

“Now I beseech you, brethren, by the *name* of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all *speak the same thing*, and that there be

NO DIVISIONS

among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the *same mind* and in the *same judgment*. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ: *is Christ divided* (1 Cor. 12: 12)? *Was Paul crucified for you?* or were ye baptized in (into) the name of Paul?” (1 Cor. i: 10– 13). “Therefore,

GO ON UNTO PERFECTION” (Heb. 6:1).

To Infidelity and Back

“*Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord. According as his divine power hath given unto us all things (in Bible) that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue. Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. And beside this giving all diligence,*

ADD TO YOUR FAITH

virtue (courage); and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance (self-control); and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness (love of brethren); and to brotherly kindness, charity (love of everybody). For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore, the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things, ye shall never fail: For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ” (2 Pet. 2:2–11).

“GOOD WORKS.”

“*For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteous and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (Tit. 2: 11–14).*

“WORKS OF THE FLESH

are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions (parties), heresies (sects—R. V.), envying, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in the past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But

THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT

is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against such there is no law” (Gal. 5:19– 22).

“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).

“Now

unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be glory in the church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages, world without end. Amen” (Eph. 3:20, 21).

CHAPTER IV. OUR NEGLECTED FIELDS.

NOTE.—This chapter is an address that was delivered at the Centennial Convention of the movement for the restoration of primitive Christianity, held at Pittsburg, Pa., during October, 1909. It is here given because it deals with the same general subject as the rest of the book and shows why and how the reunion of the followers of Christ on the primitive gospel is the greatest issue before the Christian world to-day.

Ask the brotherhood what “Our Neglected Fields” are, and the answer will come in a multitude of voices speaking from diverse viewpoints according to each speaker's knowledge, experience and field of operation. This is natural and proper. If your wife is not the best woman in the world, you are not much of a husband. If your country is not the best country on earth, you are not much of a patriot. Love for everybody and everything in general is a good thing in its way, but the specialized affections are of still greater importance in the world's progress heavenward. But while this babel of appeals in behalf of different places, classes and kinds of work is natural and proper, it does not solve the problem as to what are really our neglected fields and as to the relative amount of work and money we should give to the various calls.

Standing on the banks of the Mississippi, it is impossible to determine the origin of the various color elements in the water; but if we go to the source, it is easy to discover that the red mud comes from the Arkansas, the black mud from the Missouri and the coal dust from the Ohio. So if we wish to discover the principles that will guide us in selecting fields of operation, we must go back to the fountain-head of the New Testament. If we are in the streets of a strange city, all is confusion as to the lay of the land; but if we climb to the hilltop in the rear of the city, we can readily get our bearings. So we must climb to the hilltop with Christ and the Apostles and from there get our bearings in our missionary operations. Let us then turn to the New Testament and see if we can discover where we should go first and the relative importance of the individual and society, the earthly and the heavenly, the temporal and eternal, the material and spiritual, and their relationship to each other.

In looking for the scope of gospel work, we discover that the salvation of the individual and his attainment unto eternal life is the supreme aim in view. From the multitude of Scriptures that teach this we select the following: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life” (John 3:16). “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (Mark 16:15,16). “Who will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life” (Rom. 2:7). The Scriptures are just as clear in placing the spiritual, eternal and heavenly infinitely above the material, temporal and earthly: “We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal” (2 Cor. 4:18). “Set your mind on the things which are above, not on the things which are upon the earth” (Col. 3:2). “Took joyfully the spoiling of your possessions, knowing that ye have for yourselves a better possession and an abiding one” (Heb. 10:34). “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth... but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven... for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also” (Matt. 6:19–21). “For our citizenship is in heaven; whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory” (Phil. 3:20, 21). At best a very small per cent of Christians can ever hope to attain unto wealth and worldly success; and to present these things as an incentive to godliness is but mockery, for “if we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable” (1 Cor. 15:19). We are constantly tempted to be deceived by the delusion that wealth, health and worldly success necessarily bring happiness, while the opposite is as often true, as these things are not an end in themselves.

While the Scriptures thus clearly teach that the supreme effort of Christianity is to prepare people for a glorious hereafter, good works in this life are demanded and are of vital importance. It is the nature of godliness to seek the well-being of others, in this life and the life to come, and no soul can remain saved

To Infidelity and Back

without doing all in its power to minister unto others. “Ye tithe mint and anise and cummin and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice and mercy and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone” (Matt. 23:23). “Created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them” (Eph. 2:10). The promise of eternal life is to them who continue patiently in well-doing (Rom. 2:7). “Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away” (John 15:2). In all his works and words God seeks to reveal his love to men with the purpose of wooing them back to himself, and good works of love have an important place in winning souls to Christ. Thus Jesus did many works of mercy through which he made manifest his and the Father's love for sinners. “Even so let your light shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven” (Matt. 5:16). “Having your behavior seemly among the Gentiles, that wherein they speak against you as evil-doers, they may by your good works, which they behold, glorify God” (I Pet. 2:12). “That even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives” (I Pet. 3:1). Emerson says, “What you are speaks so loud, I cannot hear what you say.” This is, alas! too true of our Christianity. Unless our love for people is incarnated in the good works of our lives, sinners will lose faith in us and in our religion. This does not mean that the church is to forsake prayer and the Word of God to serve tables, or forsake its spiritual ministries and mainly turn its energies to ministering to the physical, social and intellectual man. Chiefly, the church, through its spiritual ministries, is to inspire its members and others to good works of love in their daily walk and conversation. As the anchor of the buoy or the ballast of the ship holds it upright, so the good works of Christians hold the spiritual salvation aloft to be seen of men, and commend it to a dying world.

Having considered the scope of gospel work as revealed in the New Testament, let us next inquire where we shall go first. As we cannot go everywhere at once, where shall we begin, and where shall we go next? Is this left to chance, or is an order of procedure revealed in the New Testament? We believe that there is, and that it is of the greatest importance that this order should be followed. Christ gave the order of march in Acts 1:8, “Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.” If we have any doubt as to the interpretation, the Apostles interpret it for us in their work under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Other things being equal, they went to the nearest territory first. Again, we notice that the Apostles were especially led to the cities, the great centers of population. This enabled them to reach most people in a given time. Beginning at Jerusalem, their missionary journeys were determined by the location of the leading cities. Furthermore, we learn from the teaching and practice of Christ and the Apostles, that they went to the ripest fields first. Christ came to the Jews, the best prepared people on earth, to gather a nucleus for his coming kingdom and to scatter preparatory light for the gospel message. The Apostles commenced their gospel work at Jerusalem on Pentecost because the most devout and enlightened saints on earth were gathered there. For this reason the order was first the Jews and then the Gentiles (Acts 13:46, 47). Paul passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia and came to Thessalonica because a synagogue of the Jews was there (Acts 17:1). The Spirit forbade him to go to Asia and Bithynia and led him by Mysia into Macedonia because there were hearts there ready to receive the message (Acts 16:6–10). Christ commanded Paul to depart from Jerusalem because they would not receive his testimony there (Acts 22:17–21). Open doors were considered as guides by Paul in his missionary operations (I Cor. 16:8; 2 Cor. 2:12, 13; Acts 14:27; Col. 4:3).

Summing up, we find that the Apostles, in their effort to preach the gospel to every creature, were guided by nearness of territory, density of population and ripeness of field. That is, all things considered, they went along the line of least resistance. This is the way of mercy and common sense as well as of Scripture, as it is the quickest way to reach every creature. It enlarges the army of conquest as fast as possible and always meets the enemy at the point of least resistance.

It will help us to understand the matter if we keep in mind that it was not only the purpose of Christ to save individuals here and there, but also to organize a salvation society or church through which to carry the gospel to the ends of the earth, provide a home for the new-born spiritual babes and to extend his reign on earth as far and as fast as possible.

To Infidelity and Back

The matter will become still plainer if we consider another principle taught and practised by Christ and the Apostles; viz., the necessity an absolute union of the forces of God under Christ for the accomplishment of his work. Christ said, "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation: and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand," and he prayed for a perfect union among his followers in order that the world might believe in him (Matt. 12:25; John 17:20, 21). Paul says, "Whereas there is among you jealousy and strife, are ye not carnal? For when one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" (I Cor. 3:3, 4). Again he says, "If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another" (Gal. 5:15). Divisions inevitably lead to weakness, waste and defeat. A small army united in the authority of a wise commander can defeat the largest army on earth if it be divided through every officer doing as he pleases or as he thinks best. Therefore Christ demanded absolute union in his authority, and the Apostles first of all worked for a union of Jews and Gentiles in one body or working force. If the purpose had only been to save individuals, the Jews might have been saved as Jews, but the object was to enlist the Jews with the Gentiles in God's new army of conquest. This new union under Christ, or re-alignment of religious forces, was so important that the salvation of both Jews and Gentiles was conditioned on their entering it, and, if necessary, all other unions and alliances had to be broken to maintain this. All race and class distinctions must succumb. "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male nor female; for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). Not even family ties were permitted to interfere with this union in the authority of Christ. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. For I came to set a man at variance with his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household" (Matt. 10:35-37). The subjection of wives to their husbands and of children to their parents is limited "in the Lord" (Col. 3: 18, 20).

Summing up the New Testament principles that are to guide us in our gospel work, we may say that we are to go as a united force along the line of least resistance, making the eternal salvation of the individual our supreme aim.

The Restoration movement became necessary because one of the fundamental principles of the gospel had been violated; viz.: that of Christian union. The success of this movement for Christian union on the primitive gospel has been phenomenal. In eighty years its adherents have increased from ten thousand to one and a third millions. But what are these among so many? The work has but fairly begun, and the field is just beginning to ripen for the larger harvest. Sectarianism is still present in all of its hideousness, but the people are beginning to see the desolation and sinfulness of divisions and are groping in the dark in various efforts at solution. However, a careful investigation will reveal the fact that the great drift towards denominational union is more due to a dying faith in sectarian doctrines than to a growing faith in the doctrines "once for all delivered to the saints." About a year ago it was declared in a large meeting of clergymen that "Protestantism is decaying and will be displaced by some sort of a new Catholicism." The statement was vigorously applauded. This simply means that sectarian Protestantism is decaying. It should be remembered that every large religious body in America, except that represented here to-day, originated in Europe under the shadow of Roman Catholicism and under political, social and religious conditions entirely different from those that now prevail in America. These sectarian systems brought to America have been thawed out by our free American religious atmosphere so that there is not a large sectarian body that would dare to promulgate seriously and persistently the basic principles that gave birth to it in Europe. The consequence is that sects are hastening to revise their creeds so as to get rid of their out-of-date features as gracefully as possible. One of the leading arguments for union with other denominations used at the recent Canadian General Assembly was that "it would give the church an opportunity to revise its creeds, and to remove the barnacles and cobwebs that had gathered around them." The leading speaker declared that "not a single minister present would dare to enforce his own interpretation of the Confession of Faith." The ministers hesitate to enforce these hereditary traditions, and the members neither know nor care what the creeds teach, and, therefore, we hear on every hand, "One church is just as good as another."

To Infidelity and Back

We thank God for this relaxing of sectarianism and for the trend toward Christian union. But the movement involves a grave danger. Having lost faith in their distinctive sectarian doctrines, which they considered synonymous with New Testament teaching, many sectarian people are rapidly drifting into indifference, worldliness and unbelief. Forsaking human leaders and their doctrines, they are in danger of also forsaking the Apostles as religious leaders and their doctrines once for all delivered to the saints. Sectarianism is bad, but sectarian life and strife is better than a lifeless, conviction-less, graveyard, sentimental union that is the result of a dying faith. In a union revival in an Eastern city practically all the Protestant churches worked together for a month, and we could not count five definite committals to Christ. Any small sectarian church alone could have accomplished greater definite results. After reducing their doctrines so as to avoid all that would give offense to any, they become so thin that there is but little to contend for.

The indifference to the doctrines of the creeds and the New Testament which is hastening the disintegration of sectarianism, is partly due to infidelity in the churches. Discerning critics cannot fail to see that much of the drift toward denominational union is due to the leadership of preachers who, through rationalism, have lost faith in the inspiration of the Bible and consequently in evangelical Christianity. As I was a student for three years at a Unitarian theological school and have gone through the process myself, I am able to speak on this subject as perhaps few of our brethren can. Misguided by rationalism, I thought it my conscientious duty to accept, step by step, the dictates of destructive criticism until the Bible was only inspired to me in religion as Kant in philosophy, Milton in poetry and Beethoven in music. But when I came to the end of the business I discovered that my conscience, that had urged me along, was gone also. For I was gravely taught that conscience is simply a creation of experience and education and that it is right to lie or do anything else so long as you do it out of love. Doubtless you have all heard of the farmer and his wife at the World's Fair, who went to see the "Exit." There was nothing in it and of course they had to pay to get in again. This was my bitter experience with rationalism. I thought I was following a great light, but I discovered there was nothing in it, that I was following an *ignis fatuus*. Rationalism has indeed proven the "Exit" to multitudes, from the peace, joy and moral security that accompany faith in evangelical Christianity into the desert of doubt, darkness and despair. To those preachers who, through rationalism, have lost faith in the inspiration of the Bible, doctrines are no longer a hindrance to union, for they have lost faith in all evangelical doctrines and therefore selfishness and utility draw them toward union.

If this is the religious condition to-day, you can see that we are in danger of religious anarchy and spiritual death. We are told that the splendid civilizations of Greece and Rome were made possible through the moral integrity and manhood inspired by their heathen religious systems. When unbelief in these systems originated among the philosophers and through them permeated the mass of the people, morality and sincerity were displaced by policy, distrust and deception, which brought utter ruin to the social and civil fabric. How much greater must the calamity be if the faith, integrity and morality underlying our splendid Christian civilization should be destroyed by the antichristian doctrines already taught in the classroom at some of the leading schools. The only hope lies in a return to "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." I believe we have been raised up for this hour. Our past work and opportunities are but a drop in the bucket compared with our present opportunities for work. As never before, it behooves us to raise the banner of New Testament Christianity as a standard to rally and reorganize the divided, confused and retreating hosts of Christ. It is not a question of staying at Jerusalem until each individual is converted, but the question is whether we will ever go to the Jerusalem of teeming millions in our land who have never even heard the plea for Christian union on the primitive gospel. Just as the Apostles went to saints (pious Jews) and sinners and demanded upon pain of their eternal condemnation that they unite under King Jesus, so we must go to the saints of the sects and sinners of the world and insist that they unite under the non-sectarian banner of Christ, in order that the whole world may believe in him as God's Son. As in the days of the Apostles, so now we need a re-alignment of religious forces in order to conquer the world for Christ.

Having learned the New Testament principles that should guide us in our missionary operations, and through these discovered our chief sphere of work in view of the present situation, let us turn to special missionary

To Infidelity and Back

problems that constantly suggest themselves to us and consider our duty towards them and their relationship to the great mission that rests upon us as a distinctive people. I refer to the Indians, Mormons, Jews, immigrants, the lower and slum districts of our cities, the mountaineers of the Appalachian system, the millions of unevangelized negroes in the South, etc.

Concerning these problems I wish to call your attention to the following considerations:

First, these problems are largely educational, legal, social and philanthropic, and as such should be solved by the united effort of all the good citizens of the land. Keeping in mind the New Testament principles that are to guide us, we can readily see that Christians should do many things that the church was not ordained to do. The church, as a church, should not go into politics and business. On the other hand, the church, through its spiritual ministries, should inspire its members to enter business, politics, philanthropic associations, etc., in order, as far as possible, to incarnate Christian principles in their life in the world. We may differ as to the finer distinctions, but none of us would advocate a union of church and state or of church and business. As this is a nation in which Christians can control the laws, they can do much through good citizenship to solve these questions and bring these classes within the reach of the spiritual gospel. One of the great duties of the church in behalf of these people is, through their spiritual ministries, to constrain their members to make and enforce proper laws for their education, protection and improvement. Christianity is the religion of a book, and the first thing needful to bring these classes to an intelligent Christian faith is at least a common-school English education. Those of us who have lived in cities that are largely foreign know that the public schools are doing more to bring these classes within gospel reach than all other agencies combined.

Second, I wish to throw out a warning against engendering or encouraging the class spirit which we find so severely condemned in the New Testament. In the New Testament we read nothing about churches for different classes or about different classes as separate missionary problems, but the effort is to reach all classes through the local churches along the line of least resistance. The best thing on earth for these various classes is that they might be brought into vital touch with the best Christian people in our local churches. Some have even gone so far as to claim that we cannot reach the slum element, but must leave that to the Salvation Army, etc. If that is true, so much the worse for our Christianity. A truly New Testament church is the incarnation of the wisdom and love of God for reaching any and all classes of people. The class spirit is the outgrowth of ignorance, prejudice and selfishness and is always sinful among Christians. Our experience with tuberculosis and with the modern complicated industrial and political systems, is thrusting upon us anew Christ's teaching about the brotherhood of man or the solidarity of the race. On the whole, it is true that the race suffers or rejoices, rises or falls, together. We condemn the segregation of foreign races in different sections of our large cities. But the segregation of the better, or at least more fortunate, classes, is just as bad and more disastrous to the welfare of the city. Social settlements and institutional churches are manifestations of the Christ spirit, but they are only proxies and excuses for the mass of Christians and but samples and crumbs in place of the square meal that a square deal would supply. What these institutions are doing in a comparatively unnatural and artificial way is simply a hint of what could and would be done if all church-members would practise the Christ spirit in all their daily walk and conversation. To give a few dollars to help pay a few mission workers to live Christ in the slum districts is all right, but is no adequate substitute for all Christians giving all their life to uplift and save their country and the whole world. The best institutional church is the one that through its spiritual ministries inspires its members to live Christ in politics, in business, in society, in the home and everywhere else. So far as possible, let us minimize and discourage the class spirit in every way, shape and form. It is marvelous what the true Christ spirit will do along this line. A church of Christ was recently organized at Romney, W. Va., with two-thirds of the members foreign born. With a few days' effort nineteen Italians recently joined the Christian Church at Uhrichsville, O. Similar results have followed faithful efforts in New York City and at many other places. If in love and faith we would make a serious effort to reach these classes through the local churches, we would do ten times more to reach and help them than by seeking to reach them as classes.

To Infidelity and Back

In the third place, we must avoid the materializing tendency of the age in our gospel work. The constant tendency is to lose sight of the spiritual, invisible and eternal, to be blinded by the things of this world and to be conformed to them. In reading popular books on Home Missions we cannot but be grieved at the flings and thrusts at the old evangelism and the laudations of the new evangelism. For the context shows that the teaching is away from the spiritual and eternal salvation of the individual, which the New Testament makes the chief and ultimate thing, to the material and temporal things of this earth, which the New Testament makes a means to a higher end. To prove that the old evangelism is defunct, attention is called to the fact that seven thousand sectarian congregations did not have a single convert in an entire year. But can that be said of true New Testament evangelism? How prone we are to forget that only a comparatively few can attain unto worldly success according to the standard of public opinion and none so as to be satisfied with the effort. For the more we get the more we want in wealth and fame and pleasure, and none of these things in themselves bring happiness or well-being, which is the real thing the soul hungers for. Who can estimate the eternal good B. F. Mills did while he pointed individuals to the Lamb of God and thus filled their souls with new life, hope and courage to do and to dare for self and others because "of the joy that was set before them"? But in an evil day he became spiritually near-sighted and spoke about saving society rather than the individual, and now he is reputed to be a hotel-keeper, ministering to the material comforts of his fellow-men. Oh, what a fall was there! But only an example of multitudes who have become near-sighted and unfruitful through a so-called new evangelism that is not new. While giving good works their proper and important place, let us never forget that to save the individual soul for eternity through the gospel is the chief work of the church, and that it must ever subordinate the temporal and material to the spiritual and eternal.

Furthermore, it is well to remember that our sectarian neighbors, having largely lost faith in what they once considered their distinctive mission, are naturally turning much of their energy to general educational, philanthropic and civilizing work. Under the circumstances it is natural and proper that they should give relatively more of their energies to this kind of work than we, as we have a distinctive mission that demands our chief effort.

The classes enumerated above present indeed great missionary problems. We should keep in mind the entire field and never plan for anything short of reaching, as soon as possible, every creature with the gospel. But accepting the guidance of the Holy Spirit, revealed in the New Testament, we must go to the ends of the earth as a body united in Christ and his truth, along the line of least resistance, ever keeping in mind the spiritual and eternal salvation of the individual as the ultimate aim.

These things being true, I still believe, as we have always taught, that the reunion of God's people on the primitive gospel is at present the overshadowing issue before us and that in working for its accomplishment we are doing the utmost in our power to solve all missionary problems. Christ can never conquer with a hopelessly divided army. Sectarianism ties up three-fourths of the men and money and kills three-fourths of the spiritual power that could otherwise be used to solve all missionary problems. Unite all saints in Christ and set free these forces, and within this generation the world will believe and know that Jesus is the Christ whom God sent into the world (John 17:20, 21, 23). I believe that God has providentially prepared both us and the field, and unless we perform the mission set before us he will raise up another people through whom to bring about Christian union on the primitive gospel, to our eternal shame, but to their eternal glory. Thus it seems that, pre-eminently, our neglected fields lie among the teeming millions of America, ripe unto the harvest for our plea, but who, through our negligence, have not even heard that there is such a plea.

Grapes of Eshcol have been gathered from every corner of our land, proving that it is a land flowing with milk and honey for primitive Christianity. Look at the wonders done in Oklahoma. Go to Southern California and see the recent record. Go to the great Northwest, both in Canada and the United States, and see the ripeness of the field. If we turn to the southeast we gather just as large clusters of grapes in Florida and along the coast. See the marvels accomplished in Washington, our capital. Two churches offered to us because we are non-sectarian. Turn to Baltimore and see the marvelous growth. Two fields offered to us because we stand for

To Infidelity and Back

Christian union. Look at the recent and abundant fruit in conservative Pennsylvania, or pass on to New York and see the wonders at East Orange and in Brooklyn among the Russians. Wherever we turn, the field is riper than ever and we must haste to garner it in or the abundant crop will perish. The heart of the country is already largely ours. Let us go forward with enlarged numbers and renewed vigor, knowing that the God of the harvest is with us and we are well able to possess the land. While greatly increasing all our other activities, let us push the Home Society to the front where it belongs according to every principle of Scripture, mercy, economy, efficiency and common sense. If we will renew among us the zeal and self-denial of the pioneers of this movement, we will soon gloriously triumph to His honor and praise.