

THE AUSTRALIAN  
CHRISTIAN

# STANDARD


"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."—I THESS. 5 : 21.

VOL. II.—No. 9.]

MELBOURNE, SEPT. 1, 1887.

[FOUR SHILLINGS  
per annum.

## Notes of the Month.

 R. J. A. DOWIE, who is well-known in Melbourne as a representative of the faith healing fraternity, has been operating in New Zealand, and as usual it is reported that a number of cases have been cured by his agency. That he may have been instrumental in effecting some cures we do not intend to question, but that they have been done by any special divine power we emphatically deny. We should not even take the trouble to do this, were it not for the fact that a New Zealand correspondent writes informing us of a wonderful cure effected by Dowie, giving us the impression that some of our good friends in New Zealand are disposed to believe that these things are done in some way that cannot be accounted for by natural causes. The following, taken from the *Contemporary Review*, June 1887, will throw some light upon the matter:—

The aim of such an inquiry as I would fain see undertaken would be twofold: first, by the correlation and examination of credible cases of faith healing to ascertain what is the efficient factor in each—the essential element, probably common to all, whereby the cure is actually brought about; secondly, the possible employment of this essential healing agency at will in the cure of disease without descent either into fanaticism or quackery. Let us briefly catalogue the various classes of faith healing under the definitions given in the last page. They fall, I apprehend, into the following categories:—

- (a) Cures wrought by a man or woman supposed to administer divine healing.
- (b) Cures wrought by relics, holy water, &c., supposed to convey divine healing.
- (c) Cures wrought by charms, amulets, &c., supposed to convey a supernatural—though not necessarily divine—healing.
- (d) Cures wrought by a man or woman supposed to transmit a natural healing.
- (e) Cures wrought by sham medicines and medical appliances supposed to convey natural healing.

In class (a) we have a man or woman prominently engaged as the healer. Historically he or she is generally distinguished by a great personal reputation for sanctity, but sometimes, as in the case of popes and of kings and queens, who "touched" for the evil, by the sacredness of their office.\* What part does this healer play in the cures he performs, and what other part belongs to the person who is healed by faith in him? Does James, the healer, transmit a force, a virtue, an effluence of some sort, directly to the *body* of John, the person healed? Or does James only influence John's *mind* by the recognised means of an impressive personality or rank, and leave the healing to be accomplished by John's mind, thus vividly impressed,—on John's body? This is the first question to be answered in any inquiry into faith healing, and it needs to be carefully examined. The ordinary view is of course the first. It is assumed that a healing virtue (*dinamis*) proceeds straight from James to

\* See Macanlay's account of the "balsamic virtues of the royal hand," which William III. so unkindly declined to exercise. Dr. Carpenter ("Mental Physiology," p. 688) tells us: "Not only theologians of eminent learning, ability, and virtue gave the sanction of their authority to the belief, but some of the principal surgeons of the day certified that the cures were so numerous and rapid that they could not be attributed to any natural cause, and thus the failures were to be ascribed to want of faith on the part of the patients. Charles II. in the course of his reign had the service appointed by the Church of England for these royal healings was only withdrawn from the Prayer Book after the reign of Queen Anne.

John's body. I must state my reasons for being of a different opinion.

In the first place, all evidence goes to show that the *sine quâ non* of a successful experiment in miracle-working is the faith of the patient. "Not many mighty works" have been done in any time or place where "unbelief" prevailed. This faith would not be indispensable if the cure were effected by a material force or effluence reaching directly the body of the patient. Secondly, an equally large number of cures (class b) have been wrought by relics, holy water, and such objects, which may be understood vividly to affect the *mind* of a believer, but from which it is impossible to think that a physical healing force or effluence can have been dispensed.

For these reasons I am convinced that genuine cases of religious faith healing have been wrought purely by mental influence.

(b) The second class of faith healing supports the same conclusion with even greater cogency. As I have already said, a healing force proceeding from a living saint is just conceivable; but one issuing from holy water, oil, thorns, old bones, nails, hair, and bits of wood, is hardly within rational acceptance. Especially when it is noted that fictitious relics (such as the pieces of the "True Cross," of which there are said to be enough to build a ship) are just as efficacious as others, we cannot fail to see that it is through the believing mind of the patient that the healing is achieved. As he approaches the holy shrine, to which he has perhaps made a long a toilsome pilgrimage,—the longer and more toilsome the better,—or is anointed on his sick bed, amid the tears and solemn prayers of his friends, the tide of religious emotion rises in the man's soul as in the presence of a living apostle.

The third class (c) of faith healings, wrought by charms and amulets, common among uneducated people to this day in England, and everywhere implicitly believed among savages, are so obviously cures wrought by *mental* stimulus alone

(whenever wrought at all), that it is needless to speak of them at any length in this connection.

The fourth class (d) of cures includes those wrought by men supposed to possess natural healing powers. Here we find ourselves in the midst of the mesmeric and hypnotic controversies, into which I confess myself unable to penetrate. One point connected with them, which supports the view that faith healings are purely subjective, is—that the phenomena produced when a powerful mesmerist makes passes over his patient and *seems* to fling the magnetic fluid upon him, are very nearly matched by the phenomena produced by Braidism and hypnotism, where no mesmerist is concerned. As I have said, I feel incompetent to deal with this matter. There are many other cures, however, worked by faith in men or women quite independently of either mesmeric or religious pretensions, e.g., in the case of doctors of great reputation, whose mere presence in the sick-room does more good than their prescriptions.

Lastly, we reach the fifth (e) class of faith healings—cures wrought by sham medical appliances supposed to possess natural healing powers. In this department of the subject, we have certainly evidence galore of the power of purely mental impressions to heal disease. It is impossible to catalogue the absurd and absolutely inert drugs and agencies which—necessarily impotent on the *body* of the patient—have been powerful enough in their influence on his *mind* to enable that mind to cure his body. As Hunter remarked of one of them (a spider's web made into pills), it is necessary that they be administered "with the knowledge of the patient, else they have no effect at all." It is, then, his mental impression of their potency wherein all their potency resides. Dr. Carpenter admits that these sham medicines produce their effect not only in maladies in which nervous disorders have a share, but also in some, such as scurvy and gout, which "seem to depend on the existence of a definite perversion in the condition of the blood." He quotes from Lind "On Scurvy" a story of the siege of Breda in 1625, when the garrison were in so deplorable a state from scurvy that they were on the point of capitulating when the Prince of Orange managed to send three small phials containing a decoction of chamomile and camphor to the doctors, who gave out that four or five drops in a gallon of water was an infallible remedy for scurvy. The "Prince's remedy thoroughly checked the disease, and restored numbers who had been invalidated. (See "Mental Physiology," p. 668.)

We have now briefly surveyed the different kinds of faith healings, from the noblest to the basest, and having found

reason to attribute the cure to an influence exerted primarily on the mind of the patient, we are in a position to proceed to the main inquiry: What is the nature of that influence on the mind which enables it to conquer the diseases of the body?"

The consideration of this question opens up an important and interesting field of enquiry, which, no doubt, in the course of time, will be fully investigated and used by medical science for the relief of suffering. In the meantime, knowing somewhat of Mr. Dowie's past history, we would not recommend our friends to put too much faith in *him*.

SPAIN has generally been regarded as one of the strongholds of the Romish Church, but owing to the growing enlightenment of the people, there seems to be a growing desire on their part to get rid of some of the superstitious tyranny under which they have groaned for many centuries. Mrs. Lopez Rodriguez, writing to *Evangelical Christendom*, the monthly magazine of the Evangelical Alliance, gives a very striking account of a "pilgrimage" from Figueras to the shrine of "Our Lady of the Mountain" at Garriguella, a village among the Pyrenees. It was in reality rather a picnic than a pilgrimage, as we understand the word; for the pilgrims were conveyed by train, supplied with provisions, and even compensated for the loss of their day's wages. In spite of all these inducements there was no great eagerness to go, and considerable pressure had to be applied to make up a sufficient company. The attitude of the town population was scornful to begin with. The crowd showed no respect for the procession, and jeered at what they called the "comedy." When the excursion returned things were still worse. One of the priests was foolish enough to shout "Viva Carlos! Death to the Protestants! Viva the Inquisition!" At the sound of the Inquisition, the procession was at once charged, scattered, and stoned, the images smashed, the banners torn to shreds. In the end, one of the priests who had given the greatest provocation was arrested and locked up. It is not likely to do the cause either of Protestantism or

Catholicism much good, and the experiment will probably not be repeated for some time to come. Unfortunately, the result of such a scandal is to make people hostile, not to a church, but to religion in general.

IT is very gratifying to notice that the gospel of Jesus Christ is finding its way into the minds and hearts of a great number of Jewish people. The recent movements in this direction give ample proof that after the lapse of 19 centuries the ancient gospel has lost none of its power and vigor. The *British Weekly* gives the following short account of a remarkable Jewish Christian movement in Siberia:—

"News comes from ice-bound Siberia of a gospel movement essentially the same as that of Rabinowitz. The leader is Jacob Scheinmanu, a Polish Jew, who, 20 years ago, through independent thought, came to the conclusion that the Messiah, the Son of David, was the true Saviour. The strict Talmudic Jews got him transported to Siberia, where for 15 years he labored, almost unheeded, to awaken faith in his fellow exiles. Among the uncalled-for mail matter which he found at Tomsk, where he was engaged in business, was a pamphlet by Rabinowitz, with whom he at once communicated. He has been busy disseminating his views through pamphlets called "The Voice of One Crying in the Wilderness." Delitzsch's Hebrew translation of the New Testament is being eagerly read and studied by the Siberian Jews."

THE United States of America is far ahead of other nations in its efforts to curtail the operations of the liquor trade. The most advanced section of the total abstinence army—the Prohibitionists—are strong and united, and have gained many decisive victories. What they have done has not of course been accomplished without rousing the opposition and hatred of the liquor interest, as may be gathered from the following summary of "arguments" taken from an American paper:—"Wichita is a town of Kansas in which liquor used to flow freely. When news reached the saloonists of that place that a prohi-

bitory law had been passed, they published the following card:—

TO ALL PROHIBITIONISTS.

The saloon-keepers of Wichita have 300 dols. on deposit in this office

FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE WIDOW

of the Son of a Gun who makes

THE FIRST COMPLAINT

against the

LIQUOR DEALERS OF THIS TOWN.

This is the argument of intimidation.

In Texas men more or less prominent have met the argument for prohibition thus:—"We will fill the Brazos River with dead Prohibitionists."—*Judge Gerald.* "We will damn them."—*The Hon. John Hancock.* "The Prohibitionists go to Kansas for their pattern, to Plymouth Rock for their religion, to John Brown for their morals, and will go to Hell for their meanness, unless they quit it."—*Judge Gustave Cook.*

**A**N experiment (says the *Presbyterian Monthly*), is being made in the East end of London which cannot fail to be watched with profound interest. A band of men have gone out from Oxford and Cambridge, to the number of some twenty or thirty, and have settled down in that hitherto neglected locality, in order that they may employ their leisure time in improving and elevating the lower classes around them. They make themselves at home among the people, place themselves in immediate sympathy with the conditions of their life, ascertain by personal observation their tendencies and requirements, introduce elevating forms of recreation, spread higher knowledge, and show them how life may be made a noble thing—something worth living. The effort is known as the institution of Toynbee Hall. It is to be hoped that it will prove an important step in the direction of solving the great social question of the hour. The castle in the air, recently constructed by the popular novelist in "All Sorts and Conditions of Men," may possibly resolve itself into a veritable Palace of the People, not the least of the wonders of modern times.

Hymn for the Month.

THE ETERNAL WORLD.

Hark! hark! my soul, angelic songs are swelling  
O'er earth's green fields and ocean's wave-beat shore  
How sweet the truth those blessed strains are telling  
Of that new life when sin shall be no more.  
Angels of Jesus, angels of light,  
Singing to welcome the pilgrims of the night.  
Onward we go, for still we hear them singing,  
"Come, weary souls! for Jesus bids you come!"  
And, through the dark its echoes sweetly ringing,  
The music of the Gospel leads us home.  
Far, far away, like bells at evening pealing,  
The voice of Jesus sounds o'er land and sea,  
And laden souls by thousands meekly stealing,  
Kind Shepherd! turn their weary steps to Thee.  
Rest comes at length: though life be long and dreary,  
The day must dawn and darksome night be past;  
All journeys end in welcome to the weary.  
And heaven, the heart's true home, will come at last.  
Angels! sing on, your faithful watches keeping,  
Sing us sweet fragments of the songs above;  
Till morning's joy shall end the night of weeping,  
And life's long shadows break in cloudless love.

F. W. FABER.

Lord's Day Meditations.

September 4th.

"If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given to him."  
—Jas. 1: 5.



**H**ERE there is reference to a common human experience. Who is there that is not conscious of such a lack? Even those who have risen highest in the knowledge and love of God are

most sensible of their deficiencies, and are ready to ask for richer supplies. What is wisdom? (see chap. 3: 15-17.) In the reception of such Divine communications we are enriched—yea, are clothed with wisdom.

September 11th.

"Let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not."—Verse 5.

The apostolic injunction needs to be emphasised—"ask of God"—not of man, but of God! Much time is wasted by professing Christians even, in seasons of darkness and perplexity, in going after those who are esteemed wise men for counsel. A little season on the knees before God is the better way. "*He giveth liberally, to all men.*" He gives with divine magnanimity—gives like the only wise and loving heavenly Father. "*And upbraideth not.*" He will not reproach you for your unworthiness, your repeated asking and His frequent gifts, nor yet for the largeness of your present petitions, O, no! "*He upbraideth not!*"

September 18th.

"And it shall be given him."—Verse 5.

Here is a gracious promise. You need not come to the Mercy-Seat with any hesitancy or painful misgivings—but under the light and inspiration of the promise—a promise that is "yea, and amen, in Christ Jesus,"—a promise that shall have accurate and abundant fulfilment. Plead His own promise, and success is assured. The "shall" of the text is authoritative and conclusive.

September 25th.

"But let him ask in faith."—Verse 6.

There must be no wavering nor doubt of mind in coming to God—but faith. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." "*He that doubteth is like a wave of the sea.*" "Yea," says Mr. Wesley, "such are all who have not asked and obtained wisdom." "*Driven with the wind*"—from without; "*and tossed*"—from within, by his own unsteadiness.

Guide.

G. HUGHES.

# The Australian Christian Standard.

MELBOURNE, SEPTEMBER 1ST, 1887.

## PUBLISHER'S NOTICES.


Articles for publication (which should be as brief as possible) to be addressed "the Editors of the A. C. STANDARD," care of M. McLellan, 180 Russell Street, Melbourne, and should be to hand not later than the 10th of each month. All church news to be addressed A. B. MASTON, Chetwynd Street, Hotham, and should reach him by the 16th of each month to ensure insertion; earlier when convenient.

Subscription 4s. per annum, payable in advance, to

M. McLELLAN,  
Manager and Publisher  
180 Russell st., Melbourne.

PURITY, PEACE, UNITY, LOVE, POWER.

## THE VICTORIAN FREEMAN AND THE STANDARD.

 HE *Victorian Freeman* has rather strange notions in reference to journalistic etiquette. It practically holds the view that it is quite at liberty to use its columns for the purpose of misrepresenting and grossly libeling those with whom it may disagree, and refuse to allow the parties so injured any opportunity of defending themselves. This at any rate is the experience we have had of Baptist news papers, and of the *Freeman* more particularly.

There is only one conclusion we can come to in reference to conduct of this character, and that is, that the *Freeman* is afraid to permit its readers to see our side of the question. The journal that is not prepared to give its opponents fair play should never open up a controversy. Under no consideration should it be tempted to leave a neutral position and assume a hostile attitude, unless prepared to conduct the fight after an honest, manly fashion.

The *Freeman* for August comes out with a violent attack upon our article in the June *Standard*. Evidently what we said on that occasion has touched it to the quick, and from the intem-

perate nature of the language used it is evident that, finding it has no case, it has proceeded to "abuse the other side." As the first part of the article is mainly taken up with this kind of thing, we do not intend to reply to it, and consequently will not give it space in our columns.

It will be sufficient to say that the charge brought against us by the *Freeman* of "corrupting the word of God" by translating *eis* "in order to" has not been sustained, and that we have made good our position in this respect without having had to call in the aid of our reserve forces.

Those who care to see further proofs in support of our position, can do so by turning to page 206 where an article will be found under the heading of *The Voice of Scholarship on Acts 2:38*. From the perusal of this, our readers will be able to form an opinion of the scholarship of the writer who charged us with "corrupting the word of God" in giving the force or meaning of *eis* as "in order to."

We are therefore left free to deal with that phase of the question which the *Freeman* has succeeded in bringing into the controversy, viz., "Salvation by faith alone." It is well for various reasons that the *Freeman* has spoken out boldly on this question at the present juncture, as it leaves us in no doubt as to the position taken by the Baptists on this most important question. We are given to understand by the official organ of the denomination in Victoria that they hold, and teach that "Salvation is by faith alone." It is therefore clear that as the Disciples strenuously oppose this doctrine as false and dangerous, the difference between the two religious bodies is greater than is generally supposed. That the differences between them and us may be fully appreciated, we give the following extract from *Herzog's Cyclopaedia*:—"The essential distinction between the belief of the Baptists and that of other bodies of Christians is found in their view of the constitution of the visible church. Holding the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures and the doctrine of God's choice of His people, of regeneration as the sovereign work of the Holy

*Spirit, and of justification by faith alone.*" It will be seen from the foregoing that the Baptists have no more in common with us than other Protestants, save their agreement with us as to the mode of baptism; and as the practice of open communion prevails to a large extent with them, with a tendency towards "open" membership as well, even this point of agreement is considerably modified. We make these statements because we think it right to make the points of distinction between us as clear as possible, the more especially as the *Freeman* insists on these as causing a gulf of separation between us and them.

In order that our readers may see for themselves what the *Freeman* thinks of us and our views, we give the following extract from the article which appeared in the August issue:—

But we must hasten to a close. Only in the last column or two does he (*Standard*) touch upon the real point at issue between us. To our statement that the Scriptures teach salvation by faith alone, and that their testimony is most clear and decisive on this point, the *Standard* replies—"We discover that salvation is attributed to a number of things, as will be clearly seen from the following passages." He refers to Acts 16:30, *Believe, &c.*; Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptised, &c.;" Acts 2:38, *Repent and be baptised,* Rom. 10:9, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth, &c.;" Acts 22:16, "Arise and be baptised, &c.;" 1 John 4:16, "Whosoever shall confess, &c.;" He then adds—"In these passages salvation is attributed to (1) Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; (2) Repentance towards God; (3) Confession of the name of Christ, the Son of God; (4) Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Of course we do not mean to convey the idea that each of these statements set forth different ways (the grammar and the phraseology are the *Standard's*) of obtaining salvation, but that taken together they form the Divine plan whereby man may appropriate to himself the salvation which Christ wrought out for him . . . . The sensible and scriptural way of stating the matter is, that when the inspired writers say that faith, or repentance, or baptism are means of salvation, they intend to convey the idea that the part stands as expressive of the whole law of pardon."

It would appear then, according to the *Standard*, that the whole law of pardon is made up of a series of distinct and separate items, and that the due observation of each and all is necessary to salvation. He enumerates four such items, and it will be observed they are drawn from different and distant parts of the New Testament, and that no one chapter or even writer contains them all. But we beg to inform the *Standard* that the above four items are

only a few out of many. Christ said to the young ruler: "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." To a large multitude He said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Paul speaks of calling upon the name of the Lord, and the *Standard* vaguely hints at the Apostle James having something to say about the necessity of works. Now if the *Standard's* theory be correct all these items must be looked up and observed before pardon can be secured, and if this be so we are driven to the startling conclusion that throughout the whole New Testament there is not a single plain or correct statement of the way of salvation. Search the sayings of Christ, the writings of Paul, Peter, James, and John, and not one of these has unfolded the whole "law of pardon," or told a sinner how he may be saved! Nicodemus came to Christ for instruction, and Christ told him that God gave His Son that *whosoever believeth* on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life, but, according to the *Standard*, Christ knew that baptism and other things were necessary, and yet He did not say a word about them, and thus misled and deceived Nicodemus. In John the 6th, addressing a large multitude, He said, verse 40: "This is the will of my Father, that every one that *beholdeth* the Son, and *believeth* on Him should have eternal life." In the 47th verse of the same chapter he says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me hath everlasting life," and so on in many other places. It seems however, according to the *Standard*, Christ was wrong, and that the New Testament is a book of riddles, a storehouse of enigmas, and that it has been reserved for Alexander Campbell and his followers, in this nineteenth century, to discover the key which unlocks all these mysteries, and supplies all the deficiencies so sadly found in the teachings of Christ and His Apostles. For century after century the lowly followers of Jesus Christ have sat at His feet and trusted His teachings. When He has said to them: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent," John 6: 29; and again, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," John 3: 36, they have accepted His words in their plain, obvious meaning, and regarded them as containing an expression of "the whole law of pardon," and they have found peace, and victory over sin, and power for service. In this simple belief men like Luther, Owen, Flavel, Howe, Westley, Whitfield, and multitudes of distinguished servants of Christ, in all ages, have lived and labored and died, but all, according to the *Standard*, have been under a fatal illusion—misled by the Saviour they trusted; and to the *Standard* belongs the credit of having improved upon the teachings of his Master, and of making the brilliant discovery that in addition to repentance, faith, and baptism, innumerable other items are required to complete "the whole law of pardon," and secure the salvation of the soul. Fortunately, though so late in the world's history, the *Standard* is at last putting the Christian Church in the way of discovering how a sinner may be saved. Still much remains to be done

and the mournful fact is apparent that even the Campbellites have failed, and are in reality not a whit better off than their neighbors. Let the *Standard* bestir himself, and hunt out all the items which go to make up "the whole law of pardon." Let him summon to his aid all the helpers he can command, let them bequeath the work to their posterity, and then aided by their indefatigable exertions, we may hope, that as the day of Judgment draws near, some fortunate individual may have discovered the last item, put all the "scraps" together, and so have secured the salvation of his soul. But it may be too late to help others and whilst rejoicing in his own safety, he may have to gaze with sad and painful interest upon the vast multitudes of professed disciples of all ages, who have perished, through not understanding that a part stood for the whole—misled by the teachings of Christ and His Apostles.

"One other extract from the *Standard*, and we must close. Let us hear what he says about justification:—

"But does Paul teach justification or salvation by faith *alone*? We emphatically assert that he does not, but that he teaches justification by faith 'without the deeds of the law,' which is a very different thing." Of course after the examples we have had we shall not be surprised at anything the *Standard* may assert or deny, however emphatically it may be done. Those who are guided by Scripture will attach very little importance to his assertions, one way or the other. Let us turn to the Scriptures. Paul says being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. 5: 1). He tells us Abraham was justified by faith (Gal. 3: 6), and that they that be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. That it is one God who shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith. We beg to inform the *Standard* that the Apostle Paul was a truthful, honest man, incapable of equivocation, duplicity, or mental reservation; that he uses plain and simple language; that he means what he says, and says what he means; and that when he affirms we are justified by faith, he just means what any and every honest truthful man would mean by such an expression, viz., that faith itself, apart from any and every auxiliary, apart from the deeds of the law and baptism, &c., is sufficient to justify; in other words he means that man is justified by faith *alone*. Abram believed God and his faith was counted to him for righteousness. He was justified by faith. Was Abram's faith only one item towards his justification? Was he baptised, &c.? Even the *Standard* could hardly say that; and yet precisely the same faith in God's testimony respecting Christ justifies the sinner now.—See Gal. 3: 6-9, 22-26. The degree of information differed; but the faith is one. Abram believed God's testimony concerning Christ, and was saved. Christians believe the fuller testimony now presented, and are saved; and in both cases it is faith that justifies—a faith in God's word.

Our controversy with the *Standard* is now closed. A writer who virtually charges Christ with falsehood, and who attributes to Him a style of instruction which age

after age has fatally misled His followers; a writer who would teach us, that, when Christ affirmed "He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life." He did not mean it, and that other things, besides believing, and only to be found in Paul's writings, or elsewhere in Scripture, are equally necessary to salvation; a writer that emphatically contradicts the plainest assertions of Paul and other sacred writers, puts himself outside the pale of fair and honorable discussion. It is no longer a question of interpreting the word of Christ and His Apostles, it is a determination, at all hazards, to wrest those words in support of a forgone conclusion. It is really a setting aside the word of Christ, and a usurpation of His authority. Such a writer should seriously ask himself whether it is not possible he may be suffering from judicial blindness, and under strong delusion to believe a lie. At all events with such a writer we have nothing in common, and we would far rather encounter an open and avowed infidel than one who can so recklessly handle the word of God. May God give him repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.

We have only to say, in conclusion, that we are saved by grace through faith. To as many as receive Christ to them is given authority to become the sons of God, even to those who *believe* in His name. When Christ was asked what should we do that we may work the works of God, His reply was, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." Nor is there any contradiction in saying, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved; and in saying, "He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved." Baptism is a putting on Christ, a profession of faith in Christ, and is an act not to secure salvation, but a profession of a salvation already ours by faith. So confessing Christ, we don't confess Christ to obtain pardon, but in acknowledgment of a pardon already ours. They that are in the flesh cannot please God. By faith in Christ we obtain justification, the pardon of sin, eternal life, and when the tree is made good, then only can fruits of righteousness appear. This faith is the root out of which life springs, and from which only acceptable obedience flows and every statement of the way of salvation to be found in the New Testament perfectly harmonises with this truth."

The *Freeman* says:—

"If the *Standard's* theory be correct, all these items must be looked up and observed before pardon can be secured; and if this be so, we are driven to the startling conclusion that throughout the whole New Testament there is not a single plain or correct statement of the way of salvation."

As we do not hold ourselves responsible for the vagaries of the *Freeman* nor the vivid imagination which permits it to make us answerable for things we never expressed, we do not intend to ask the inquirer after salvation to go through the ex-

haustive process of "looking up" indicated by our contemporary. All the "items" mentioned by us can be found, either expressly stated or necessarily implied in Acts 2. We will take it for granted that the writer of the *Freeman* has sufficient intelligence to discover these "items" for himself, without putting us to the trouble of pointing them out in detail. We do not claim to possess an undue amount of intelligence, yet we guarantee to put the "anxious enquirer" in possession of the means of obtaining salvation, from the portion of scripture referred to, and yet, strange to say, it does not contain a single word about "salvation by faith alone."

The *Freeman* is rather unfortunate in selecting the case of Nicodemus to bolster up its particular theory, and instead of confounding us, it brings confusion on its own head. We are told—

"Nicodemus came to Christ for instruction, and Christ told him that God gave His Son that *whosoever believeth* on Him should not perish but have everlasting life; but, according to the *Standard*, Christ knew that baptism and other things were necessary, and yet He did not say a word about them, and thus misled and deceived Nicodemus."

Did He not say a word about them? Had you not better read your New Testament through again, Bro. *Freeman*? If you do so, and take off your "faith alone" spectacles, you will find that Christ did refer to baptism. He said to Nicodemus in the most solemn and emphatic manner, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). Referring to this passage, Dr. Lightfoot, who takes the front rank among commentators, says, "Baptism, our Lord tells him (Nicodemus) in this answer, is the ordinance of God by which all mankind are to be admitted into the kingdom of God or the gospel state." It is therefore evident, that so far as the *Freeman* is concerned, "it has been reserved for Alexander Campbell and his followers" to point out to it that Christ did not "mislead Nicodemus," but told him that baptism was necessary to an entrance into the kingdom of God. It so happens, however, that the Disciples

were not the first to discover that Christ spoke to Nicodemus in reference to baptism; it has been known and acted upon ever since the gospel of John was written, and no doubt Luther, Owen, Flavel, Howe, Wesley and Whitfield were not quite so ignorant as the *Freeman* appears to be on this subject. We can speak with certainty in reference to Wesley, as we have his "Notes on the New Testament" at hand, and by reference to them discover that he was not "misled by the Saviour he trusted," but knew very well that Christ had told Nicodemus that he must be born of water and of the Spirit before he could enter into the kingdom of God. What Wesley understood by this can be clearly seen from his comment on John 3:5, which runs thus:—"Except a man be born of water and the Spirit—Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptised (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it." In another place Wesley is still more emphatic on the subject of baptism. He says—"Baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and a seal of pardon; nor did God ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this (pardon) on any unless through this means." The *Freeman* should make itself acquainted with the writings of the men whose names it uses for the purpose of confounding us, or else it will incur the danger of being "hoist with its own petard," as it has in this case. Had Whitfield, who was the companion and friend of Wesley, lived in these days he would no doubt have been "put outside the pale of fair and honorable discussion" by the *Freeman* for his temerity in arraigning the clergy as "blind guides." Not having Whitfield to operate upon, the *Standard* is made the scape-goat of the *Freeman's* wrath.

The *Freeman* being at a loss for something to say (to put it in a charitable way) and giving the reins to its wildest imagination says:—

"Let him (*Standard*) summon to his aid all the helpers he can command, let them bequeath their work to their posterity, and then aided by their indefatigable exertions, we may hope that as the day of judgment draws near, some fortunate individual may have discovered the last item, put all the

"scraps" together, and so have secured salvation for his soul."

As a specimen of "argument" this is worthy of a place in the columns of a Freethought journal, it is certainly out of place in the columns of a decent Baptist paper. The *Freeman* is supposed to be referring to something that we have said; but we fail to find anything in our remarks to warrant any such conclusion or inference. We are much afraid that it is another instance of misrepresentation. In enumerating the conditions of pardon, we gave the following items—1. Faith; 2. Repentance; 3. Confession; 4. Baptism. For each of these we gave passages of scripture which undoubtedly supported our position, and which the *Freeman* could not gainsay. These were given as the conditions laid down in the New Testament, and if the *Freeman* quarrels with them, it does not quarrel with us, but with the word of God. If the *Freeman* chooses to regard these as "scraps"—well, so much the worse for it.

The *Freeman* now proceeds to deal with that part of our reply in which we ask, "Does Paul teach justification by faith alone?" The *Freeman* affirms, we deny. We, however, have never denied that Paul taught "justification by faith," but we have denied, and still deny, that he taught the "faith alone" theory. Paul (says one of our ablest writers) nowhere affirms justification by faith without the "obedience of the faith;" on the contrary, he declares that that which justifies—that which avails in Christ—worketh by love. It is not "faith alone" for which he everywhere contends, but faith which although unpreceded by any justifying obedience, is nevertheless accompanied, succeeded, and evidenced by obedience to Christ. It is a theory that induces a vain attempt at filling the mind with faith rather than engrossing it with Him on whom the candidate for salvation is commanded to believe. It makes a *saviour of faith* rather than of Christ. It invests faith with such an all-engrossing importance as to make it almost, if not altogether, the only term of salvation. Other terms specified with equal distinctness are ignored, and "faith alone" is inscribed on the

banners of Protestantism, albeit the phrase occurs in Scripture but once, and then only to be condemned.

This will be seen at once by a reference to James 2. The apostle James, we beg to inform the *Freeman*, "was a truthful, honest man, incapable of equivocation, duplicity, or mental reservation; that he uses plain and simple language; that he means just what he says, and says what he means." You agree with us, do you not Bro. *Freeman*? Let us hear then what this eminently trustworthy witness has to say. "What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith but have not works? *Can faith save him?* . . . . . Even so faith if it hath not works, is dead in itself. Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith. Thou believest that God is one; thou doest well; the devils also believe and shudder. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought *with* his works, and by works was faith made *perfect*; and the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God. Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith *only*." James 2: 14-24. Here, James says expressly that a man is *not* justified by "faith *alone*." Will you also put him "outside the pale of fair and honorable discussion?"

"We," says the *Freeman*, "beg to inform the *Standard* that the apostle Paul was a truthful, honest man, incapable of equivocation, duplicity, or mental reservation; that he uses plain and simple language; that he means what he says and says what he means."

Well, that is just what we always thought of the Apostle Paul, and it gives us great pleasure to agree with you for once by way of a change, but we cannot, we regret to say, apply the same words to those who teach the doctrine of salvation or justification "by faith alone," for they do not mean what they say. The fact of the matter is that "justification

by faith *alone*" is part of the stock in trade of the theological juggler, used by him to defend positions he could not hold for a single moment had he not some piece of legerdemain with which to hide his confusion. If he is hard pressed and put into a corner, it is discovered that with him faith means more than faith; in his hand it is a word of mysterious meaning, passing entirely the comprehension of ordinary mortals. As the advocates of infant sprinkling find a misty refuge in the Abrahamic covenants, so our Baptist friends cover themselves with the fogs of "faith alone." The apostle Paul being "an honest truthful man" never descended to tactics of this kind. When he spoke of "justification by faith," he did not speak of faith as though it possessed magical powers, nor did he *disassociate* it from other things in the philosophy or plan of salvation. "The very heart and centre of the apostle's argument," says Wace, "is to be seen in Chapter 6 of the Epistle to the Romans, in which, to obviate any possible abuse of the doctrine of grace and forgiveness, he insists with the utmost urgency on the fact that our position as Christians is one of the most intimate union with the Saviour, alike in his death and in his risen life. The baptism which admits us to our Christian privileges, is described by the Apostle as baptism into Jesus Christ, into His death, and into His life. We pledged ourselves in that sacrament to fellowship and oneness with Him in the supreme act of His life, in that crucifixion in which He died to all sin, living only unto God. Faith in Him, the faith which ensures our forgiveness and justification at God's hands, *implies this acceptance* of complete fellowship with Christ in that renunciation of all sin which led to His crucifixion, and which was carried out to the full in it; and in proportion as such fellowship and oneness in Christ's death is attained by us, in that proportion are we also united with the Saviour in His present life of power and grace." The faith that Paul speaks of is never alone, it is always accompanied by action, it makes itself manifest in some tangible way, otherwise it is barren—without

fruit. There is no instance in the Bible, that we know of, where faith is spoken of with approval, in which faith does not make itself manifest by an overt act, therefore when the *Freeman* speaks of "faith being alone" it is not true to Bible teaching.

We are next referred to Abraham and Galatians 3. So far as Abraham is concerned, the apostle James explains his case, but although James virtually settles the matter, yet we have a word or two to say in this connection. We are asked, was Abraham baptised, &c., and the *Freeman* says that "even the *Standard* could hardly say that." No, for the simple reason that we are not in the habit of saying silly things; but what we do say is, that the Galatians to whom Paul wrote were baptised, and that they put on Christ in baptism. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3: 26, 27.) The *Freeman* in this controversy quoted verse 26 but left out 27. In the article in the August number our attention is directed to Gal. 3: 6, 9, 22, 26, but verse 27 is left out; the reason for this course is obvious, for only in this way can the supporters of the "faith alone" theory make any decent show at all. Verses 26 and 27 are joined together, and explain each other, and have no right to be separated, in this present argument at any rate. Paul says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." We believe that, but we do not find anything here about "faith *alone*." As a matter of fact, the next verse denies that faith is *alone* in making us the sons of God, for the argument is, "(Ye are sons) for ye have put on Christ in baptism, and all who have put on Christ are sons." The apostle therefore affirms here that we become sons of God through faith and baptism. The chief point we wish to bring out is, that faith and baptism are associated together in making us "sons of God," and therefore that faith is not *alone*. But perhaps, Bro. *Freeman*, you would like to hear what Luther has to say on this portion of scripture. Was he under "a fatal illusion—misled by the Saviour he

trusted?" Let us see. "This is diligently to be noted, because of the fond and fantastical spirits which go about to deface the majesty of baptism and speak wickedly of it. Paul contrarywise commendeth it, and setteth it forth with commendable titles, calling it the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Titus 3: 5.) And here also he saith, that all they which are baptised into Christ have put on Christ; as if he had said: ye are carried out of the law into a new birth, which is wrought in baptism." (*Luther on Galatians 3: 27.*) Here you will see, Bro. *Freeman*, that Luther knew all about baptism, and that if he was misled he was misled with his eyes wide open.

The *Freeman* is very prolific in assertion, but it does not back up what it says by appealing to recognised authorities. It quotes from the word of God such portions as seem to suit its convenience, and we are asked to receive the unsupported comments of a writer whose name we are not supposed to know. We, on the contrary, give not only quotations from the New Testament, and our understanding of them, but support our view by the opinions of men standing high in the world of scholarship. In pursuance of this method, we have much pleasure in quoting from Joseph Agar Beet's Commentary on the Romans, of which Dr. Morrison says, "It is a masterpiece of biblical exposition; I prize it exceedingly." Others speak of it in equally high terms. Beet, in speaking of the doctrinal results of the Epistle to the Romans, and particularly in reference to Paul's view of the way of salvation, says: "Paul assumes that God has given to all his readers the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit (8: 9-16, 5: 5.) He speaks of the Spirit, as of justification, never as a benefit to be sought, but as one already received. The absence of the Spirit would be proof that they did not belong to Christ (8: 9), hence we infer that the Spirit was given to them, together with justification, when they believed and were baptised (Gal. 3: 14; Acts 2: 38.)"

Here we have one of the foremost commentators of the present day giving

it as his opinion that the apostle Paul teaches in his epistle to the Romans that the Holy Spirit and justification are given to the believer at his baptism. From this, and what we have said previously, our readers will be able to judge for themselves who it is that "determines at all hazards to wrest the words of scripture in support of a foregone conclusion." They will see that in charging us with "setting aside the word of Christ, and usurping His authority," the *Freeman* is just as correct as when it charged us with "corrupting the word of God" in translating *eis* "in order to." We might ask, Who is this writer that so recklessly condemns us as "suffering from judicial blindness and under strong delusion to believe a lie?" What proof has he given us in this controversy of his ability to expound the word of God? If he stood in the front rank of biblical critics, his language, even if we were wrong in the position we have taken, would be unjustifiable to the last degree, but coming from one who is utterly unknown to the scholarship of the day, it is the very height of presumption and bad taste.

For every assertion we have made in this controversy we are supported by the word of God and the best scholars of this and other days, and yet this writer is so ignorant of his Bible and the men who expound it, that he declares that he would rather encounter an "open and avowed infidel than one who can so recklessly handle the word of God." The only way we can palliate a statement of this kind is by believing that the writer is a very ignorant man and more deserving our pity than our anger.

In conclusion, we may say that we agree with the *Freeman* when it asserts that there is no contradiction in saying "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" and saying "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." We will even go further than the *Freeman*, and say that when Peter on the Day of Pentecost, said—"Repent and be baptised . . . . unto the remission of sins," he did not contradict either of the foregoing statements. The

simple elucidation of the matter is found in regarding the word "belief" when used by itself in reference to salvation as of necessity contemplating repentance and baptism. For instance we have seen a column in Baptist newspapers headed "Baptisms," giving a list of those added to the church. We never concluded that the persons so enumerated were only immersed, but regarded the word "Baptism" as including the idea that those spoken of had manifested faith and repentance as well. So too when we speak of persons as "believers," it is a short way of indicating that they have been obedient in that which pertains to salvation: the idea of faith is not the only thing contemplated.

Baptism is more than a profession of faith in Christ, strictly speaking—that is not its primary signification. It is rather putting on the Christ in whom we have already professed to believe; it is a burial of the past life with its sins, and rising to walk in newness of life. Robert Hall, the greatest preacher the Baptist denomination ever had, knew the word of God better than to say what the *Freeman* does on this subject. He stands side by side with us when he says, "I embrace without hesitation the affirmative side, and assert that, in the apostolic age, baptism was necessary to salvation." *Hall's Work*, Vol. 2, p. 286.

---

It is high time that beautiful upon the mountains should be the feet of those that bring good tidings, and that publish peace. I look upon that as the great crusade of this generation. Our fathers went as Crusaders to Palestine to rescue a material sepulchre, and we have to rescue the living temples, in some respects, human beings for their Saviour and their Lord.—*Canon Farrar*.

THE tree of peace strikes its root into the crevices of the everlasting Rock; it grows securely from that Rock, and casts out its cool shadow in the sunshine, and makes sweet music in the storm, and is to the believer as the shadow of a great rock and fruit of refreshment in a weary and parched land.—*Dr. Cumming*.

Busy lives, like busy waters, are generally pure. Stagnant lives, like stagnant pools, breed corruption.—*W. D. Nicholas*.



## Editorial Notes.

**MESSIAH'S MINISTRY**, Visit to Sydney, in type, will appear in next issue.

**SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.**—One of our wealthy brethren is desirous of having a more systematic system of lessons taught in our schools, so that the leading principles of the gospel dispensation may be more firmly grounded in the minds of our young people. He offers to give a substantial prize for the best list of gospel questions and answers, and to bear the cost of printing them. We commend the matter to the S.S. Union officers.

THE adjourned meeting of officers of the Churches of Christ in Melbourne and suburbs was held in the Swanston Street Church on August 1. Bro. J. Strang filled the chair, and Bro. Wiseman was appointed secretary. The churches at Carlton, Collingwood, Melbourne, South Melbourne, Brighton, Prahran, Footscray, Kensington, North Fitzroy, and Hawthorn were represented. The topic under consideration was the question of "Eldership," the further consideration of which had been adjourned at the previous meeting. Considerable interest was manifested in the question, and a number of those present gave their ideas upon the matter, thus bringing out various points of interest.

WE have received two communications from a correspondent signing himself "Anti-Christ Exposed," dealing with the subject known as "Soul Sleeping," of which theory he appears to be an advocate. We regard this as one of the questions which it is not profitable to discuss in the columns of a newspaper. It makes but little difference whether we hold that the soul proceeds at once to its final place of abode, or that we hold that the soul sleeps until the resurrection, so long as our faith is firmly fixed in Christ as the resurrection and the life. It is a question that Christians may discuss in a friendly way at the fireside, but at present we do not see our way clear to give the discussion a place in our columns.

The first half-yearly report of the Mutual Improvement Society, Footscray, has been forwarded to us by the Secretary, Bro. W. Renwick, and contains an account of the formation and work of the Society since October, 1886, to the present time. Judging from the variety of exercises given by its members, we should say that the Footscray class is doing a good work, and should be very successful in developing the talents of those belonging to it.

"CHRISTIAN BAPTISM or the Baptism of the Holy Ghost *versus* Water," is the title of a pamphlet sent to us for review; but as the writer disputes the authority of the

apostles and seems to think that it is his business to put them right, we cannot waste our time and space trying to follow the bewildering track of such an erratic scribe. The article in the last number of the *Standard*—"Messiah's Ministry," contains all the reply that need be given on the subject of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

WE are requested to state that the Church at Prahran intend holding a tea and public meeting about the end of September, in order to bid farewell to Bro. Lewis, who will shortly leave the colony for New Zealand. As Bro. Lewis is highly esteemed by all the brethren, there is sure to be a large gathering to say "Good-bye."

ALL communications for the church at Footscray should be addressed to Bro. Charles Clark, Staff Street, who has been appointed Sec, Bro. Warne having resigned.

BRO. J. LAURIE, junr., of South Australia, writes expressing his satisfaction that Bro. C. E. Hutchinson has submitted to Christian baptism, referring to a letter from this brother which appears in last *Standard*, under the heading "Christian Baptism." Bro. Laurie appears to write on this matter in order to express his dissatisfaction with that part of Bro. C. E. H.'s letter in which he refers to the Presbyterians and the drink trade. This is what C. E. H. says:—"I also know that they (Disciples) to a member took a clear unhesitating stand against the drink trade; the Presbyterians don't, so I felt at one with the Disciples." Bro. Laurie intimates (with approval evidently) that many brethren in South Australia do not regard total abstinence as being taught or enjoined by the word of God. It appears to us that all the scripture required to make us stand squarely opposed to the drink trade is found in the admonition given by the Apostle Paul, viz., that we do nothing which shall cause our brethren to fall or stumble. No one reading the daily papers, or acquainted with the verdicts pronounced from the judicial bench, can be ignorant of the fact that the drink trade is the greatest cause of "falling and stumbling" known to mankind. It is the chief cause of crime, misery, and poverty. As the *Times* once said, it does more in [these directions than all other causes of evil put together. The *Standard* therefore, for these reasons, if for no others, stands squarely against the drink trade. It would be sad news for us to learn that our brethren in South Australia were not occupying the same ground on this question as their brethren in the other colonies.

TITLES.—J. W. MCGARVEY, editor of the *Apostolic Guide*, writes:—"The editor of this paper recently received a letter from a distinguished scholar, in which it suited his purpose to ask me for my titles. In

reply I said—'I have no titles except the literary degrees given me by the college in which I was graduated. I am associated with a body of disciples who eschew honorary religious titles, and seek to restore the primitive order of things.' In a letter he responds to this remark as follows:—"Your remark about religious titles finds in me a strong sympathy. It has always seemed to me that the honorary degrees conferred by colleges upon clergymen foster a spirit at variance with the command of Christ and the simplicity of the gospel. For myself, I could never seek for nor encourage such distinction.' This is a fair indication of the way in which these titles are regarded by men of high attainments and little vanity. If we will only adhere firmly and consistently to the teaching of the Master on the subject, we will find an ever-increasing number of good and thoughtful men in sympathy with us, until finally the 'simplicity of the gospel' will prevail. Will our contributors all please take the hint, and never in their articles for publication make use of the title *Rev.* or *D.D.* as an attachment to any man's name, or of the equally unscriptural and oft-times false prefix, *Eld.*"

THE first of the winter series of discourses arranged by the Committee of the Sunday School Union was delivered on the 8th of last month by Bro. G. B. Moysey, who took for his theme "The Special Blessedness of Piety in Early Life." The speaker handled his subject in a most able manner, and fully repaid his audience for their attendance. We should like to see these meetings well patronised by the brethren generally, but especially should teachers and scholars belonging to the different schools avail themselves of the opportunities of acquiring useful knowledge and instruction, as it is for their advantage that the Committee of the Union design these meetings. The next discourse is by Bro. Porter on August 25, subject—"The Teacher's Qualifications," to be followed by Bro. Strang on "The Existence of God," and by Bro. Maston on "Money and the Kingdom." All of these will be delivered in the Swanston Street Chapel.

LYGON STREET—Adelphian Mutual Improvement Society.—A circular and copy of the amended rules of the above society have been handed to us. This society has been in existence in connection with the Church in Carlton for many years. During those years it has won for itself an honourable record. Under its auspices young brethren in former years developed gifts which eventually resulted in their taking an influential position amongst the brotherhood as preachers and teachers. The society displays unabated vigor. At no time, perhaps, has there been a larger number of

young men connected with it; and it is the avowed intention of "the members to raise the tone of the exercises considerably, so as to prove more instructive and attractive to a more advanced class." The first, and therefore the primary object of the society as it is now constituted is thus expressed, viz.,—"The acquiring of *Scriptural* and other useful knowledge by its members, with a view to develop their talents for usefulness." We decidedly like the ring of this, and wish the Adelphian Society much success in so laudable an object. Already there are several young brethren from sister congregations on the members' roll, and others who desire to develop their gifts could not do a better thing than become Adelphians. The meetings are held on the first Wednesday of every month, in the vestry of the Lygon Street Chapel. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday evening, September 7th, the topic for the evening being "Prayer in Relation to Natural Law." Bro. Strang, the president of the society, will open the subject with a paper supposed to occupy twenty minutes, after which the question will be thrown open for discussion. The theme is in touch with the current of "modern thought," and its consideration should be conducive in an eminent degree to the intellectual, moral, and spiritual improvement of all who can make it convenient to attend. The meetings, we may add, are not confined to members of the society. A cordial invitation is extended to the members of the various congregations and the general public.

## The Expositor.

### THE VOICE OF SCHOLARSHIP ON ACTS 2: 38.

(Ten years ago Robert T. Mathews, a writer with whom most of our readers are well and pleasantly acquainted through his articles that we have had the pleasure of publishing, wrote to a number of scholars asking for their translation of Acts 2: 38, and he received the following replies. We copy them so that they may be preserved in more convenient form.)



HIS is the request that I make of these Greek professors:—

"Will you be so kind as to give me your translation of the preposition *eis* in Acts 2: 38, and your opinion, as a Greek scholar, as to what grammatical relation it expresses between the predicates of the verse and the phrase *aphesin amartion*? I shall be obliged for your

answer in the light of scholarship, aside from all theological applications of the verse."

The answers are herewith given as appeared in the *Apostolic Times*, June 8 and 15, 1876.

Professor Tyler, of Amherst College, Massachusetts:

"Yours of the 9th inst. is just received. I shall translate Acts 2: 38 literally thus:—*Repent and let every one of you be baptized in (or on,) the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of sins.* The preposition *eis* seems to denote the object and end of the two verbs which precede in the imperative. In other words, remission of sins is the object and end (or result) of repentance and baptism. The meaning may perhaps be more definitely and unequivocally expressed thus: Repent and let every one of you be baptized to the end that your sins may be forgiven. The passage does not imply that repentance and baptism stand in the same moral, religious, essential or formal relation to forgiveness, any more than believing and being baptized stand in the same relation to being saved in Mark 16: 16; or being born of water and the Spirit stand in the same relation to entering into the kingdom of God in John 3: 5. The result is fully realized in each of these cases only when both the outward and the inward conditions are fulfilled. But that the outward condition is less essential is clearly indicated by its omission in the negative and condemnatory part of Mark 16: 16, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' I do not know that I have met the precise point and object of your inquiries, I have only touched the points of chief interest and importance as they present themselves to my own mind."

Prof. H. C. Cameron, of Princetown College, N. J.

"The preposition *eis* in Acts 2: 38, is evidently used in its final sense, and the phrase is clearly connected with *metanoesate kai baptistheeti* (repent and be baptized) as the end to which repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus led. The conviction of sin in the crucifixion of Jesus, who was both Lord and Christ, led the multitude to inquire of the apostles, 'What shall we do?' 'Do', for what purpose? Evidently 'for the remission of sins', as shown in the answer of the apostle. They thought only of the sin against Christ, which, since His advent as the essence of sin ('of sin because they believed not on me,); but the apostle makes the matter more general—'remission of sins.' The term *aphesin* (remission), except in the quotation from Isaiah (Luke 4: 18) has but one signi-

fication in the New Testament. This then, was the object contemplated both in the question and the answer, and to which *eis* points. Trusting that this hasty note, which does not enter into the question of baptism, or of its relation to salvation, or even of the meaning of the expression *epi too onomati* (in the name,) is a sufficient answer to your question, I remain yours truly."

Professor Packard, of Yale College, Connecticut:

"Your letter of inquiry as to the meaning of *eis* in Acts 2: 38, was handed to me this morning. I do not suppose it is possible to determine from classical or patristic usage a necessary meaning for such a word, which can be applied in any new case. It is so frequent a word, has so many various meanings, and expressing only relation, depends so entirely on context for its determination, that each case must be decided mainly by itself. Here it seems to be connected with both verbs. With *baptizo* alone it has a special New Testament use, as to the meaning of which scholars are somewhat divided. My own impression (to give it for what it is worth) is that I shall translate it, if these words occurred in Plato, for instance, to the end of remission of sins. It would then make *aphesin hamartion* an object aimed at, or a result attained by the acts denoted by the verbs. But this leads one necessarily into the domain of theology. I am sorry I cannot give you a more definite answer."

Professor Foster, of Colby University, Maine:

"Without a special examination of the passage in connection with others in which like expressions occur, I should say that the word here has the force of 'unto', 'in order to', 'for the sake of', indicating a result to be attained, and that it connects the phrase *aphesin hamartion* with both the foregoing imperative verbs, alike grammatically considered, though, on other grounds, I shall say, specially with the first, since pardon is nowhere offered on condition of baptism alone, while it is on that of repentance. This is briefly my response to your inquiry as I understand it."

Prof. D'Ooge, of Ann Arbor University, Michigan:

"In reply to your inquiry I would say that in my judgment the preposition *eis* in the verse referred to expresses the relation of aim or end in view, answering the question *eis ti* (for what?), and to be translated by 'unto', 'in order to', 'for.' This sense of *eis*, as you doubtless know, is recognised by Liddel and Scott for classical, by Winer for New Testament, usage. I cannot agree with those who ascribe

to *eis* nearly the same force in the phrase, 'baptise into the name,' but understand it then to be used in the sense of 'in reference to,' 'in relation to.'

Prof. Flagg, of Cornell University, N. Y. :—

"In answer to your enquiry about the force of the preposition *eis*, in the passage of the New Testament to which you refer (Acts 2 : 38), I should say that it denoted intention or purpose, 'with a view to,' much as if it had been written 'so as to obtain remission of sins.' I speak, however, wholly from the standpoint of classic Greek, not being familiar with the changes introduced by Hellenistic. As to any theological bearings that the subject may have, I am wholly indifferent."

Prof. Proctor, of Dartmouth College, N. H. :—

"It is my opinion that *eis* is to be connected with both predicates, and that it denotes an object or end in view. I am inclined to think that the phrase, 'in the name of Christ,' though grammatically limiting only *baptistheeti*, does in thought modify the connection of *eis*, the ideas standing logically in the following order, viz: Having been shown your ill behaviour against the Messiah, put faith in (the name of) Christ; on the basis of that faith repent and (confess) be baptised, and then be forgiven:—*eis* connecting *aphesin* not with the two predicates separately, but with the whole preceding part of the sentence. I have first and last given a good deal of attention to this point, but cannot yet speak more confidently than I have done. If you enjoy this study as I do, I congratulate you most cordially. I establish few doctrines as such, but the divine Word is more and more a sustenance and solace."

Prof. Harkness, of Brown University, Rhode Island :—

"In my opinion *eis* in Acts 2 : 38, denotes *purpose*, and may be rendered 'in order to,' or, 'for the purpose of receiving,' or, as in our English version, *for*. *Eis aphasin hamartion* suggests the motive or object contemplated in the action of the two preceding verbs."—*Christian Quarterly*.

God's laws were never designed to be like cobwebs which catch the little flies, but suffer the large ones to break through.  
—Matthew Henry.

God is love. It is He who hath made everything, and He loves every thing that He has made.—Brooke.

## THE SYNONYMES "BISHOP" AND "PRESBYTER."



It is a fact now generally recognised by theologians of all shades of opinion, that in the language of the New Testament the same officer in the church is called indifferently "bishop" (*episcopos*) and "elder" or "presbyter" (*presbuteros*.) The bearing of this fact on the origin and authority of the "episcopate," as the term was understood later, and as it is understood in the present day, will be considered in a dissertation at the end of this volume. At present it will be sufficient to establish the fact itself; but before doing so, it may be useful to trace the previous history of the two words.

*Episcopus*, "bishop," "overseer," was an official title among the Greeks. In Athenian language it is used especially to designate commissioners appointed to regulate a new colony or acquisition, so that the Attic "bishop" corresponded to the Spartan "harmost." Thus the impostor, who intrudes upon the colonists in Aristophanes (*Av. 1022*) says *episkopos neou den ro kuamo la chon*. These officers are mentioned also in an inscription, Boeckh No. 73. The title however is not confined to Attic usage; it is the designation for instance of the inspectors whose business it was to report to the Indian kings (Arrian *Ind. xii. 5*); of the commissioner appointed by Mithridates to settle affairs in Ephesus (Appian *Mithr. 48*); of magistrates who regulated the sale of provisions under the Romans (Charisius in the *Dig. l. 4. 18*); and of certain officers in Rhodes whose functions are unknown (Ross. *Inscr. Græc. Ined. fasc. III. Nos. 275, 276.*)

In the LXX the word is common. In some places it signifies "inspectors, superintendents, taskmasters," as 2 Kings 11 : 19, 2 Chron. 34 : 12, 17, Is. 60 : 17; in others it is a higher title, "captains" or "presidents," Neh. 11 : 9, 14, 22. Of Antiochus Epiphanes we are told that when he determined to overthrow the worship of the one true God, he "appointed commissioners (*episkopous*, bishops) over all the people," to see that his orders were obeyed (1 Macc. 1 : 51 comp. Joseph *Ant. xii. 5. 4*; in 2 Macc. 5 : 22 the word is *epistatos*.) The feminine *episkope*, which is not a classical word, occurs very frequently in the LXX, denoting sometimes the *work*, sometimes the *office*, of an *episkopos*. Hence it passed into the language of the New Testament and of the Christian Church.

Thus beyond the fundamental idea of *inspection*, which lies at the root of the word "bishop," its usage suggests two subsidiary notions also; (1) responsibility to a superior power; (2) the introduction of a new order of things.

The earlier history of the word *presbyterus* (elder, presbyter, or priest) is much more closely connected with its Christian sense. If the analogies of the "bishop" are to be sought chiefly among heathen nations, the name and office of the "presbyter" are essentially Jewish. Illustrations indeed might be found in almost all nations ancient or modern, in the *lerousia* of Sparta for instance, in the "senatus" of Rome, in the "signoria" of Florence, or in the "aldermen" of our own country and time, where the deliberative body originally took its name from the advanced age of its members. But among the chosen people we meet at every turn with presbyters or elders in church and state from the earliest to the latest times. In the lifetime of the lawgiver, in the days of the judges, throughout the monarchy, during the captivity, after the return, and under the Roman domination, the "elders" appear as an integral part of the governing body of the country. But it is rather in a special religious development of the office, than in these national and civil presbyteries, that we are to look for the prototype of the Christian minister. Over every Jewish synagogue, whether at home or abroad, a council of "elders" presided. It was not unnatural therefore that, when the Christian synagogue took its place by the side of the Jewish, a similar organisation should be adopted with such modifications as circumstances required; and thus the name familiar under the old dispensation was retained under the new.

Of the identity of the "bishop" and "presbyter" in the language of the apostolic age, the following evidence seems conclusive.

(1) In the opening of this epistle St. Paul salutes the "bishops" and "deacons." Now it is incredible that he should recognise only the first and third order and pass over the second, though the second was absolutely essential to the existence of a church and formed the staple of its ministry. It seems therefore to follow of necessity that the "bishops" are identical with the "presbyters." Whether or not the Philippian Church at this time possessed also a "bishop" in the later sense of the term, is a question which must be reserved for the present.

(2) In the Acts (20 : 17) St. Paul is represented as summoning to Miletus the "elders" or "presbyters" of the

Church of Ephesus. Yet in addressing them immediately after he appeals to them as "bishops" or "overseers" of the church (20:28.)

(3) Similarly St. Peter, appealing to the "presbyters" of the churches addressed by him, in the same breath urges them to "fulfil the office of bishops" (*episkopountes*) with disinterested zeal (1 Pet. 5:1, 2.)

(4) Again in the first epistle to Timothy, St. Paul, after describing the qualifications for the office of a "bishop" (3:1-7), goes on at once to say what is required of "deacons" (3:8-13.) He makes no mention of presbyters. The term "presbyter" however is not unknown to him; for having occasion in a later passage to speak of Christian ministers he calls these officers no longer "bishops," but "presbyters" (5:17-19.)

(5) The same identification appears still more plainly from the apostle's directions to Titus (1:5-7); "That thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain *elders* in every city, as I appointed thee; if any one be *blameless*, the husband of one wife, having believing children who are not charged with riotousness or unruly; for a *bishop* (*ton episkopon*) must be *blameless*," etc.

(6) Nor is it only in the apostolic writings that this identity is found. St. Clement of Rome wrote probably in the last decade of the first century, and in his language the terms are still convertible. Speaking of the apostles he says that "preaching in every country and city (*kata choras kai kata poleis*) they appointed their first-fruits, having tested them by the Spirit, to be *bishops* and *deacons* of them that should believe (*mellonton pistenain*)." § 42. A little later, referring to the disorganised state of the Corinthian church, he adds, "Our apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife concerning the authority (*epi tou onomatou*) of the *bishopric*."—"We shall incur no slight guilt if we eject from the *bishopric* those who have presented the offerings unblameably and holily. Blessed are the *presbyters* who have gone before, whose departure was crowned with fruit and mature." § 44.

This is the last instance of identification. With the opening of a second century a new phraseology begins. In the epistles of Ignatius the terms are used in their more modern sense. In his letter to Polycarp he writes: "Give heed to the bishop, that God also may give heed to you. I am devoted to those who are obedient to the bishop, to presbyters, to deacons (to *episkopo, presbuterois, deakonis*.)"

The bishop is always singled out by this writer as the chief officer of the church. So about the same time Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, gives directions to the *deacons* and the *presbyters*. He also begins his letter, "Polycarp and the *presbyters* that are with him." With this form of address may be coupled the fact that the writer is distinctly called "*bishop* of Smyrna" by Ignatius (*Polyc. init.*)

Towards the close of the second century the original application of the term "bishop" seems to have passed not only out of use, but almost out of memory. So perhaps we may account for the explanation which Irenæus gives of the incident at Miletus (Acts 20:17, 28.) "Having called together the *bishops* and *presbyters* who were from Ephesus and the other neighboring cities." But in the fourth century, when the fathers of the church began to examine the apostolic records with a more critical eye, they at once detected the fact. No one states it more clearly than Jerome. "Among the ancients," he says, "bishops and presbyters are the same, for the one is a term of dignity, the other of age." "The apostle plainly shows," he writes in another place, "that presbyters are the same as bishops...It is proved most clearly that bishops and presbyters are the same." Again in a third passage he says "If anyone thinks the opinion that the bishops and presbyters are the same, to be not the view of the scriptures but my own, let him study the words of the apostle to the Philippians," and in support of his view he alleges the scriptural proofs at great length. But, though more full than other writers, he is hardly more explicit. Of his predecessors, the Ambrosian Hilary had discerned the same truth. Of his contemporaries and successors, Chrysostom, Pelagius, Theodore of Mopseustia, Theodoret, all acknowledge it. Thus in every one of the extant commentaries on the epistles containing the crucial passages, whether Greek or Latin, before the close of the fifth century, this identity is affirmed. In the succeeding ages, bishops and popes accept the verdict of St. Jerome without question. Even late in the mediæval period, and at the era of the reformation, the justice of his criticism or the sanction of his name carries the general suffrages of theologians.—*Dr. Lightfoot on Philippians.*

The strongest men are the most tender-hearted. The coolest and sweetest waters flow from under the greatest rocks.—*W. Battershall.*

## Studies in History.

### THE HISTORICAL ANTIQUITY OF EGYPT, INDIA & OTHER ANCIENT NATIONS.

BY D. MACALLISTER.

No. I.



EW subjects have given rise to so much warmth in discussion as the location in time of such ancient nations as India, China and Egypt.

Theologians with a time-restriction of B.C. 4004, and a universal deluge limitation of B.C. 2349, would not and could not accede to the long demands usually made; and when arguments from facts failed to refute the demands, personal feeling too often became heated and unseemly warmth ensued.

Everyone now recognises that the evidence for a great antiquity is so strong that simple negation is not admissible as argument, and personal opinion cannot be accepted as refutation. We must expand our ideas of time so as to embrace all that history legitimately demands. As a principle of exegesis, I have always held that the word of God, being the embodiment of truth, must harmonize with every other truth, whether historical, geological, or evolutionary. Taking then the Bible as a standard, I have devoted much consideration on the questions of the historical, pre-historic, and geological antiquity of man; and in this paper I purpose confining my remarks to the historical antiquity of the most ancient people known to us.

The most ancient historical records we possess are the Hebrew Scriptures, the Dynasties of Manetho, the Chinese Annals, the Abstract of Sanchoniathon by Eusebius, and the Hieroglyphics of Egypt. Upon these then, and the opinions of the various commentators thereon, as viewed in the light of recent investigations and discoveries, must rest our opinion as to the antiquity of the people of whom they treat. Even possessing these, ancient and valuable as they are, we find that in seeking for a knowledge of the time of existence and the doings of the first races of men, we speedily get adrift on a great and unknown ocean, with neither chart nor compass to guide us. As a very learned Spanish Rabbi has well said, "The Genesis and sacred books left us by Moses are not sufficient to set us right. Where they

speak of the settlement or re-establishment of a people it is always with reference to our own nation (*i.e.*, the Hebrews). They omit, and make no mention of what has not a tendency to illustrate our people." I am sure that every intelligent and unbiassed reader of the Bible will acquiesce with Rabbi Moncecca, for from Genesis to the end of the historical books the Bible is professedly the account of God's dealings with His chosen people—chosen, not because they were better in His eyes than other people, but because it was necessary that the moral education of the world should be restricted in some such manner, and because the earthly descent of a prophetically intended Saviour required a racial or national background of reality to give Him a *locus standi* in the history of humanity.

This being so far clear, it is evident that it is to the relics left us by those ancient people that we must look for our knowledge of them, and glean therefrom what information we can. With this object in view, let us begin our investigation in Egypt.

The demands usually made on behalf of the historic antiquity of Egypt are very large, ranging as they do up to B.C. 40,000. On such large demands, let us briefly concentrate the rays of actual or positive historical facts, and from the residue deduce a reasonable data for our calculations.

Lenormant, in his "Manual of Ancient History," places the beginning of Egyptian hieroglyphic writings at about B.C. 5000. Bonwick, in "Pyramid Facts and Fancies," claims B.C. 5000 to cover the antiquity of the Pyramids, which are the works of a very civilised and advanced people, and certainly not such works as we would expect to find among a people just coming into the light of historical existence. Baldwin, in "Pre-Historic Nations," places the *origin* of the Egyptian people at about B.C. 5000. So far as actual historical evidence will assist us, we must take B.C. 5000 as the *extreme* of demand for the historical national existence of Egypt. The more closely however we look into the career of these people the shorter does the period of their existence become, and the converging lines of investigation all unite at a point far short of B.C. 5000.

Champollion and Rosellini, with all the available evidence before them, and having every desire to give as great an antiquity as possible, could only locate Menes, admittedly the first of the human kings of Egypt, at B.C. 2782, or more than 2000 years short of the *extreme* of historic demand.

In B.C. 56, Diodorus Siculus visited

Egypt. While there he compiled a history of the nation, in which he traced back the reigns of 470 kings and five queens to the reign of Menes, whom he placed at B.C. 2806. This history, mark, was compiled in Egypt, under the guidance and instruction of Egyptian priests, with the archives of the nation at their disposal and a natural and reasonable desire to prove themselves as ancient as possible. Eusebius, however, in his abstract of Sanchoniathon, places Menes at B.C. 3907. It is necessary that it be borne in mind that in every quarter it is admitted that Menes was the first *human* King of Egypt; otherwise when we take up the "Dynasties" of Manetho, we shall soon be involved in hopeless difficulty and confusion. Manetho was an Egyptian Priest employed by Ptolemy Philadelphus about B.C. 220, expressly to arrange and chronologically allocate the various dynasties that had reigned over Egypt. I have now before me both Bunsen and Boeckh's restoration of Manetho's chronological "Dynasties." As a start, Manetho gave three dynasties of the Gods, four dynasties of the Demigods, and one of Manes or Ghosts, comprising 24,925 Egyptian years (nearly 26,000 of our years), before the advent of Menes the first human king. From Menes to the first year of Alexander the Great, Manetho accounts for 31 dynasties of human kings covering 5375 years, but it has now been proved to the satisfaction of all competent Egyptologists that several of these dynasties were contemporary, and that Manetho made neither allowance nor deduction in his total summation for this concurrency. The proof that they were concurrent is found in the hieroglyphics of the people, and when such known concurrent dynasties are allowed for, we cannot, even from Manetho's tables, locate Menes further back than B.C. 3170. Rollin, in his well-known "Ancient History," goes no further back for Menes than about B.C. 2500, and dates the historic origin of the nation from that date; and Rawlinson, at the conclusion of a splendid examination of how far Manetho's history is authenticated by Egyptian monumental writings and records (for which I am indebted to the Mr. Richardson of Brighton, whom I now thank), shows most clearly that the furthest date to which "History Proper" can be said even *probably* to extend is to B.C. 2650.

Regarding the Pyramids, for which Bonwick demands 5000 B.C., we find that the greatest antiquity which modern research can grant them does not exceed B.C. 2,300. Piazzi Smyth only gives 2,170 B.C. for the oldest of

them. The chronological calculations of the people themselves are also of great value to us on this subject. Their cycle of Thoth, or the "Sothic Cycle," consisted of 1460 years. The second of these cycles, called the Phœnix, was completed B.C. 240, which places its commencement at B.C. 3,160. The starting-point of this cycle was the reign of Menes, so that by it we place him 10 years short of Manetho when known concurrent dynasties and contemporary individual reigns are allowed for.

Leaving Egypt for a moment, let us just briefly survey the claims of other ancient people.

*Assyria.*—The greatest antiquity claimed for this nation does not exceed B.C. 3000, but Scaliger and Syncellus in their computations allow no greater antiquity than B.C. 2676, and according to Rawlinson their cuneiform writings cannot be dated further back than B.C. 2400, which agrees with Rollin's estimate.

*Phœnicia.*—B.C. 2500 will cover all demands of history on its behalf; while from Meander, and other historians, we learn that the pinnacle of its fame and greatness were only between B.C. 780 and B.C. 2000.

*India.*—As in the case of Egypt, we hear much vague assertion about a supposed enormous antiquity, but many of these assertions will not stand investigating by the light of facts. We are told by some that Hindu poetry and science will carry us back to at least B.C. 3000, and it is sometimes asserted that eclipses were registered and the mean motions of Saturn and Jupiter determined about that time; astronomers however do not believe these statements.

About all we have to guide us in their ancient history is their own calculation of time. Of course I now refer to time as applied to history, not as applied to Bhudda, for like the demands of Manetho for the reign of the gods in Egypt and Geoffrey of Monmouth's Kings who ruled in Briton from the time of the Trojan war, all such must be discarded, and our researches based upon plain matter of fact data.

The cycle of the Hindus, which they affirm began with their human history, consist of 60 years. We are now in the 31st year of their 85th cycle, thus locating the start of their history at B.C. 3184. There are three other cycles of historical importance, and consisting of different numbers of years, used by the Hindus, and all of these in ultimate results are corroborative of the above-given date. The recorded civil history of the Hindus cannot be extended backward to a

point much more distant than B.C. 2000. Beyond this all is assumption, for which there is no solid foundation in historic fact, its chief, indeed its only support being deduced from the dim gloaming or twilight of prehistoric traditions which shadow off the period of positive knowledge.

If we turn to China, we obtain similar results, viz., a large discount off currently assumed antiquity.

Fo-hee is the first historically placed emperor of China, and his reign, according to Legge and other trustworthy authorities, cannot be placed at an earlier date than B.C. 2950, many of the best authorities placing him at B.C. 2200. As of India so also of China it is asserted that astronomical observations and calculations were made, and results registered as far back as B.C. 2900. This, and all such like assertions, are disproved by Delambre, who has shown that the diminution of the obliquity of the ecliptic is 48 deg. in a century. If we compare the registered results of Chinese observations with this accepted astronomical fact, we cannot stretch the period of their observation further back than B.C. 2209. The time cycle of the Chinese also assists us. Like that of the Hindus, the Chinese time cycle consists of 60 years, and according to their own admissions they date back to the beginning of their national history. We are now in the 49th year of their 77th cycle, so that we can only place the origin of their history, according to their own demands, at B.C. 2722.

Leaving nations, let us look at the most ancient known individual cities, and ascertain how far back we can extend the term of their existence. Take Babylon, Benares, Bubastes, Damascus, Memphis, Meroe, Sidon, Syene or Thebes, the most ancient historic cities on the face of the earth, when you go into the details of their history you will not find one of them requiring more than B.C. 2500 to cover all demands either historical or traditional for the full period of their existence.

What now are the results so far arrived at in this cursory glance into the historic antiquity of these ancient people! The following will show:—

Egypt	5000 B.C.—Historic <i>extreme</i> , urged by Lenonmant, Baldwin, M. Mariette, and others.
"	3907 " Sanchoniathon.
"	3892 " Lepsius.
"	3170 " Manetho when concurrent dynasties are deducted.
"	3160 " Sothic cycle.
"	2806 " Diodorus Siculus.

"	2782 " Champollion and Rosellini.
"	2650 " Rawlinson.
"	2500 " Rollin.

So giving the historical existence ranging from B.C. 2500 to B.C. 5000.

From the peculiar facilities afforded Manetho and D. Siculus in their compilations, backed up as their conclusions are by the Sothic cycle, I am constrained to accept their calculations in preference to any of the other estimates which are at best only guesses. I place—

Egypt at B.C. 3000.

India " 3150.—This antedates their civil history by more than 1000 years.

Assyria " 3000.—Thus taking the *extreme* of all historical demands on their behalf.

China " 2950.—This covers the requirements of Chinese historians themselves.

Phœnici " 2500.—All that is claimed for it.

Most ancient } 2500.—Sufficient to cover cities known } all demands.

Pyramid Era 2300.—Or nearly 200 years in excess of recent computations.

The foregoing are the results of a very extended research in ancient history, and from such studies there is forced on every student the conclusion that at about B.C. 3200 mankind made a very decided movement in civilisation, and began to disperse and to found nations, but the full particulars of that period are lost in the dim light of pre-historic times, from which only myths and traditions have reached us, so that from the foregoing dates, and this last fact, we may give to the most ancient nations or people known on an historical antiquity of about B.C. 3000. I have not referred to Mexico or Peru in the above considerations, because neither of them can produce valid reason for assigning to them an antiquity of anything like 3000 B.C. The important question now is, how can I reconcile an historical existence so far back as B.C. 3000 in the face of the creation of man B.C. 4004, and a universal deluge at B.C. 2349? I shall answer this question in my next paper. Suffice for the present to state that I am persuaded I can show that so great an antiquity as the above does not at all affect the accuracy of scripture; indeed that it rather confirms them.

THE wise man expects everything from himself: the fool looks to others.—JEAN PAUL RICHTER.

## Open Column.

[This column is placed at the disposal of all brethren who desire to discuss questions about which there is a difference of opinion. The Editors wish it to be distinctly understood that they do not endorse all the opinions expressed.—ED.]

### EVANGELISING.

HAVING had the pleasure of perusing the writings of the brethren Metzenthin, Maston, and Warren, permit me to present your readers with part of a sermon I have just read by a Paedo-Baptist, who preached it on behalf of the London Missionary Society many years ago, but which, as a plan drawn from the New Testament, may appear as much an astonishment to our brethren as it was to the "crammed" (or crowded) congregation who heard it, and that there is something good to come out even of Galilee. The preacher said he heard a speaker on a missionary platform say, "If I were asked what is the first qualification in a missionary? I would answer, Prudence; if asked the second, I would answer, Prudence; if asked the third, I would still answer, Prudence," at which the preacher said he was disgusted, holding faith much more important; and taking it for his key note, he chose the Master sending out His disciples according to the 10th chapter of Matthew as his theme, and thus described the model missionaries or evangelists;—To keep their character clear from all mendicity or meanness, there is no scrip, no purse, nor obsequious demeanor allowed them; nothing that might take from the heavenly condition of the men; no demand for food and raiment; what is set before them they partake of, and the spiritual knowledge and power which they possess they as freely give in return. They are kept in close dependence on God's assistance and cannot move a step but in the strength of faith. They are delivered out of the conditions of policy, force, gain, selfishness and ambition. In prayer and communion with the Spirit of God, they sail along an unseen and unpiloted course. They are living models of what they teach; moving epistles of the Spirit of God, incarnations, each one in his measure of the Divine spirit nature, instead of the scriptures, to those who have them not. They address only the immortal part of the people; they confer upon no news but the good news of the kingdom; they touch no interests but those of eternity, speak of no country but heaven, in no authority but the name of God." Of the treatment they would be likely to meet he continued, "Bad as the world is, wild as is its ambition,

heartless as is its vanity, proud as are its riches, and mad as they are all—ambition, vanity and riches, I cannot but please myself with the imagination that there is no clime so barbarous or (which I believe is the more dangerous extreme) there is no region so polished as not to possess a gleaming of worthy spirits to welcome these travellers between heaven and earth . . . . The ambitious I see would spurn them, and they would be content to be spurned; the cruel maltreat them, and they would be content to be maltreated, etc.; and the bustling crowd would pass them unheeded, and would be content all unheeded to be passed. "What do these babblers say?" "They seem to be setters forth of strange gods." "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," "they set up another king one Jesus." "Away with them, they are unworthy to live." I hear these sentences echoing round their path and following it fearlessly onward to the death. But do I not see a Felix trembling, a royal Agrippa knitting his half-convinced brows? A Jason, Gamaliel, Dorcas, a Lydia and honorable women not a few waiting upon the wants of the all-enduring men, and the thoughtful of the people pondering the words they speak, serious-minded applying their hearts to the doctrine . . . . and the genius of every high and heavenly faculty of the soul is sitting at their feet, well pleased to be schooled and taught by the messengers of heaven."

And a certain Baptist commenting thereon says—"impracticable as this theory may appear to some, it is difficult to believe in the scripturalness of any system of operations which is likely to suffer from such utterances as these. His conception of a missionary or evangel may differ widely from the class of men whom societies maintain and control, but it does not follow that it is not the true conception after all. Indeed I hesitate not to say that it best accords with the missionary of the New Testament and that those who have resembled it most have been the greatest benefactors of the world, and should it be that moderns differ from it widely, it will still have to be maintained, though at the expense of the directors. "The worse for philosophy," said one who was told philosophy and the Bible did not agree, and so say we. The worse for the missionary if he does not accord somewhat with the preacher's description. Let me not be misunderstood. Neither I nor the preacher censure the devoted men at present engaged, but I cannot rid myself of the thought that another class or agency is required. If ever the teeming millions are to be con-

verted, it will not be by the quiet and estimable family-men who settle down in their own residences, and involve themselves in all kinds of domestic entanglements, teaching a few children, or preaching the gospel to a few who come to hear, or acting as the pastor of some little church, depending the while on a committee for support, and obeying the committee's control; but by enthusiastic ardent-souled men to whom preaching is a passion which they cannot restrain, who, whether supported or not, will say "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel," who for the sake of Christ will forego all human comforts, taking their lives in their hands, ready to either suffer or die for the sake of the Lord Jesus," who will not settle down where a few disciples have been gathered around them, and think of spending the remainder of their days, but adopting as their motto, "Amplius, amplius—further, still further" will continue till life's latest hour to bear the gospel into the regions beyond.

Where, it may be asked, are you to find such men? You would not go? Perhaps neither you nor I would go. It may be that God, not designing us for the honor, has not endowed us with either the desire or qualification. What then? Perhaps we should be better with fewer, were they men of a higher class. Perhaps the few would do the work better than the many who were forthcoming when the standard was not so high. I cannot however bring myself to believe—I dare not think so meanly of the churches of the day as to believe—that when their christian principles are fairly appealed to, there will be any lack of this very heroic agency. My conviction is that the way to increase the number of evangel or missionaries is not to add to their worldly comforts or advantages, for in that respect you can never compete with your rivals—in other callings there are competitors that far outbid you. Your strength must lie in an appeal to higher principles, to the constraining influence of the love of Christ and compassion for the souls of men. The young men of our churches will be attracted not by the love of ease or comfort, but by the prospect of hardships endured and deeds of daring done for Christ. Set before them as their guerdon and crown the reward Christ will bestow. But oh! unman them not, enervate them not, foster not their selfishness by promising them in an earthly sense "the best of both worlds." Lift high the standard, sound the trumpet in the ears of the church. Summon the best of her sons to take part in this holy war, the men will

come. Though love throws silken cords around them, *they'll come!* Though the world presents its allurements *they'll come!* Though formidable obstacles rise in their path *they'll come;* and when they come they will not be unsupported. There is wealth in the coffers of the church, and when her heart is stirred by the spectacle of such heroic self-sacrifice she will not fail to support by her sympathy, prayers, and contribution, the men who so nobly plead her cause and push her conquests in the high places of the heathen world.

A. CARMICHAEL.

Telowie, S. Australia.

### THE SECOND COMING OF THE LORD.

It is certainly matter for sincere regret that the article which appeared in last *Standard* over the signature "W. S. Houchins," and purporting to be "a review of Bro. Watt's position," should have been couched in such uncharitable terms. Bro. Houchins, being a Christian, ought to know that truth, to be vindicated, needs not such an unworthy alliance. In fact the adoption of such a tone points to the grave suspicion that the party making use of it lacks the truth, and seeks, in another way, to compensate for inherent weakness in an argument. Now, is the article of our good brother a review of my position? Let the reader judge.

(1). I headed my paper as above. Why, if he wished to review my position did not he do the same?

(2) I gave an example of the use of the disputed word (*analusei*) which clearly refers to the Lord's return. This being one of the most important points of my position demanded notice. Why did he quietly pass it by? The reason is obvious.

(3). I quoted a number of passages in support of my reading. Why did he ignore them all? To me it does not appear like fair criticism, to wrench a small portion of an argument away from all that supports it, and after parading a number of inaccuracies of which he says I was guilty, characterise his paper as "a review of my position."

1st. Bro. Houchins affirms that mine is a case of "Athanasius against the world." And so positive is he of this that he delivers himself as follows. "I venture the assertion that Bro. Watt has never seen or heard of a version that gives his rendering . . . ., favours his interpretation, or even mentions it as a possible one." I accept his challenge. There is now lying before me "The Emphatic Diaglott," containing the original Greek text (according to

the Recension of Dr. J. J. Griesbach) by Benjamin Wilson. Here is his rendering of Phil. 1: 23-24. "I am indeed hard pressed by the *two* things; (I have an *earnest desire* for the *returning*, and being with Christ, since it is very much to be preferred); but to *remain* in the *flesh* is more requisite on your account." He moreover adds a footnote as follows:—"To *anulusai*—the loosing again or the returning, being what Paul earnestly desired, could not be death or dissolution, as implied by the word *depart* in the common version, because it seemed a matter of indifference to him which of the two—life or death—he should choose; but he longed for the *anulusai* which was a *third* thing, and very much to be preferred to either of the other two things alluded to."

Whether this be right or wrong, one thing is certain, viz., that our good brother has lost his "venture."

2nd. I freely admit that "the unbroken ranks of the learned host" on which Bro. Houchins relies "understood Paul to mean that he had the desire to die and so be with Christ." But the same "learned host" understood a few other things which, taken into consideration, tend to weaken their testimony somewhat. I have several translations on my shelves and they all support the common reading save this one. Nevertheless my candid opinion is that Bro. Wilson is the more faithful translator. For the following, amongst many other reasons—

(A) They all (except McGarvey) give baptise, baptism, and baptist as translations of the Greek words. Wilson gives immerse, immersion, and immerser. In this, the many are wrong, and the *one* right, Bro. Houchins himself being judge. (B) They all (except McGarvey) give "faith" without the article as the proper reading, thereby teaching that the operation of the mind in accepting testimony is what is intended. Thereby conveying quite an erroneous impression, inasmuch as it is, in many instances, the *Christian system* in contradistinction to the Mosaic law that is meant. Take one or two examples from a multitude. Rom. 4: 14. They give "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void." Wilson; "For if those of the law are heirs, the faith becomes useless." Again Gal. 3: 26, "For ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus." Wilson: "Through the faith by Christ Jesus." Once more Heb. 12: 2, "The author and perfecter of *our* faith." Wilson: "of the faith." To neither of these have they added any marginal note, and in the last one they have put "*our*" in italics which signifies that there is no word for it

in the Greek. But while weighty reasons such as those would induce me to repose greater confidence in Bro. Wilson than in the others, there is a far stronger reason for accepting his rendering of our disputed passage; and that is, "*the returning*" is in *harmony with the whole New Testament teaching, while "to depart" is squarely opposed to it.* And this leads me to remark—

3rd. The reason that "the unbroken ranks of the learned host" give "to depart" is, because the truth of "the second coming of the Lord" has been all but lost sight of by professing Christians. It is a simple matter of fact that in the early centuries of the Christian era, the church, because "the Lord delayed His coming," abandoned the watchful attitude and "spiritualised" the promise. As a consequence all manner of wild speculations were indulged in. Many thought the Millennial reign had commenced when Constantine became "converted." And later Emmanuel Swedenborg thought that He came to him and imparted "the Science of Correspondences." Then about the year 1700, Daniel Whitby invented the "post millennial" theory, saying that the gospel must win the world to Christ—then the peaceful reign of a thousand years—then the coming of the Lord. Thus doing away completely with the necessity of "watching."

The idea however that most widely obtains at present is that the coming of the Lord will be at death. Hence the reading "to depart" And this again has necessitated the assumption that, at death, the soul goes, at once, either to heaven or hell. So satisfied were the translators of the A. V., and compilers of the various creeds, of this that they not only put the rich man there by the words "in hell he lifted up his eyes," but they had the blessed Saviour in the same inhospitable region. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." And according to the creed, "He died and was buried, and descended into hell."

Is it to be wondered at that they so unanimously agree with Bro. H.? But Bro. Houchins replies, the reading has never been corrected to hades.

Right; and this correction is just what will overthrow his reading of "to depart" in Phil. 1: 23.

The soul of Jesus went into the unseen state (hades), and the place called Paradise. He returned to earth again to take possession of His glorified body, and said to Mary, "touch me not, for I am *not yet* ascended to my Father." And in further proof that He really had not been to heaven during his disembodied condition, we

read Acts 2: 34, "For David ascended *not* into the heavens." And yet David had been in hades (Paradise) for a long time, where, freed from sin he would be happy waiting for "the returning" of the Lord, where his soul, re-united to his corruptible body, would be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air." Thus, hades seems to prevail against the church in the meantime, because all God's people who fall asleep must go there. But by-and-bye "death and hades shall be cast into the lake of fire," and then shall come to pass the saying that was written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O Hades, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting? The R. V. destroys the force of this by giving "death" in both clauses.

And, further, if it be true that the soul goes immediately at death to heaven, is it not passing strange that in the one instance where Paul certainly refers to that event he would make no reference to it? "For I am already being offered, and the time of my departure is come. . . . henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge, shall give to me *at that day*: and not only to me, but also to all them that have loved His appearing." 2nd Tim., 4: 6, 8. And is not the plain idea in these verses in keeping with the Master's promise. "If I go away I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also?"

Moreover, in writing to the Thessalonians, 1st letter, 4: 13-18. The same apostle seeks to "comfort" those who were weeping for loved ones who had died, by telling them that by and bye they, and those who had "fallen asleep," would be "for ever with the Lord. Now, if they were *at that time* with the Master, why did he withhold the information that would have filled them with joy? In conclusion, I remark that while the N.T. contains *not one* warning or injunction for the christian to prepare and watch for death, it abounds with warnings and injunctions to prepare and watch for "the coming of the Lord." It is needless to quote here. Look everywhere. This is highly significant, and greatly strengthens the reading of "the returning" in our passage. As shewing how completely the "second coming" was abandoned, I close with one passage. "For many deceivers have entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." 2nd John, 1: 7 (A.V.) The R.V. has improved this a little by giving "cometh;" whereas the correct rendering, according to Alford, Jamie-



son, Fausset, and Brown, should be "is coming."

A word or two touching the array of inaccuracies of which Bro. H. says I was guilty. (To the insinuation of "wresting the Scriptures for a purpose," it is sufficient to remind our good Bro. that the Master once said "Judge not that ye be not not judged." If seeking to remind the brethren that "Jesus Christ is coming in the flesh" is an unworthy purpose, then I am guilty.)

When I said "literal" I did not mean in the hard and fast sense of a word for word translation, or this could easily have been supplied. I meant rather a *faithful* one. And therefore his hypercriticism entirely loses its point. Now for his six items.

(1) Bro. H. is right: I *did* misplace *de*.

(2) The writing "return" in place of "returning" was a mere slip of the pen."

(3) Reference to Wilson's reading in this paper will show that he gives *einai* by "being."

(4) No sacrifice. *Gar* was mis-translated *which* in place of "for," "because," or "since."

(5) No. 4 explains the presence of which.

(6) I am here charged with "supplying the word 'is.'" Surely this is criticism run to seed? And then he coolly informs us that "having the desire for to depart" would make "good sense," but "not excellent English." And this immediately on the back of trying to justify the omission of *eis* from the passage altogether.

In other words, our Bro. first finds fault with me for "supplying *is*," which he is himself compelled to do to make sense, and then turns round and justifies omitting *for* from the authorised reading.

To appreciate this I write the two readings down together—

"Having the desire for to depart and be with Christ." R.V.

"Having the desire for the returning and being with Christ."

CHARLES WATT.

### PHILIPPIANS 1: 23.

I see from the August number of the *A. C. Standard* that our Bro. H. S. Houchins makes an aerial flight on the wings of his Greek, Latin, French, &c., in order to make us believe that there is not a translation of the Greek text in the whole world that renders *analsia* in Phil. 1: 23 by the word *return*. Well, if our brother will fold his wings and drop down into some quiet corner where a book called the "Emphatic Diaglott," by Benjamin

Wilson, is to be found, and turn to the passage, he will find the 23rd verse reading as follows:—"I am indeed hard pressed by the two things; (I have an earnest desire for *the returning*, one being with Christ, since it is very much to be preferred.") The nice little foot-note to this verse is also there, which has evidently been the further means of misleading our Bro. Watt. But who is Mr. Wilson? A Christadelphian advocate of America, who, in giving us a very good book in some respects, has made some of the greatest perversions of a few Greek texts in order to read his nonsensical ideas into them that I have ever seen in any translation of the New Testament. Spurgeon was not far wrong when he said the people crucified our Saviour under Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and they are continuing to do it. My object in writing this note is to warn our brethren who use this Emphatic Diaglott to be on their guard in receiving its translations of the Greek. Col. 1: 13 contains another notable perversion. If Bro. Watt does not believe in the unconscious state of the dead, as he declares, he and the brethren generally would be wise to handle the books written by those who so believe in this doctrine, and teach it with their eyes wide open.

FRANK.

### CHRISTIAN CRITICISM.

Criticism is an indispensable thing in Christian literature. We want "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." This cannot be attained without diligent search; and moreover that anomaly known as "Christendom" is so saturated with anti-Christian error, and this by the force of early training is so engrafted into the minds of even those who are diligently in search of truth, that it is difficult for them to eliminate it from their minds. On this account everything which comes before us must be closely sifted and severely tried. This gives to our periodical literature a controversial cast which is liable to be construed by others as the outcome of a carping contradictory spirit. This construction is intensified, not only by prejudice, but by ignorance of the real difficulties in the way of the attainment of truth, and especially the ignorance which prevails in reference to the way in which revealed truth has come down to us, the majority supposing that King James' version of the Bible is just as it came down from heaven. Thoughtful Christians cannot but regret this wide-spread misunderstanding of our jealous care to

eliminate error from all the teachings we receive, and while fully aware that it is impossible wholly to avoid it, will certainly feel that much might be done to minimise it. All disputes about words, and things involving no matters of vital importance, should be scrupulously avoided. No doubt it is hard for others to apprehend the difficulties of editors, but one could wish that the editors of our periodical literature could refuse as "unsuitable for our pages" all articles which provoke controversy without any appreciable good result in the way of the discovery of truth, or the elimination of error, and especially all criticisms which are not Christian. Some will, no doubt, demand an explanation of this, and ask do we indulge in criticisms that are not Christian? Too often, I fear (I do not refer to the *Standard* alone.) Suppose a brother with a spice of rashness in his composition, allows his zeal to outstrip his knowledge, it may be necessary for some one to point out where he is in error, or where his critic supposes him to be so; but there are two ways of doing this. The truth may be set forth, and the error pointed out in meekness, while the erring one is spared, or chief attention may be paid to giving the daring one a good scathing and showing up. Which is Christian? Not the latter; for if it be speaking the truth, it is not "speaking the truth in love."—Which of the two methods will have the best effect? Will not the former? On the one criticised, by fixing his attention on the subject, rather than on his castigator; on the brotherhood, by fostering a kindly spirit instead of a pugnacious one; and on the outside public, by convincing them that our object is to get the truth, and not to fight.

I well recollect that when I had recently joined the Disciples, I suffered (what I thought at the time) a very severe and unkind attack; but I had been more daring than I knew. I had presumed to differ from an editor, and I now understand that what I suffered was mildness and gentleness itself, compared with what others often have meted out to them.

Our literature is read by others, and it is desirable it should be more widely so; but in order to secure this end, and if secured to derive benefit from it, there must be an improvement in the spirit of our criticism.

Suppose a preacher is attacked by another preacher (I fear the preachers are the greatest transgressors), in the latter mentioned of the two methods, he is made to appear in a very unfavorable light, for it is he, not the subject in dispute that is held up to view.

How can the brethren in his neighborhood circulate the magazine and then invite people to come and hear him?

I have noticed that the writings of highly-educated men, scientific and philosophic, are comparatively free from the method of criticism complained of. I suppose this is partly because a high-class education teaches that refinement of manners is necessary to make a gentleman, and partly because experience teaches them that they will be likely to have their methods turned upon themselves. We may reflect however, that that which is thus learned by indirect processes, ought to be learned by every Christian directly, for, irrespective of any other education, the disciple of Christ should learn to imitate "the meekness and gentleness of Christ" which at once brings him to the highest kind of refinement, and without waiting for experience (which may not be pleasant) he may know infallibly that "with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again."

W. W. D.

[We quite appreciate the spirit which has prompted our esteemed brother to make the above remarks, and agree with what he has said in reference to the spirit that should pervade criticisms given on any subject, and hope that our contributors will make a note of what he says. Of course his remarks do not refer to the editors, as they are always courteous.

As to exercising a more careful supervision over articles sent to us for publication, we may say that in the past we have endeavoured to tone down, as much as we could, any harsh or injurious statements; sometimes for so doing receiving the thanks of our contributors, and at other times receiving anything but gratitude for our kindly services. We will continue to exercise the same supervision, but cannot undertake to refuse the publication of a good article simply because it is couched in somewhat severe terms. Those who criticise must expect to be criticised, more or less severely, according to circumstances.

Our correspondent very properly observes that our position as a religious body "gives to our periodical literature a controversial cast." This it is impossible to avoid; nor do we think it desirable that we should go out of our way to do so. It is being forced upon our attention more and more every day, that as a religious body we stand alone in presenting to the people the simple and plain New Testament plan of salvation. We have to contend against abuse and misrepresentation. This, were it merely personal,

would be of very small moment, but as at the same time the truth is obscured or distorted, we cannot, in view of the responsibilities resting upon us, refuse to defend the truth committed to our charge.

Some brethren say "Let these things alone." We say *No*; the let alone theory is the theory of inertia, stagnation, death. Those who thus speak had better get "Rip Van Winkle" for an editor, and have the paper published in "Sleepy Hollow." As for us, we want a wide-awake paper—one that brings the light of the first century to bear upon the present one.

In order to do this, we must "quit ourselves like men"—strong to wield the sword of truth against all forms of error. Bayards of Christian courtesy if you will, but not effeminate "peace at-any-price" sort of men. The victories won by Campbell, Scott, Franklin, and other pioneers were not achieved without friction. Discussion in the press and on the platform were the principal means used to bring out the truth. What they did we must do. We are not out of the pioneer stage yet.—Eds.]

## Correspondence.

### "FRENCH MISSION."

3 Rue Thibournery, Paris,

May 23rd, 1887.

Dear Sister Christopher,—

O, my sister, it is Christian to forgive or I could not hope for forgiveness in letting you wait so long for an answer to the beautiful Christian letter of sympathy. Believe me, it has not been neglect or forgetfulness; oh, no! I have read and re-read that loving letter over and over again, and many a tear has dropped upon its pages. We feel God will be with us, and provide for us better than before for we have been faithful, self-sacrificing, and devoted, as far as a man and woman can be. God knows and He who instituted this mission and choose us for the work, will not leave us or the mission. It is a trial of our faith. We have received numberless letters of deep sympathy, many containing funds. Thus we feel assured that God will put into the hearts of His own to provide for us in His own appointed way. We work on in faith, and leave the rest with Him, for "He doeth all things well." This will be my excuse for not writing sooner. I have not written to my own dear father for six months. I rejoice to read of the good work you and your dear mother are engaged in the State

school. May the Lord who died to save souls reward to overflowing your work of faith and real labour of love among the dear children. May the saved souls of these little ones star your eternal crowns. It is a noble work you are doing, dear sisters. Keep on, faint not by the way, and by and bye you will hear the "Well done, good and faithful, enter into the joy of thy Lord."

The interest and kindness you have shown in printing my letter, did stir the hearts of our dear sisters in Australia; the fruit of that labour of love of your hands was the collecting and sending me £2, which I received all right. May God bless you and them, and reward you both as only He can. I hope, dear sister, that the sisters in Australia will still endeavour to help us. We need all the help we can get, as we are depending upon the voluntary contributions of God's own dear people, according to true apostolic method.

Pray over the French Mission and its faithful but tired missionaries, and ask God to direct you how to aid us, He will hear and help. Thus I leave this important matter in your hands. I shall also write to the dear sisters who have already remembered us last year. Our mission is doing well. We have a fine Sunday school, four meetings a week well attended, also a large Bible class every Thursday at our home. We have had several baptisms, many more next week (D.V.). Oh, that our people may wake up to the vast importance of occupying this desolate bibleless country where God has much people, but I must finish my long letter with much love from my children, myself, and Bro. De Launay. I am ever your faithful and devoted sister in the one faith of our Lord.

ANNIE DE LAUNAY,  
French Missionary.

Dear Bro. Editor,

Will you kindly publish this foregoing letter, in the columns of your valuable paper, *A. O. Standard*, in order to stir the hearts of our sisters to assist our missionaries in the foreign field, who are in great difficulties at the present time.

With an earnest desire that much good may be done for the Master,

CATHERINE CHRISTOPHER, Sec.  
Sisters Missionary Society, Geelong.  
August 8th, 1887.

### THE ELDERSHIP QUESTION.

I trust you will follow up the Officers' Meeting on this question, by summing up the evidence as given; but, speaking from personal experi-

ence, there is one fault to be avoided. We ought not fasten on some defective expression of our opponent to prop up our opinion, but honestly keep in view the main drift of his argument, and (if it cannot be fairly met) alter our views accordingly. After my brief remarks on the names, one brother charged me with being indifferent about names, and another with me wishing to tie them to one name, simply through the fault above mentioned. I said it seemed to me we had been differing for years as to the names, while the office was left unfilled and the work undone. I then mentioned presbyter, bishop, and pastor, and objected to them, not as unscriptural, but as Greek, or Latin words, which the learned men might use. Teachers using the best word for instruction should not use to unlearned folk. I objected to elder as prejudicing people against any but an old man, which was not the apostle's meaning. I think my argument was weak on this, as the overseer expresses the work as elder does the character of the workman and shuts out the inexperienced whose only qualification is a college training. Again, on the question of pay. I think Bro. Dick's views as to being a paid office are at variance with scripture, and mischievous in its effects. The genius of Christianity is love and self-sacrifice, and in this spirit Paul told the Ephesian overseers to work like him at their calling; and told them to remember the words of Christ—that it was more blessed to be on the giving side than the receiving one. The use of the plural in small churches (in both deacons and elders) and the needs of the poor would make it impossible to pay them all in that age, while the jealousy with which they regarded the claim to support is seen in the questioning of Paul's claim to it, and Paul's conduct on all occasions points the same moral; and the only passage that can be brought to support the claim as applying to elders seems distinctly to refer to exceptional cases—or such as join other functions, such as teaching and preaching. As in Peter's case, who was an elder, the "double honour" evidently refers to support, but, as in the case of father and mother, or the widows, only to be claimed in case of need. As to the ordination, a reprint of Prof. Milligan on this point is one way to get at the premises, and from it each draw his own conclusion—but on this question especially, the pioneers of reformation find it is not the learning but the unlearning that is the most difficult. When we think of the office of a bishop, there comes before our prejudiced eyes the royal cardinal robes,

the mitred crown, the province of Canterbury or York, and we carry these into the qualifications, and judge accordingly. We are like a person coming into the presence of machinery in motion that is quite harmless, but to the uninitiated its noise produces awe and fear. So we decide only to choose deacons, though the qualifications are much the same, because we are used to them, or we do without any and leave one part of God's requirements unobeyed. Our logic is like the Mormon's as to elder's wife. Oh, says the Mormon, he may have three wives, but he must have one at least. We say, ah, it is wrong to have a pastor but quite right to have none. Or like the mistress needing seven servants who have to cook and wait etc., but they are not qualified for either, so engages them all as general servants, so all are responsible and no one in particular. Sense and scripture both left behind, and inefficiency the result.

Yours truly, H. JOHNSON.

[We do not intend to lose sight of this question; for the present we give an article by Dr. Lightfoot on the synonymes "Bishop and Elder," see page 207. Dr. Lightfoot is probably the best of living commentators.—Eds.]

#### THE VICTORIAN FREEMAN AND THE STANDARD.

(To the Editors of the A. C. Standard.)

Glancing over the controversy with the *Baptist Freeman*, I notice some features that are fitted at any rate "to point a moral, though they do not adorn a tale," or more correctly speaking a theological discussion. The end so far, on the *Freeman's* side, is an attempt to retire under a cloud of dust, the old worn out weapon, the "odium theologicum" is brought into prominence, and the dust of all the pious dead is stirred up as with a revivatory fan; but this dust has been so often agitated, first by the Jewish doctors A.D. 80-100, then by Rome at the Reformation, and subsequently against every effort to pour a ray of light into any dark corner, that it has become dissipated, and is of none effect now, and serves only to demonstrate how feeble the cause must be that needs such help. Your efforts to clear off the mists and fogs enveloping the minds of your discussionist are praiseworthy, but it is of little use to employ scientific weapons against a foe that is never long enough in one place to get a bead on him; a magazine repeating rifle is of no account against a mosquito, a wet dish-clout is more effectual, even if less dignified; a Toledo blade of the best tempered steel is not nearly as good as half a

brick judiciously jaculated, when employed against nocturnal vocalists of the feline persuasion. Any how, you can congratulate yourselves that you stopped the legerdemain performance of changing "unto" into "because of." This is the point aimed for; as long as the *Freeman* will stand to "unto" he is safe to spoil his own case. "Into" or "in order to" every unbiassed critic will admit is a better rendering of the original, but "unto" will serve the purposes of truth when taken with the context nearly as well. How true it is that "people frequently reject great truths, not so much for want of evidence as for want of an inclination to accept them." I was amused at the self-sufficient air with which the *Freeman* attempts to settle the matter by claiming the whole of Protestantism on its side as being one with it on the dogma "justification by faith alone," which claim when analysed, proves as baseless as all its other assertions, for the Episcopalians and the Lutherans, who, together form by far the great majority of Protestants, unmistakably teach Baptismal Regeneration, and therefore do not support the "faith alone" pillar as held by the *Freeman*. The refreshing coolness with which it assumes that its complex, self-contradictory, irrational, and unscriptural theory of regeneration is the teaching of Christ and His apostles, would amuse were it not so pitiable. As an illustration of the truism "it is indeed shorter and easier to proceed from ignorance to knowledge than from error." I can in my own case assert that when I started to enquire after truth, my only prejudices were those in which like the *Freeman*, I had been educated, I however took the New Testament as my sole guide; and without knowing of the existence of such a people as the Disciples, or reading a scrap of their literature, I found as the clear and logical teaching of the New Testament those principles with which we, as a people, are identified, and it was a matter of pleasant surprise to find others with whom I was in accord on the momentous question "What must I do to be saved."

"Oh! how unlike the complex works of man,  
Heaven's easy, artless, unencumbered plan;  
It stands like the cerulean arch we see,  
Majestic in its own simplicity."

Upon this ground I strongly object to the term "Campbellite." The teachings of the Campbells had nothing to do with my convictions. I honor them for their noble stand for the truth, for the great results which they achieved, and I can with them in the words of Augustine say "When truth is revealed let custom give place; let no man prefer custom before reason

and truth." The *Freeman* tells us that "Paul was a truthful, honest man, incapable of equivocation, duplicity or mental reservation, that he was plain and simple in language; that he meant what he said and said what he meant." To this I can heartily agree. It was my very thought not only concerning Paul, but of Christ and all His apostles when I first searched their writings for the truth. I went to them without prejudice, and I am satisfied that I grasped their meaning, and that any intelligent person can arrive at a contradictory theory upon the question after such a search can only arise from the fact that

"The difference is as great between  
The optics seeing as the objects seen."

The discussion of these points have an objective benefit, as they serve to show, at any rate, the utter want of anything approaching a sound argument that is to be brought against the position we take, from the simple reason that truth is unchangeable. If we stand upon the rock firmly placed by Christ and his apostles, teach as they taught, practise what they practised, all the acumen of the schoolmen, all the arguments of those who seek to improve upon heaven's plan will not shake one honest mind that has caught a gleam from the "light of ages."

Yours, &c., A DISCIPLE.

## Hearth and Home.

### NO ROOM FOR MOTHER.

"Going North, madam?"

"No, ma'am."

"Going South, then?"

"I don't know, ma'am."

"Why, there are only two ways to go."

"I didn't know. I was never on the cars. I'm waiting for the train to go to John."

"John? There is no town called John. Where is it?"

"Oh, John's my son. He's out in Kansas on a claim."

"I am going right to Kansas myself. You intend to visit?"

"No, ma'am."

"John, sick?"

"No."

The evasive tone, the look of pain in the furrowed face were noticed by the stylish lady as the gray head bowed upon the toil-marked hand. She wanted to hear the story, to help her.

"Excuse me—John in trouble?"

"No, no—I'm in trouble. Trouble my old heart never thought to see."

"The train does not come for some time.

Here, rest your head upon my cloak."

"You are kind. If my own were so, I shouldn't be in trouble to-night."

"What is your trouble? May be I can help you."

"It's hard to tell it to strangers, but my old heart is too full to keep it back. When I was left a widow with the three children, I thought it was more than I could bear; but it wasn't bad as this—"

The stranger waited till she recovered her voice to go on.

"I had only the cottage and my willing hands. I toiled early and late all the years till John could help me. Then we kept the girls at school, John and me. They were married not long ago. Married rich as the world goes. John sold the cottage, sent me to the city to live with them, and he went West to begin for himself. He said we had provided for the girls, and they would provide for me now—"

Her voice choked with emotion. The stranger waited in silence.

"I went to them in the city. I went to Mary's first. She lived in a great house, with servants to wait on her; a house many times larger than the little cottage—but I soon found there wasn't room enough for me—"

Tears stood in the lines on her cheeks. The ticket agent came out softly, stirred the fire and went back. After a pause she continued:

"At last they told me I must live at a boarding-house and they'd keep me there. I couldn't say anything back. My heart was full of pain. I wrote to John what they were going to do. He wrote back a long, kind letter for me to come right to him. I always had a home while he had a roof, he said. To come right there and stay as long as I lived, that his mother should never go out to strangers. So I'm going to John. He's got only his rough hands and his great, warm heart—but there's room for his old mother—God bless—him."

The stranger brushed a tear from her fair cheek and awaited the conclusion.

"Some day when I am gone where I'll never trouble them again, Mary and Martha will think of it all—some day when the hands that toiled for them are folded and still; when the eyes that watched over them through many a weary night are closed forever; when the little old body, bent with the burdens it bore for them, is put away where it never can shame them."

The agent drew his hand quickly before his eyes and went out, as if to look for the train. The stranger's jewelled fingers stroked the gray locks, while the tears of sorrow and the tears of sympathy fell together. The weary heart was unburdened. Soothed by a touch of sympathy the troubled soul yielded to the longings of rest and she fell fast asleep.—*Selected.*

MANY Christians are like the Leaning Tower of Pisa—as far gone from uprightness as it is possible to go without toppling over. They exhibit a leaning towards the world, sometimes for lack of a firm foundation, at other times for a false sympathy with the world, for fear it will think them puritanical. The world is much more likely to pull over the Campanile at Pisa than the original intention of the Leaning Tower was to serve as a belfry, and it now swings

a chime in which the heaviest bell is rated at twelve thousand pounds. The builders endeavored to compensate for the crookedness of the lower stories by a better adjustment of the upper stories. This not least of its characteristics reminds us of the attempt which some make to atone for crooked conduct by a mystic spirituality. The week-days, all wrong, can not be set straight by topping them off with a little devotion on Sunday. The upper stories will always be imperiled where the foundations are crumbling. After all, the true purpose of the Campanile was not to excite the world's wonder by its leaning, but to call the people with its bells; and for that work uncompromising uprightness is best. The world will be better saved by uncompromising consistency, which rings out clearly, than by any attitude of false sympathy. The more one is lifted up to exact agreement of life with God's will, the greater lifting power will one have to draw others heavenward. Be strict to self, then, however lenient to others. He who breaks the least commandment, and teaches men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.—*S. S. Times.*

### HIS OWN.

BY MRS. M. L. RAYNE.

ALL who remember the late Dr. Bush, of the American Board of Missions, will recall the rare eloquence with which he addressed congregations upon his favorite topic. But few were ever cognizant of a most pathetic fact in his own life. He had a lovely daughter just budding into early womanhood, upon whom all his hopes were centred. He had given her every advantage of education and social position, and she had graduated with high honors, and with more than the usual accomplishments of social aspirants. She was as the apple of his eye to her father, who anticipated many happy years in her society, now that she was exempt from school duties.

It was at this time that Dr. Bush preached a sermon famous for its pleading pathos, asking for missionary labor. He addressed himself to his audience with a fervor that was overpowering. He demanded youth, beauty, talent, all to be laid upon the altar of sacrifice. He addressed himself especially to the young ladies present, and drew a vivid picture of the reward which awaited a life of self-abnegation, ending with an eloquent appeal that touched every heart and bowed every head in tears.

Then one beautiful girl arose and went forward, her face glowing with the zeal of inspired purpose.

"I will go my father," she said, in a firm voice.

It was his own cherished daughter.

He had never thought of this! Stricken to the heart he walked home like one distraught, and entered his library. A small volume of poems lay upon the table. Mechanically he took it up and read:

"O fond, O fool, and blind

To God I gave with tears,

But when a man like grace would find

My soul put by her fears."

It was like a voice of heavenly censure to the grudging father. From that moment

he accepted the sacrifice in the spirit it was offered, and which he had himself inspired. His daughter became a missionary and carried out to the letter the advice he had given so bravely to others, and which had come home to his own.

## Gleanings.

Don't speak until you have thought on what you intend to say.

Pleasure is the flower that fades; remembrance is the lasting perfume.

Lay by a good store of patience, and be sure to put it where you can find it.

Conscience is the voice of the soul? the passions are the voice of the body.

Good resolutions may shape the future, but they cannot undo the work of the past.

You cannot dream yourself into a character? you must hammer and forge yourself one.

Men seldom improve when they have no other models than themselves to copy after.

To repent without mending one's ways is to pump out the ship without mending the leak.

True benevolence is to love all men. Recompense injury with justice, and kindness with kindness.

If I can put one touch of a rosy sunset into the life of any man or woman, I shall feel that I have worked with God.

If you would be pungent, be brief, for it is with words as it is with sunbeams, the more they are condensed the deeper they burn.

It takes a man with keen eyesight and a brain of much scope to see and grasp the golden opportunity before it turns the corner.

Happiness consists not in possessing much, but in feeling content with what we possess. He who wants but little, always has enough.

Whatever difference there may appear to be in men's fortunes, there is still a certain compensation of good and ill in all that makes them equal.

A restless mind, like a rolling stone, gathers nothing but dirt and mire. Little or no good will cleave to it, and it is sure to leave peace and quietness behind it.

There can be no peace in human life without the contempt of all events. He that troubles his head with drawing consequences from mere contingencies shall never be at rest.

All persons possessing any portion of power ought to be strongly and awfully impressed with an idea that they act in trust, and that they are to account for their conduct in that trust to the one great Master, Author and Founder of society.

## NEGRO PHILOSOPHY.

We am all hypocrites. We am all two-sided. We hev got one face fur de public, an' anoder fur private life. To sum us all up an' bile us down, we am all poo' critters an' a mighty long ways off from anythin' like perfeckshun.

## SHORT SUMMER SERMONS.

BY BROTHER GARDNER.

When I h'ar an individual riz up an' declare his disgust wid de world I sot him down as a pusson who has contributed his fa'r share to'rds bringin' de world to its present condishun.

Dar am sartin people who war' bo'n into dis life fur no pertickler reason. Dey am as outer place as a blind hoss befo' a look-in'-glass. Dey haven't de smartness to steal nor de speeret to work. Dey am too cowardly to suicide, an' not brave 'nuff to face de problems of life. Dey am mean 'nuff to covet, but not reckless 'nuff to steal. Dey begin on Sunday mawnin' to predict short crops, an' wind up Saturday night by a prophecy of airthquakes or cholera. On de front doah of ebery sich man should be nailed a sign readin': "It am better to pass on to de next co'ner an' take de small-pox instead."

I sit down wid my pipe of an eavenin' an' boil sartin matters down an' frow away de skimmins. I'ze bin gainin' two or three pounds of flesh a y'ar fur de last ten y'ars. What rich man has done better? I'ze got a tight roof ober head, an' a good cellar below. Jay Gould's roof may be higher an' his cellar bigger, but why should I envy him when I have room 'nuff?

On my table am co'n beef, 'taters, cabbage, bread, an' odder fings which please my taste, satisfy my hunger an' put fat on my ribs. Does any millionaire do mo' dan eat to please hisself?

De panes in my windows am small but clear. I kin look out to de east, no'th, south or west. De Vanderbilts can't do any better. Deir glass may be larger an' cost mo' money, but it doan' keep out any mo' weather.

I'ze got a bit of a garden in which I'ze growin' 'taters, lettuce, onions, beets an' de like. De Queen of England kin have a bigger garden, but her vegetables must grow in de same way, an' would taste no better.

I'ze got plenty of fuel fur cold weather, an' fly screens to keep out de dust an' flies in summer. De king's palace am warmed by de same coal an' his screens made frum de same wire. I want neither his heat nor his 'skeeters.

I'ze got good health and a purty fa'r job. Dar am plenty of millionaires who haven't got no health 'tall, and whose worry am mo' tiresome dan my labor.

I'ze got a lot all paid fur in de graveyard. Some men may have two, but I doan' envy 'em. By an' bye me'n the ole woman will be laid away up dar. By an' bye de rich man an' his wife will also be laid away. Dey may have a monument towerin' above their tombstuns, but dey'll sleep no sweeter nor awaken any sooner. Deir coffins may be richer, but de same airth will bring all to decay.

De great trouble wid aiverage humanity,

as I see it, am de fack dat people grasp fur too much. What was riches to de las' ginerashun am jist nuff to make dis one discontented. What was comfort den am poverty now. De wages of our gran'-fathers would hardly buy ap'ons fur de wives of workin' men to-day. We am full of froth an' show. Hypocrisy an' deceit am part of our stock in trade. Envy an' jealousy am drivin' out charity an' contentment. Fifty y'ars hence, if dey should dig down to my coffin, an' find dat I had turned ober, de papers need'n't make any sensashun. It am quite sartin' onless a great change takes place, dat de nex' ginerashun will make us ole dead folks tired.

## Querist.

[This column is open to all brethren who are seeking for information in reference to biblical matters. We will always be glad to give the best information we can, but cannot undertake to enter into a discussion on the replies given. We do not lay this down as an absolute rule, but as one that we will not depart from unless, in our opinion, the circumstances of the case seem to call for a more extended discussion.]

## ELDERS AND DEACONS.

In a church where there are deacons but no elders, who are expected, or whose right is it to rule and take the oversight of the church?

In such a case, if the deacons have not the power, what then?

What are the helps and governments for.

[1. In the absence of properly-appointed elders, the church will have to carry on the work the best way it can. The deacons, if there are any, from the very necessities of the case, will have to do the work which otherwise would devolve upon the elders. This of course they cannot do as effectively as it would be done if there were elders, hence the church cannot be as well looked after in the absence of such officers. It follows, therefore, that the organisation of the church on a New Testament basis can never be complete until both elders and deacons are appointed and are discharging their respective functions.

2. 1 Cor. 12:28-30 refers to special gifts which the church enjoyed during the apostolic age, and therefore does not concern us in our church organisation of to-day.

*Helps or Helpings.*—Probably assistance to the sick or poor (same word in 2 Macc. 8:19, 3 Macc. 5:50, for miraculous help from God in time of need.) Compare Acts 20:35, where the cognate verb is used.—*J. A. Beet.*

*Helpers*, who, speaking by inspiration to the edification of the church, are fitted to assist the superior teachers, and to help the faith and joy of others.—*A. Campbell.*

*Governments.*—Powers of leading and organisation.—*Farrar.*

Governments or Directors, who, by the gift of discerning spirits, are fitted to direct the church.—A. Campbell.—Eds.]

### SHOULD WOMEN SPEAK IN THE CHURCH.

Will you in your next issue kindly answer following questions relative to 1 Cor. 14: 34, and oblige.

W. W. TOMLINSON.

1. Does the command of the apostle apply to churches of that age only, or to the present also?

2. Does it preclude a sister from reading scripture in the churches, and from praying?

3. If no brethren were present, would sisters by this command be precluded from breaking the bread?

[1. Paul says, "Let your women be silent in the churches; for it is not permitted them to speak, but to be in subjection as the law also saith; and if they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home, for it is indecent for a woman to speak in the assembly (1 Cor. 14: 34, 35). There is no warrant for restricting this command to the apostolic age.

2. We are of opinion that it does.

3. The occasions when this would occur are so rare that it seems scarcely needful to raise the question, but in the case of isolated sisters we should say it is their duty and privilege to "break bread."—Eds.]

### KNEELING OR STANDING IN PRAYER.

At a bible-class meeting at Berwick, Bro. McAllister stated regarding posture in prayer that Mark 11: 24, 25, Luke 18: 10-13, and *perhaps* John 17, are the only New Testament examples of *standing* in prayer, and were all before the institution of the Christian church. He further stated that after the coming of the Holy Spirit, who was to guide the apostles' into all truth, every example of prayer where the posture is specified was found to be *kneeling*. If that is so, why do we not take the example of the apostles' as our guide and kneel? Should expediency come between us and the following of a Divine example and apostolic precedent? If you would answer these questions, and give New Testament reasons for standing in our prayers, you would confer a benefit on many here who are interested in the matter, and desire to know what is right that they may do it.

A BELIEVER IN PHIL. 2: 10.

[Both kneeling and standing in prayer were common prior to the institution of the Christian church, and

it is probable that both practices obtained in the new order of things. The only passages referring to the subject, after the ascension of Christ, are found in Acts 7: 10, 9: 40, 20: 36, 21: 5. All these refer to special occasions. We are not informed as to what was the practice when the disciples met together on the first day of the week. It would seem, however, from the testimony of the fathers, that standing was the posture assumed on the Lord's day. An early author, supposed to be Justin Martyr, says:—"Forasmuch as we ought to remember both our fall by sin and the grace of Christ, therefore we pray kneeling six days as a symbol of our fall by sin, but our not kneeling on the Lord's day is a symbol of the resurrection, whereby through the grace of Christ we are delivered from our sins and from death, that is, mortified thereby. And thus custom took its original from the times of the apostles, as Irenæus says in his book concerning Easter, wherein he also makes mention of Pentecost: "during which time we kneel not, because it is of the same nature as the Lord's day, according to the reason that has been given." Other ancient writers bear testimony in the same direction. The deduction to be drawn, we think, is that either postures are right; but the chief thing is to worship God in spirit and in truth. We may say that the practice of sitting in prayer, unless necessitated by illness, is both unbecoming and irreverent.—Eds.]

### PSALMS AND HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS.

Can you please inform your readers as to the distinctions in the mind of the apostles when giving directions to the disciples for the use in their assemblies of "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Eph. 5: 19). First, what is the difference between a hymn and a spiritual song? and, second, what the difference in a psalm from either or both?

EDWARD LEWIS.

1. [Psalms (*psalmos*) no doubt refers to the Psalms of David, which were uniformly sung by the first Christians.

2. Hymns.—A hymn is properly a song or ode in honor of God. About A.D. 107, Pliny describing the worship of the persecuted Christians, says they were accustomed to sing among themselves a hymn to Christ as God. Eusebius, in the following century, speaks of psalms and hymns as affording historical evidence of the constant belief of the Christian church in the divinity of Christ.

3. Spiritual songs or odes.—*Ado*

from the Hebrew *to confess*, praise; because the original use of singing among both believers and idolaters was in the confessions and praises of their respective gods, and indeed in this appropriated sense only is the verb *ado* applied in the New Testament.

To sing, utter harmoniously, occurs Rev. 5: 9, 14: 3, Eph. 5: 19, Col. 3: 16. In the last two texts it is applied figuratively to the heart.

*Spiritual songs*, therefore, we should say, are songs relative to spiritual things, and composed under the influence of the Spirit (comp. 1 Cor. 14: 15, 26.) *Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon*.—Eds.]

### LUKE 11: 13.

Will you kindly allow me space in your columns to call attention to a portion of the Saviour's teaching as recorded by Luke 11: 13. I would observe that from the position we take as a religious body with respect to the mission of the Holy Spirit there is an apparent difficulty here. Our teaching on this point, as I understand it, and which I conceive to be correct, is to the effect that the Spirit is definitely promised to all who obey the gospel in its entirety, and *when* they so obey it, is to be an indwelling and abiding guest so long as they continue in Christ. Such teaching appears to me to preclude the possibility of any present application of the passage to either saint or sinner, since to the one the gift is already bestowed, and to the other promised upon the same terms. May we not infer that the words "give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him" were exclusively meant for the disciples and others while under the former economy? Permit me, however, to ask whether these words are a faithful translation of the original, and, if so, does Luke here record the same utterances of the Saviour in his sermon on the mount as Matthew, as the expression there is "good things."

Yours in the hope of the gospel,  
Geelong. J.D.

[J.D. expresses correctly the views generally held by us as a religious body in reference to the Holy Spirit. This position we regard as impregnable. In reference to Luke 11: 13 the question is, "Is the Holy Spirit" a correct rendering of the original. It is so translated in the Authorised and Revised Versions. We understand that some commentators give the rendering "a holy spirit." In the original the article is not indicated, but this in itself proves nothing, as in undoubted references to the Holy Spirit in other

places in Luke the article is not used. In any case, therefore, we should be disposed to reject "a holy spirit" as an incorrect translation.

The next thing to ascertain is, does the Greek text admit of any other reading than that from which the Authorised and Revised versions are translated. Westcott & Hort's Greek New Testament is reckoned by those capable of judging as being the best we have. Turning to Luke 11:13 we find that they give in the body of the text *agion pneuma* (Holy Spirit), but give in the margin as an alternative reading *agatha domato* (good things.) In reference to the value of these alternative readings, they say in their appendix "No alternative reading is given which does not appear to have a reasonable probability of being the true reading." There are, then, two readings of this passage of nearly equal value. How then shall we decide which is the correct one? There are several reasons which decide us in concluding that *agatha domato* (good things) is the true reading.

1. We find *agatha domato* (good things) given in the parallel passage in Matt. 7:11.

2. The Holy Spirit was not yet given. "But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believed on Him were to receive, for the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7:39.)

3. The Holy Spirit is not spoken of as a benefit to be sought, but as one that follows faith and obedience. Faith and obedience being understood, the Holy Spirit follows as a necessary sequence. It does not require seeking or asking.

4. The word of God does not contradict itself, therefore "good things" (*agatha domato*) is in our opinion the correct rendering.—Eds.]

#### GENERAL EVANGELIST'S REPORT.

To the Missionary Committee.

Dear Brethren,—The inclement, yet not unseasonable nor unwelcome weather spoken of in my last continued without intermission until the last few days, and consequently the preaching meetings in Horsham have not been numerous attended, although the brethren and sisters have been present themselves and unremitting in their endeavors to bring others. The same cause has also interfered with the Lord's Day afternoon preaching in the gardens. Yet the truth is steadily making way; two ladies (mother and daughter) having been "baptised into Christ" during the month. We have also been strengthened and encouraged by the addition to our fellowship of a young brother in Christ who has been meeting in another part of the colony with the "Brethren." Having come to reside in Horsham, after

some consultation and mature consideration, he decided to unite with us, and will be able to do good work for the Master here. The Tuesday bible class, and Thursday lectures are well attended. We have established a weekly bible class out at Polkemmet on Wednesday evenings. The brethren there are anxious to learn and willing to work, although none of them are able to speak in public yet, as some possess natural talent, we trust they will soon be able to assist in the proclamation of the gospel at meetings. We were unable to make arrangements for carrying on the work at Horsham while we visited Laen until the end of the month. On Saturday 30th, we rode over to Minyip (36 miles.) It was one of the wettest days, and both horse and man were glad to see the end of the journey. We spent the evening at Sister Powell's, and had a very refreshing talk with her and our brother Adam Benn. Next morning we visited Laen, and in spite of a heavy storm preached to a full house. The prejudice against the doctrine seems to have almost passed away here. Next morning, according to arrangement, Bro. Saunderson came over and was immersed in Bro. Smith's dam. He bids fair to be a stout upholder of the apostolic practice. In the evening, we went down by train to Murtoa, and there preached and baptised the two ladies before spoken of from Horsham. Returned to Laen, where we preached on Thursday. On the way to the meeting rode round by Bro. Saunderson's, who had gone some distance away, but we found our active Sister Hillgrove there. As she had been talking of the necessity of obedience to the Lord's commands, and Sister Saunderson was convinced she also ought to be baptised, we walked down to the dam and immersed her upon the confession of her faith straightway, and then with thankful hearts rode on and spoke the word of the Lord. We feel hopeful of more fruit in the coming week. Friday, we rode over 25 miles to see Sister Vinnicome, who lives many miles away from any gathering of the brethren. Found her holding fast the faith, and doing what she can for the Lord by Sunday school work. May our heavenly Father shortly give her the desire of her heart and enable her to meet with some fellow-disciples to remember her Lord. Returned on Saturday to preach at Minyip on Sunday. Broke bread at the latter place in the morning and preached the apostolic gospel there for the first time in the afternoon and evening. Seven disciples will meet to "break bread" regularly at present, and we trust and believe that the Lord will add unto them many more. With gratitude to our heavenly Father and beseeching your prayers for His future blessing.

Yours in the love of Christ.

W. D. LITTLE.

Laen, 6th August, 1887.

#### PRIZE ESSAYS.

H. W. C. having placed in our hands the sum of £11, which he offers for three prizes, viz., £7 for the first, £3 for the second, and £1 for the third best essay on "The unscripturalness of those in Christ intermarrying with those out of Christ,

with remarks on the impropriety of Christian evangelists assisting to consummate such marriages."

The competition will be open to all members of the Church of Christ. Intending essayists are requested to adopt a *non de plume* enclosing a sealed envelope bearing the name and address of the writer.

All communications to be addressed to the editors of this paper marked "Competitive Essay." As conciseness with clearness will form one of the elements of success, the essay is not to occupy more than two pages of the *Standard*, and be in the hands of the editors not later than the 7th November next.

The first prize essay will be published in the December number.

### New Books.

EVENINGS WITH THE BIBLE: OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES. By Isaac Errett, L.L.D. Standard Publishing Co., Cincinnati.

This is a fine work in two volumes. The author is well known to the brotherhood as a veteran preacher, editor, and author of many years' standing. His works previously published have won for him a high place amongst our people. This work is his latest and beyond all question his best. The leading scenes and characters of the Old Testament are considered in order, and we are only doing the writer simple justice when we say that the subjects are treated with masterly ability. He grasps the leading principles that lie below each succeeding theme, and presents them with great clearness. The lessons deducible are faithfully and forcibly put. The style is simplicity itself. Not the simplicity of common-place, but comparable rather to the crystal brook that laughs and ripples and sings as it meanders pleasantly onward through verdant meads and rugged precipices to its ocean home. The high moral and spiritual tone of these volumes invest them with a special charm. The literature in circulation amongst us is generally dry and argumentative; to those who feel this we recommend "Evenings with the Bible." There is a cultured intellect and vigorous thinking manifest on every page, while the practical and experimental aspects are stimulating and refreshing to the soul. These volumes are eminently adapted for family reading, and for drawing out the devotional side of one's personality, in addition to their critical value, and every Christian household should procure them. J. S.

### Loved Ones Gone Before.

JEROME.—On the 4th August, late at night, our Brother Edward Jerome died after a long and painful illness, which he bore with a fortitude known only to a Christian. Our late brother was immersed at South Melbourne by Brother Illingworth. During one of the very hot days experienced last summer, Brother Jerome was engaged at his occupation as a painter, and received a sharp sunstroke. He partially recovered

from this, and was able to return to work, but in a few weeks was again stricken down, and never recovered. A sister wife and six children are left to mourn the loss of a husband and father. It is our prayer that they may each receive the consolation that only their Heavenly Father can give.

South Melbourne T.S.

**SMETHURST.**—On Thursday, 28th July, the beloved infant son of our Brother and Sister Smethurst, Gembrook, was called away. The child had been a sufferer for several months, and He who careth for his children transplanted the little flower from the soil of pain and trouble to bloom in that brighter and better world, where suffering and sorrow are unknown. The parents of course lament their loss; the tendrils of the heart's affection being suddenly ruptured are always painful. We pray with them that the Lord will enable them to cast their burden on Him, and that they may look forward to the happy meeting where partings and death are unknown. Although the child had been a sufferer, his death was not expected, and when it did occur his father was away from home, and our Bro. Orchard set out to find him and break the sad news. Truly, "many are the afflictions of the righteous," but we must ever feel "Our Father knows," and "He doeth all things well." D.M.

**SMITH.**—Our beloved Sister Smith fell asleep in Jesus on the 19th of last July, aged 43 years. For many years her health has been delicate, but during the last few months she rapidly grew worse, enduring much pain and extreme weakness without a murmur. Just four months before her departure, the remains of her youngest son was laid in the grave, and though she felt her loss severely she knew that they would soon meet again. She was one of the first who obeyed the truth during Bro. Illingworth's stay with us, and continued firm to the end in her confidence in Him who died for her and rose again. She earnestly desired that her family might be led to love the truth, but especially did she pray for her eldest daughter whose husband had been the means of bringing her (Sister Smith) to the Saviour, that she with Him might enjoy that peace which passeth all understanding. Her prayers have been answered, for her daughter made the good confession and was baptised into Christ last Lord's day evening. While we know that there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, may we not hope that those who have gone to be with Jesus are sharers in that joy; that in some way it may be made known to them, that their dear ones are learning to love Him who is the fairest among ten thousand, and the altogether lovely. E. E. W.

Footscray, August 8th, 1887.

## The Harvest Field.

**FOOTSCRAY.**—Since last report, five have been received into the fellowship of the church, three by commendation, and two by faith and baptism. The Lord's day meetings are well attended, and the week-evening meetings are improving. Bro. Charles Clark of Staff Street, Footscray, is now the secretary of the church.

15th August, 1887. E. E. W.

**MELBOURNE (Swanston Street.)**—The interest in the Sunday and week-night meet-

ings conducted by Bro. Houchins still continues, and on the two evenings previous to this report being written the largest audience assembled that we have had yet. Since last month, one has been added by faith and obedience, but the results of Bro. Houchins' efforts will be felt more in the strengthening of the faith of the members than in the numbers added to the church. R. L.

**AN APPEAL.**—Bro. J. B. Carr, of Yatina, S.A., formerly of Brighton, Victoria, writes, asking us to make an appeal to the brethren on behalf of a few brethren located at the Teetulpa Goldfields who have been holding forth the words of life with such success that they have been constrained to take steps to secure a meeting place. They have exerted themselves to the full and have made no small sacrifices to attain their object. They are however some £30 short, and they appeal to the brethren to help them. We have confidence in recommending their case to those brethren who may have a little of the Lord's money on hand. We shall be pleased to take charge of any monies sent to us for this worthy object, and will have it forwarded to Bro. Carr, who has this matter in hand.

**ST. KILDA.**—Bro. Nevill has been laboring in this field for the past 3 months, and his ministrations have been appreciated and blessed. During the term, seven have put on Christ in His appointed way, a result for which we have much cause to rejoice, and be thankful to the author of all good. It is much to be regretted that some of our brethren neglect the assembling together. May our gracious Father give us courage and help in every seeming difficulty and make us to go on our way rejoicing. J. H.

### NOTES FROM SYDNEY.

Since my last month's report, four more have put on Christ in baptism, at Elizabeth Street chapel. On the 3rd of August, a tea and entertainment were given in the chapel under the auspices of the Young Men's Improvement Class, which proved quite a success. The audience was large for the occasion, and the programme consisted of songs, recitations, dialogues, etc. The young ladies of the church are also indebted to our Sister Thurgood for organising them into an improvement class during her recent visit to our city. The class numbers about twenty with Miss Jane Morrison as president. They are making an encouraging beginning, and we hope to hear good reports from them in the future. Bro. E. Bagley is pushing his work with the new church in Balmain. He reports one confession. He has organised a Sunday school, which is quite promising of success and good fruit.

A Mr. Smith, known as Captain Smith, who, for a number of years has been an immersed believer, and who has been doing some open air preaching in connection with the "Church Army" of Balmain, came to see the writer and some of the Sydney brethren in reference to uniting with us. Mr. Smith said he thought we were more scriptural than the "Army," and that he would like to labor among us. But on being informed that we could not now promise him an appointment to preach, he decided not to take membership with the Elizabeth Street church, as he wished to see his way clear to an engagement before severing his connection with the Church of England. J. F. FLOYD.

### VICTORIAN MISSION FUND.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR AUGUST, 1887.

Church Murtoa district (Murtoa, Laen, Polkemmett, &c.)	£8	4	0
Church at Fernihurst (20s. collected by Sister Evans)	...	3	0
Church at Pakenham	...	2	2
Do. Elphinstone	...	1	0
Do. Swanston Street (collected by Sisters)	...	7	13
Church at Collingwood (collected by Sister Rowles)	...	3	2
Church at Lygon Street (collected by Sisters Ward and Harcott)	...	3	5
Church at Croydon (collected by Sister Houghton)	...	1	2
Church at Hotham (collected by Sister Norfolk)	...	4	16
Church at Hawthorn (collected by Sister Butchers)	...	1	7
Church at St. Kilda (collected by Sisters Hill and Lee)	...	1	1
Sister Rossell, Yanipy	...	1	1
Bro. B. Hill, St. Kilda	...	1	0
Sisters of Prahran, Dorcas Society	...	0	8
		£39	4
		9	

W. C. THURGOOD, Treas.  
209 Swanston St., Melb.

### QUEENSLAND MISSION FUND.

Received by Bro. Thurgood—

H. and J.	...	£1	1	0
L. and S.	...	...	1	0
		£2	1	0

### NEW SOUTH WALES MISSION FUND.

RECEIPTS FOR AUGUST, 1887.

Church at Newtown	...	£8	2	0
Do. Sydney	...	7	0	0
Do. Petersham	...	1	6	0
Bro. Rowles, Dubbo	...	4	0	0
Do. John Kingsbury, Newtown	...	1	1	0
Do. W. W. White, Lismore	...	1	0	0
Sale Pamphlets	...	1	9	10
		£23	18	10

Hay St., Sydney. Wm. WILSON, Treas.

### MISSION SCHOOL (Little Bourke-st.)

Contributions thankfully acknowledged—

Bro. H. R. T	...	£0	2	0
Do. Joseph Wilson	...	0	5	0
Do. Geo. Ritchie	...	1	0	0
St. Kilda Sunday School	...	4	5	0
		£5	12	0

Also a parcel of clothing, from Bro. Jas. Hartley, St. Kilda,—acknowledged with thanks on behalf of the teachers.

M. McLELLAN, Manager.  
180 Russell-st., Melbourne.

### CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED.

4s. from Mrs. J. Taylor, Alderson, Jacklyn, Colson, Miss Barrett, Harvey, Antonsen, Moffitt, Wiltshire, Ashton, Mrs. Burtenshaw, and Langhorn; 10s. from E. Good; 20s. J. P. Muir, and C. Fischer; 12s. R. Pattison; 8s. Mrs. Brooks; 28s. A. Dawson; 5s. 8d. K. W. Duncan, Miss Williamson, Zelius and John Newby (correct); 11s. 8d. H. A. Ladbrook, and W. E. Ladbrook; 32s. A. Shaw; 6s. E. Miller.

Printed by THOS. SMITH, 55 & 57 Russell-street, Melbourne; and published by MALCOLM McLELLAN, 180 Russell-street, Melbourne, for the "Australian Christian Watchman Newspaper Company, Limited."