

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/  
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

- Additional comments: / Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE  
CHRISTIAN GLEANER.

VOL. 2.

HALIFAX, OCTOBER, 1836.

No. 8.

“PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD.”

THE VOICE OF GOD AND THE WORD OF GOD.

THE GOSPEL NOW THE WORD OF GOD.

It is very instructive to examine, with great accuracy, the various uses and applications of important words and phrases in the sacred writings. By so doing we form an acquaintance with the language which those holy men used as they spoke by the Holy Spirit; and from such an acquaintance with their language, we obtain the same ideas which they entertained of the great objects of christian faith and hope. Words and phrases which, in the Jewish writings, were used in a more general sense, are, in the New Institution, used in an appropriated sense. Thus while the term *Christ* was generally applied to all the anointed ones in the Jewish Age, it is in the apostolic writings exclusively appropriated to the Saviour. The phrase “*the Word of God*,” is used in a like restricted sense in the apostolic writings.” From the ascension of Jesus it is appropriated to denote the glad tidings concerning Jesus. This is its current acceptation; so that out of *thirty-four* times which it occurs, from Pentecost to the end of the volume, it thirty times obviously refers to the gospel. On three occasions it is applied to the literal *voice of God* at the Creation and the Deluge, and once to him who is in his own person the *Word of God*. But what I wish to note here, is, that it is never applied to any *writing* or *speech* from the day of Pentecost, but to the gospel or proclamation of mercy to the human race. The previous writings given to the Jews are not called the *Word of God* now, because this phrase has in it the idea of the present command and will of God.

“A word of God,” or “a word of the Lord,” or “a message from the Lord,” are phrases which frequently occur in the Jewish scriptures, and always refer to the immediate communication made by some messenger and addressed to some particular occasion. It did not mean what was before written or spoken, but what was spoken at that particular time, and by that particular person. For example, “a word of God came to Nathan;” “a word of God came to John in the wilderness.” Some particular message is always intended, implying a command with promises or with threatenings accompanying.

Now this is *the word* which as *glad tidings*, says Peter, has been announced to you. This is now the will of God that we should obey him whom he has commissioned.

If it were necessary to establish this by proofs and arguments, it were easy to adduce many. But I shall only add, as a very strong evidence of the justice of this discrimination, the following fact:—Multitudes who received the Jewish scriptures as containing revelations from God—the former communications and messages of God, are, by the penmen of the New Testament, said to *receive the word of God* only when they obeyed the gospel. Acts iv. 31. “They spoke *the word of God* with boldness;” “*the word of God* increased in Jerusalem.” viii. 14. “they heard that Samaria had received *the word of God.*” xiii. 44. “The whole city came to hear *the word of God.*” 46. “It was necessary that *the word of God* should have been first spoken to you Jews.”

The same remarks apply to the phrase “*the word,*” without any discriminating epithet, such as “*the word* which God sent to Israel”—by John. “Labor in *the word* and teaching.” “If any one obey not *the word.*” “They received *the word* with all readiness of mind.” And so in every passage in the Epistles where there is no peculiar direction given to it from accompanying explanations.

Having so far traced the exact import of the phrase “*the word of God,*” and “*the word,*” in the apostolic writings, I proceed to notice the various epithets which are used to designate the peculiar character of the word of God, or the gospel.

It is called “the word of reconciliation; the word of life; the word of his favor; the word of faith; the word of truth; the word of righteousness; the implanted word, which is able to save your souls.”—Such are the titles and descriptive epithets by which the word of God is recommended to us by its author. It is the word which reconciles man to the divine character, will, and government. It is the word through which life is communicated to man, and by which he comes into the enjoyment of life. It is the word of faith, the subject matter of the christian’s belief, and the means by which we have confidence in God. It is the word of truth, or *the truth* emphatically, which delivers us from errors and darkness, and imparts to the mind certainty in things unseen and future relative to the divine purposes. It is the word of righteousness by which we are accounted righteous in the sight of God, and by which alone we are qualified to live righteously. It is the implanted word, the word established by the Apostles in the world, which is able to save the soul. In a word, it is the word of God’s grace, or favor, by which alone we do enjoy the favor of God here, and are prepared to enjoy it forever.

The attributes of this word are strikingly displayed in the apostolic writings. It is called the *living* word, the sword of the Spirit. In one period Paul gives us a full description of it. Heb. iv. 12. “The word of God is *living* and *effectual*, and more cutting than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the parting of both soul and spirit, and

of the joints also and marrows, and is a discerner of the devices and purposes of the heart."

By it we are said to be purified, sanctified, begotten again, enlightened, saved. Nothing is so much extolled; no instrument so powerful, energetic, and effectual; so well adapted to its end, as *the word of God*. Every great moral change in man is ascribed to it; and it is uniformly presented to us as the great instrument of God's Almighty power. It is *the voice* of the Almighty. By his voice all his great works have been accomplished. God commanded light to shine out of darkness, and the only instrument which he is said to have employed in the original creation was his *word*. In the new creation he has not changed his plan, or employed a new instrument. Of his own will he has impregnated us by the word of truth, and has made his word the very principle of renovation. *Hearing* is imparted to man by his word; for faith comes by hearing, and hearing itself comes by the word of God.

To hear many of the moderns, who profess to preach *the word*, talk of it as they do, and represent it as a *dead* and inefficient letter, is enough to provoke the meekness of a Moses, or to awaken the indignation of a Paul. The voice of God spoke the universe into being from the womb of nothing. The same voice recreates the soul of man, and the same voice will awaken the dead at the last day. His voice, heard or read, is equally adapted to the ends proposed. Some look for another call, a more powerful call than the written gospel presents. They talk of an inward call, hearing the voice of God in the souls. But what greater power can the voice of God in the soul have, or what greater power can this inward call have, than the outward call, or the voice of God, echoed by the Apostles? God's voice is only heard now in the gospel. The gospel is now the only word of God, or will of God—the only proclamation and command addressed to the human race. 'Tis in this word of God his Spirit operates upon men, and not out of it. Were the Spirit to lay it aside, and adopt any other instrument, it would be the greatest disparagement of *the word of God*, "which is the wisdom and power of God," "the word of life," and "able to save the soul;" it would be to dishonor that word as men do who prefer other means for converting men to the gospel of Christ.

But let me ask, and seriously ask these inwardly called saints, who have heard some other voice of God than the word of God, What did that voice say? Any thing different from that which is written? If so, how did you judge it? To what standard did you refer it? If it said any thing to you different from what is written, you dare not hearken to it: for the written gospel, Jesus declared, will judge you at the last day. If it said nothing different from the written gospel, it must have repeated the same, and what was the meaning of repeating it? Does the word of God derive power from a mere repetition of it: or must God, like men, use frequent repetitions to supply the lack of power? Can the voice of God have more power in one language

than another—at one time than another—in one place than in another? You cannot answer, Yes. What do you mean by an *inward call*? If there be a word spoken it must be what is written or what is not written. And you must see that either hypothesis issues in that which is inadmissible—in that which is absurd.

Do you mean, with Andrew Fuller, that the Spirit which first gives you life, quickens you without the word? Then I ask you two questions: First, Does it use any means? If you say, No: then you contradict universal analogy as well as the oracle of God: for the Spirit was to speak of Christ in doing its work. If you say it uses any means to quicken you, then those means are the principles of life. But then I ask, Have you not, in supposing life infused without the gospel by any other means, deprived the gospel of its character as *the word of life*—as the *living word*—as *living and powerful*, and *effectual*—as the *incorruptible seed*?

But if you have heard a voice simply telling you, *by name*, that you are welcome, remember, I pray you, that particular call or invitation to you destroys the veracity of God, and makes what is written of no value whatever. For if the general invitation is insincere, if it cannot be relied on, if there must be a particular assurance that you are welcome, that assurance given to you, implies, that without it, you had no assurance before; which would be directly to impeach the veracity of God; yes, his promise, *though signed by his name and sealed by his hand*.

The voice of God, and the only voice of God which you will hear till he calls you home, is his written gospel. This is now the only word of God, the only command and the only promise addressed to all men; proclaimed by his authority to every creature. The gospel is the power of God to salvation, to every one who obeys it. 'Tis in it the Spirit of God exhibits his energy, and he who thinks that the Spirit operates in any other way than clothed in the word of God in convincing and converting the world, feeds upon a fancy of his own, or of some other distempered mind.

I have never yet heard a person attentive to the apostolic writings, never heard a student and practitioner of them, complain of any want of power or energy in them. I have seen and felt their power to be that of the Spirit which endited them, an omnipotent moral instrument, in his hand exactly adapted to man. Not physically omnipotent, as in creating something out of nothing; but so morally omnipotent that he who regards them not, could not be persuaded though angels, and spirits, and the dead revived, did appear and speak to them in a language never before heard. It is a mistake, a gross mistake, in my judgment, of the means necessary to restore man—a mistake of the nature of the government of God over man, of the actual condition of man, to imagine that any other than *moral means*, than the well attested development of the love of God in the mission and sacrifice of his Son, is necessary to renew the heart of man, to reconcile him to God, and to prepare him for the enjoyment of the

friendship and favor of God forever. But this is only by the way. They who talk of a resistible and irresistible voice of God—who talk of a gospel grace common and special, have found a new Bible and a new gospel which I have not seen, nor read, and of course do not understand. The book, commonly called the New Testament, (rather the sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ,) is that from which I have derived my views of christianity, and to which alone I subscribe as the infallible arbiter of all questions touching the word of God, and the salvation of Jesus Christ. The voice of God has, in it, bid me welcome, and my ability to come I find in the welcome which he has given. “The Spirit and the church say, *Come*: every one who hears, says, *Come*; and Jesus says, Let him who is thirsty, come; and *WHOSOEVER* will, let him come and take of the water of life freely.” In this *WHOSOEVER*, I have found every letter of my name, and have had as special a welcome as if Gabriel had paid me a visit from heaven.—*Millennial Harbinger*:

---

DIALOGUE BETWEEN A JEW AND MR. A. CAMPBELL,

“ *Extract from my Memorandum Book,*

Containing a Dialogue between the Editor and Mr. Judah, the Ruler of a Synagogue of the Jews in Richmond, Va. while attending the Convention in December, 1829.

MR. JUDAH having signified a desire to a friend in Richmond to have an interview with me, a party being invited at the house of a mutual friend, I was introduced to this venerable Jew, almost 70 years old, apparently in the health and vigor of 50.

After sitting down by his side, I said, I feel myself peculiarly happy in being seated by the side of a son of the Patriarch Abraham.

*Judah*.—I am happy in becoming acquainted with one who so well defended the divine mission of Moses against the Infidel Owen.

*Editor*.—Have you read the debate with Mr. Owen?

*Judah*.—I have carefully read it all, and have not a single objection to any thing in the first volume of it. So far as you argue the authenticity of the Jews' religion, your arguments are substantially such as our Rabbins use; and your stripping the Deists of their *natural religion* is one of the best things I have read from any Christian. You know I differ from you on the christian part of your argument; but one thing I will say to you, I have heard some of your lectures on the Christian religion since you came to the city, which, with what I have read from your pen on that subject, assure me that you teach the religion which Jesus and the Apostles taught, if I know any thing of the meaning of what the New Testament says. And let me add, you are the only Christian preacher I have heard in a long life that does not abuse us poor Jews. I was wont to attend the Christian meetings in Richmond, but was constrained to abandon them because of the insults offered to us Jews.

*Editor.*—I never can reproach a Jew. We Gentiles are debtors to the seed of Abraham for all that gives us elevation of character; and although the remnant of your people were to be treated as you say the Christian preachers now treat them, and your own Prophets foretold; still I never will be the person who will speak contumeliously of a Jew as such. For your Fathers' sake I must always respect your nation; and glad would I be if your reproach among the nations was taken away. But there are a few questions which I would wish to propose to you for my own information.

*Judah.*—It will give me pleasure to answer them.

*Editor.*—Do you continue to read the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms in your Synagogues, as your people were accustomed to do at, and before, the Christian era?

*Judah.*—In our Synagogues every Sabbath day the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms are read, and all once through every year—just as you stated in your debate with Owen. We have these sacred writings divided into weekly lessons, and so divided as to make, in all, only *fifty-two* lessons.

*Editor.*—You have not much time for “preaching,” then, as we Christians call it.

*Judah.*—No, nor much need for your sort of preaching or expounding. We hear Moses and the Prophets. We chant the Psalms of David, and invoke the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But we have no sermons. Sometimes an exhortation is tendered; but it is short, and only occasional. We teach our children the Law, without creed or catechism. We often hear in your Christian Synagogues sermons upon a sentence in Moses or the Prophets, very unlike, however what Moses or the Prophets taught. Your preachers make all our scriptures *typical*, and your own too. They often fault our Rabbims; and talk about the traditions of our Elders; but I find that Rabbi Luther, Rabbi Calvin, and Rabbi Wesley, are as venerable as any of our Rabbims; and their traditions as sacred as those of our Elders.

*Editor.*—Does your reading of the Law and the Prophets correspond with our version of them?

*Judah.*—Substantially it does; excepting some passages in the Prophets and in the Psalms, and these are not numerous.

*Editor.*—What do you mean by *the Spirit of God*?

*Judah.*—We mean not what you mean. You represent the Spirit as a person distinct from the Father. We believe that Jehovah is one Jehovah; that the Spirit is his power, his wisdom, his goodness in operation; but have no idea of a distinct person or being.

*Editor.*—I have thought that the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is a Christian revelation and not a Jewish, and that some of the criticisms upon *Aleim* and other words and phrases in your writings, applied by our Christian Doctors to this Christian development, were forced and unnatural.

*Judah.*—They are all so. *Aleim*, with us, denotes one Jehovah. “The Lord our God is one Lorá.”

*Editor.*—As I merely inquire after your views and customs, permit me to inquire, Do you use bread and wine in eating the Passover?

*Judah.*—There have been from time immemorial a loaf of bread and a flagon of wine upon the same table on which the Passover is served; and both are used by us pretty much as Jesus is said to have used them. We give thanks for them, and distribute them among the family which partake of the lamb. We cannot tell how they came to be used; but our fathers have used them as a thank-offering, and we still hold this among our sacred customs.

*Editor.*—Do you use immersion in water as a religious institution, for any purpose?

*Judah.*—It was used in proselyting a Gentile; but since proselytism has ceased this custom has ceased. When any foreigner was added to the congregation, he was first circumcised, then sprinkled with sacrificial blood, and immersed in a running stream or bath; for we have a tradition that “only by circumcision, sacrifice, and immersion, can a Gentile be received into the congregation:” for it was by circumcision, the blood of sprinkling, and immersion in the Red Sea, or in the cloud and sea, that we were dedicated to the Lord.

*Editor.*—Might I request you to state to me your expectations of the Messiah?

*Judah.*—Our people are now very far from agreed upon this subject. I believe that our nation will all be converted in one day—not to Jesus, however; but that the Messiah will come, and all the people shall know him and receive him cordially when he comes. Then “a nation shall be born in a day.” Our people, Mr. Campbell, will never be converted by your missionaries. Those of them who have been said to be converted were hypocrites, and apostatized from us for interest, like your missionaries — and —. I agree with Paul in some things; but Paul stole them from the Prophets, and pretended to have been inspired. But it is true that “*all Israel shall be saved*, when the Deliverer shall come out of Zion, and shall turn away impiety from Jacob.” Then, too, shall all the Gentiles acknowledge him. And never will you convert all the Gentiles to Jesus. You can neither convert the Jews nor the Gentiles to your Messiah; but when the Son of David comes all nations shall do him homage.

*Editor.*—Do you know to what tribe you belong?

*Judah.*—No: the family lineage and the tribes are all lost.

*Editor.*—Was it not foretold that the Messiah would be of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David?

*Judah.*—Certainly it was.

*Editor.*—Was not this foretold for some purpose?

*Judah.*—It was.

*Editor.*—And was it not in order to enable you to recognize and prove the pretensions of the Messiah when he came?

*Judah.*—It was.

*Editor.*—How, then, can these prophecies be of any use to you when the lineage of families and the tribes is lost? The purpose for which they were given cannot now be accomplished, if the Messiah be yet to come!

*Judah.*—I will tell you how I understand this may be accomplished: when the Messiah comes he will tell every man to what tribe and family he belongs.

*Editor.*—But will his assertion of that which you cannot prove but upon his own testimony, be a testimony in his favor! Could such an imposition be detected? Is not this to open the door for imposture? If you cannot prove the family and the tribe of every pretender, the prophecies concerning the family and tribe can serve no purpose whatever.

*Judah.*—Mr. Campbell, we do not want proselytes to our religion. I do not talk with you to convert you. We want no converts. Your Master commanded you to make proselytes; but Moses gave us no such command.

*Editor.*—I admit he did not. I do not expect to convert you to the christian faith; but as you have been so condescending as to answer my questions, I wish, for my own information, to know by what arguments you reject Jesus of Nazareth.

*Judah.*—As a matter of information, but not with a design to convert you, I will continue to answer your questions.

*Editor.*—What was the most heinous offence against God, which your nation, according to the tenor of your covenant, or constitution, could commit?

*Judah.*—There were many very heinous offences which we could, and did commit.

*Editor.*—But was it not treason for your nation, and the most flagrant sin which, under your government, you could be guilty of, to apostatize into idolatry?

*Judah.*—It was. As a *national* sin, it was our greatest sin.

*Editor.*—And was it not a sin to be punished with the utmost severity, as Moses declared?

*Judah.*—Most unquestionably it merited the severest punishment.

*Editor.*—And when your nation, as such, fell into this sin, was not the seventy years captivity in Babylon, together with the destruction of your Temple and city, the punishment inflicted upon you for this sin?

*Judah.*—It was the punishment visited upon us for that sin, and the severest punishment ever inflicted upon our nation for fifteen hundred years.

*Editor.*—But a punishment still more severe has since befallen you; and were we to estimate sin by temporal punishments, we would be constrained to think, that as your Temple was razed to its foundation, your city laid in ruins, and your nation carried captive into all nations and banished from your own land for almost *two thousand years*, you must have, about that time, committed a sin as

much more aggravated in its character than simple idolatry, as the punishment consequent upon it has been more tremendous in its nature and protracted in its duration, than was the Babylonish captivity, with all its concomitants.

*Judah*—We have committed some great sin, it is true : but what that sin was, it is not easy to determine.

*Editor*—But have you not been led to suspect that as this evil came upon your nation shortly after your rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, that probably it came upon you on that account ?

*Judah*—Josephus said it came upon us for the martyrdom of James the Just ; but I profess not to know on what account it came upon us.

*Editor*—Did not Moses say, that if you would not obey that prophet of which he informed you, that such a calamity would befall you ?

*Judah*—Whom do you think that prophet to have been ?

*Editor*—Jesus the Nazarene.

*Judah*—That cannot be ; for Jesus of Nazareth was not raised up like Moses : and the prophet of whom Moses spoke was to be raised up as Moses was.

*Editor*—And whom do you say that prophet was ?

*Judah*—We believe that Moses was then speaking of Joshua, his successor.

*Editor*—And was Joshua raised up like Moses ?

*Judah*—He was a *man* like Moses ; but you say Jesus was *God*. And he pretended to be equal with Jehovah.

*Editor*—Jesus professed to be *the Son of God* : and sustained his pretensions by works equal, if not superior, to those which certified the mission of Moses. And Jesus was raised up just as Moses was raised, from obscurity, by the mighty power of God. But how can you think that Joshua was regarded in these words of Moses, when he is not named nor alluded to for *ten chapters* afterwards ?

*Judah*—What was more natural than for Moses, in the book of Deuteronomy, when he was delivering his valedictory address to our fathers, than to allude to his successor, and to caution the people on the subject of obedience to his successor ?

*Editor*—This he does afterwards ; but nothing in the context in the 18th chapter of Deuteronomy, will warrant the application of those words to Joshua. Besides, I know not on what authority you could call Joshua a *prophet*. A *prophet like Moses*, Joshua was not ; nor, indeed, could any other prophet, which God ever sent your people, be at all compared to Moses. So illustrious was Moses, that it was no disparagement to Jesus to be compared to him. For although he far excelled Moses, yet there were more points of coincidence between him and Moses, than between him and any other prophet. Joshua was, as a *leader* to Israel, the successor of Moses ; but, pray tell me, in what respect was he like Moses as a *prophet* ?

*Judah.*—I do not expect you, Mr. Campbell, to agree with me on this subject, and you know I told you that I did not aim at proselyting you to my faith.

*Editor.*—True, you said so; but I hope you will indulge me a little farther, as I wish to know what you have to offer against our faith, and what reasons influence you in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah.

*Judah.*—We have many, many reasons; more than I could tell you in a long time.

*Editor.*—Pray how do you apply the prophecy of Jacob: “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from among his descendants till Shiloh come; and to him shall the gathering of the people be.”

*Judah.*—I do not read that passage as you do. I read it. “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah till they come to Shiloh: then shall the people assemble to him”—that is, to *Saul*; for it was at Shiloh the people assembled and made Saul king.

*Editor.*—But how will this accord with the fact? Was the sceptre in Judah before it was in the family of Saul? This passage intimates that the sceptre should continue in Judah for a long time; but your reading puts it in the family of Saul before it was in the tribe of Judah: for David was not made king till Saul was rejected.

*Judah.*—Judah was prince or chief amongst his brethren, from Jacob’s time, till Benjamin, in the person of Saul, became chief; and this fact, together with the place *Shiloh*, where the people assembled to Saul, proves the interpretation.

[Here was a debate about the import of the term *Shiloh*, not remembered.]

*Editor.*—But doubtless you must confess that the sceptre did not depart from Judah when Saul was made king; for in the person and family of David it continued almost a thousand years after it departed from Benjamin.

*Judah.*—You talk about the peaceable kingdom of the Messiah; I mean, you christians are always preaching about this Prince of Peace. But show me this peaceful kingdom, and I will renounce my opposition to your Messiah.

*Editor.*—Here I admit the force of your objection; and candor compels me to say that there is some strength in this objection. I feel my inability to stand up for the modern christian profession. But one fact consoles me, viz. Paul, John, Peter, and Jude assure us that this state of things would come to pass; therefore it shakes not my faith, for it was foretold. That the Messiah should be a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs; that he should be led as a lamb to the slaughter; and that in his humiliation his condemnation should be extorted, is not more plainly foretold in Isaiah in the 53d chapter of his prophecies, than is the apostacy of christians which we now witness. But this can constitute no objection against the religion, more than that those incidents in the life of the Messiah should be an objection to his divine mission. A reformation has commenced which will never cease till Christians and christianity be what they once were.

*Judah*—You apply Isaiah as other Christians; but I apply it to the Jewish nation---and make the term *he* stand for the nation.

*Editor*—But for this arbitrary appropriation of the term *he* no good reason can be adduced. There is one consideration which I beg you to reflect upon: I will suggest it in the form of a query, and will not farther impose upon your good nature for the present. What proof can any Messiah ever give of his mission, more convincing than did Jesus of Nazareth? Tell me what signs or evidences can your Messiah adduce---only mention *one*, that our Messiah has not afforded?

*Judah*—If all that is testified of Jesus by his historians were true, I would say that the evidence was as satisfactory as necessary. But how will you prove that?

*Editor*—By all the same arguments by which you would impugn their testimony, will I impugn that of your own Moses. But you told me that my argument for the divine mission of Moses was irrefragable. My argument for the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, is just the same.

*Judah*—I read the New Testament more than most of my brethren. I blame you not for your proselyting zeal. Do try and convert your Christians to that book, and teach them to be more just to the poor Jews. I have offered you, not my best arguments, but only an *apology* for my unbelief. I respect you as an honest Christian: believe me to be honest Jew, who cannot believe for the reasons assigned by your Paul in his letter to the Romans. I shall always be glad to see you. But I must wait the conversion of my countrymen: for Israel will all be converted in one day.

*Editor*—One word more. How do you Jews expect to obtain the remission of your sins, as you have neither temple, nor altar, nor priest?

*Judah*—By prayer.

*Editor*—I know of no promise nor institution in your religion which warrants a hope of remission without sacrifice.

*Judah*—Sacrifice we cannot have; for we have neither temple, nor altar, nor priest; and therefore, if God forgive us not through prayer, forgiveness we cannot gain. But our trust is in Jehovah whose mercy endureth forever.

The Pharisee is always proud of his humility. The real Christian is always humbled on account of his pride.

A man may do many things from a principle of *fear*: but the child of God should act from a principle of *love*. And the difference will be evident. *Love* will do as much as it can; but *fear* will do as little as it dare.

Avoid the habit of speaking humbly of yourself, as a snare of the devil. Can you be willing not to speak of yourself *at all*? That is the question.—*Thoughts in Retirement.*

FAREWELL ADDRESS,  
OF MRS. MARGARET CAMPBELL TO HER DAUGHTERS,  
SPOKEN TO THEM IN THE IMMEDIATE PROSPECT OF DEATH.

[*From the Christian Baptist Vol. V.*]

MY DEARLY BELOVED CHILDREN,

It appears to be the will of our Heavenly Father to separate me from you by death. The only desire I have had to live for some time past was for the good of my family. For myself I could expect to enjoy nothing more on this earth than I have already enjoyed; and, therefore, for my own enjoyment, it is much better for me to be taken away than to continue with you. But I am reconciled to leave you, when I consider that if I continued with you I could not preserve you from evil. I might, indeed, advise you and instruct you; but if you hear not Moses and the prophets, Christ and his Apostles, neither would you be persuaded by me. And as to natural evils, it is God alone who can defend you from these. You are able to read the oracles of God, and these are your wisest and safest instructors in every thing. But I am reconciled to leave you from another consideration. I was left without a mother when I was younger than any of you; and when I reflect how kindly and how mercifully our heavenly father dealt with me; how he watched over my childhood, and guarded my youth, and guided me until now, I am taught to commit you, without a fear or an anxiety, into his hands. The experience I have had of his abundant goodness to me, emboldens me to commend you to him. But you must remember that you can only enjoy his favour, and I can hope for his blessing upon you, only so far as you believe in, and obey him. I have said you can all read the Holy Scriptures. This is what I much desired to be able to say of the youngest of you; and it is with great pleasure I repeat it, you can all read that blessed book, from which I have derived more happiness than from any other source under the skies. The happiest circumstance in all my life I consider to be that which gave me a taste for reading and a desire for understanding the New Testament. This I have considered, and do now consider, to be one of the greatest blessings which has resulted to me from my acquaintance with your father. Although I have had a religious education from my father, and was early taught the necessity and importance of religion, yet it was not until I became acquainted with the contents of this book, which you have seen me so often read, that I came to understand the character of God, and to enjoy a firm and unbounded confidence in all his promises. And now I tell you, my dear children, that all your comfort and happiness in this life, and in that to come, must be deduced from an intimate acquaintance with the Lord Jesus Christ. I have found his character, as delineated by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, in their testimonies, exceedingly precious, and the more familiarly I am acquainted with it, the more

confidence, love, peace, and joy, I have ; and the more I desire to be with him. I say to you, then, with all the affection of a mother, and now about to leave you, I entreat you, as you love me and your own lives, study and meditate upon the words and actions of the Lord Jesus Christ. Remember how kindly he has spoken to, and of, little children ; and that there is no good thing which he will withhold from them who love him and walk uprightly.

With regard to your father, I need only, I trust, tell you, that in obeying him, you obey God : for God has commanded you to honour him, and in honouring your father, you honour him that bade you so to do. It is my greatest joy in leaving you, that I leave you under the parental care of one who can instruct you in all the important concerns of life, and who I know will teach you to choose the good part, and to place your affections upon the only object supremely worthy of them. Consider him as your best earthly friend, and, next to your Heavenly Father, your wisest and most competent instructor, guardian, and guide. While he is over you, or you under him, never commence, nor undertake, nor prosecute any important object without advising with him. Make him your counsellor, and still remember the first commandment with a promise.

As to your conversation with one another, when it is not upon the ordinary business of life, let it be on subjects of importance, improving to your minds. I beseech you to avoid that light foolish, and vain conversation about dress and fashion, so common among females. Neither let the subject of apparel fill your hearts, nor dwell upon your tongues. You have never heard me do so. Let your apparel be sober, clean, and modest ; but every thing vain and fantastic avoid. If persons wish to recommend themselves to the vain and the giddy, they will dress and adorn themselves to please such persons ; but as I would deplore the idea of your either choosing or approving such companions, I would caution you, and entreat you to avoid the conversation, manners, and apparel, which would attract the attention of such persons. They are poor companions in sickness and death ; they are no helpmeets in the toils and sorrows of life, and, therefore, we ought not to study to please them in the days of youth and health. I never desired to please such persons ; if I had, my lot might have been, and no doubt, would have been, far different. No, my dear children, I chose the course which I now approve, and which, when leaving the world, I recommend to you. And I am sure you can never be more happy in any other course, than I have been in that which I recommend to you. Persons of discernment, men and women, of good understanding, and of good education, will approve you ; and it is among these, in the society of these, with such company, I wish you to live and die. I have often told you and instanced to you when in health, the vain pursuits and unprofitable vanities of some females who have spent the prime and vigour of their lives in the servile pursuits of fashion, some of whom have grown grey in the service ; and where and what are they now ? Let these be as

beacons to you. I therefore, entreat you neither to think of, nor pursue, nor talk upon such subjects. Strive only to approve yourselves to God, and to commend yourselves to the discerning, the intelligent, the pious. Seek their society, consult their taste, and endeavour to make yourselves worthy of their esteem.

But there is one thing which is necessary to all goodness, which is essential to all virtue, godliness, and happiness; I mean necessary to the daily and constant exhibition of every Christian accomplishment--and that is, to keep in mind the words that Hagar uttered in her solitude, "*Thou God, seest me.*" You must know and feel, my dear children, that my affection for you, and my desires for your present and future happiness cannot be surpassed by any human being. The God that made me your mother, has, with his own finger, planted this in my breast, and his Holy Spirit has written it upon my heart. Love you I must, feel for you I must; and I once more say unto you, remember these words, and not the words only, but the truth contained in them--"*Thou God, seest me.*" This will be a guard against a thousand follies, and against every temptation.

I must, however, tell you, that I have great confidence in the Lord, that you will remember and act upon, and according to the instructions given you. I feel grateful to you for your kind attention to me during my long illness; although it was your duty, still I must thank you for it; and I pray the Lord to bless, and indeed, I know that he will bless you for it.

I cannot say much more upon this subject. I have already, and upon various occasions, suggested to you other instructions, which I need not, as, indeed I cannot, now repeat. As the Saviour, when last addressing his disciples, commanded and entreated them to love one another, so I beseech you to love one another. It is scarcely necessary, I hope, to exhort you to this; nevertheless, I will mention it to you, and beg of you, all your lives through, to love one another, and to seek to make one another happy by all the means in your power. But I must have done, and once more commend you to God and to the word of his grace; even to him who is able to edify you, and to give you an inheritance among all that are sanctified. That we may all meet together in the heavenly kingdom, is my last prayer for you: and as you desire it, remember the words of him who is the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*. Amen.

---

## SORROW FOR THE DEAD.

[*From the Christian Baptist Vol. V.*]

The sorrow for the dead is the only sorrow from which we refuse to be divorced. Every other wound we seek to heal--every other affliction to forget; but this wound we consider it a duty to keep

open—this affliction we cherish and brood over in solitude. Where is the mother that would willingly forget the infant that perished like a blossom from her arms, though every recollection is a pang. Where is the child that would willingly forget the most tender parents, though to remember be but to lament? Who, even in the hour of agony, would forget the friend over whom he mourns? Who, even when the tomb is closed upon the remains of her he most loved, and he feels his heart, as it were, crushed in the closing of its portal, would accept consolation that was to be bought by forgetfulness? No! the love which survives the tomb is one of the noblest attributes of the soul! If it has its woes, it has likewise its delights; and when the overwhelming burst of grief is calmed into the gentle tear of recollection; when the sudden anguish and the convulsive agony over the present ruins of all that we most loved is softened away into pensive meditation on all that it was in the days of its loveliness—who would root out such a sorrow from the heart? Though it may sometimes throw a passing cloud even over the bright hour of gaiety, or spread a deeper sadness over the hour of gloom; yet who would exchange it even for the song of pleasure, or the burst of revelry! No! there is a voice from the tomb sweeter than song! There is a recollection of the dead, to which we turn even from the charms of the living. Oh the grave! the grave! It buries every error—covers every defect—extinguishes every resentment. From its peaceful bosom spring none but fond regret and tender recollections. Who can look down upon the grave, even of an enemy, and not feel a compunctuous throb that ever he should have warred with the poor handful of earth that lies mouldering before him!

But the grave of those we loved—what a place for meditation! Then it is that we call up in long review the whole history of virtue and gentleness, and the thousand endearments lavished upon us, almost unheeded, in the daily intercourse of intimacy! then it is that we dwell upon the tenderness, the solemn, awful tenderness of the parting scene—the bed of death, with all its stifled griefs, its noiseless attendance, its mute, watchful assiduities—the last testimonies of expiring love—the feeble, fluttering, thrilling, O how thrilling! pressure of the hand—the last fond look of the gazing eye, turning upon us, even from the threshold of existence—the faint, faltering accents, struggling in death to get one more assurance of affection!

Aye, to go to the grave of buried love and meditate! There settle the account with thy conscience for every past benefit unrequited—every past endearment unregarded, of that departed being who can never—never return to be soothed by thy contrition!

If thou art a child, and hast ever added a sorrow to the soul, or a furrow to the silvered brow of an affectionate parent—if thou art a husband, and hast ever caused the fond bosom that ventured its whole happiness in thy arms, to doubt one moment of thy kindness or thy truth—if thou art a friend, and hast ever wronged, in thought, or

word, or deed, the spirit that generously confided in thee—if thou art a lover, and has ever given one unmerited pang to that true heart that now lies cold and still beneath thy feet; then be sure that every unkind look, every ungracious word, every ungentle action, will come thronging back upon thy memory, and knocking dolefully at thy soul—then be sure that thou wilt lie down sorrowing and repentant on the grave, and utter the unheard groan, and pour the unavailing tear, more deep, more bitter, because unheard and unavailing.

Then weave thy chaplet of flowers, and strew the beauties of nature about the grave; console thy tender spirit, if thou canst, with these tender, yet futile tributes of regret; but take warning by the bitterness of this thy contrite affliction over the dead, and be more faithful and affectionate in the discharge of thy duties to the living.

## MATERIALS FOR THINKING.

### ON UNSCRIPTURAL PHRASEOLOGY.

IT is very possible that some readers may be ready to exclaim, on the first view of the remarks I am about to offer, that it is making too much of a trifle; that it is dwelling too much on an immaterial point, to press a serious objection to the practice to which I mean to allude. I believe, however, that this apprehension is an unfounded one, and that, with by far the larger proportion of mankind, the use of a *wrong word* too frequently betokens the existence of a *wrong idea*,—an idea which often involves a fundamental error.

The subject, then, to which I am desirous of drawing some attention, is that of the adoption of certain words, and words, too, of no immaterial but important meaning, into the Christian vocabulary, *which either are not used at all in scripture, or are used there in a different sense from that which is now commonly assigned to them.* The two leading instances which occur to me at the present moment are. 1, the word which is very generally substituted for the Divine Name; and 2, the word which is too frequently made to push out of view the only way of salvation,—faith in the Saviour.

1. I remark, then, that nothing is more common than to hear the gracious acts and leadings of the Christian's Lord and Master ascribed to what is called "*Providence.*" This is done continually in some of the best books we have, and by some of the best men. Yet it is not to be allowed to pass without remark on that account, when we observe that *it is never done by an apostle*; and that, in short, the word itself occurs but once in the whole Bible, and that in a case which no Christian will think of quoting as a precedent. Tertullus, the orator, retained by the Jews to plead their cause against Paul, addresses Felix the governor after this fashion,—

"*Seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy PROVIDENCE, we*

accept it always, and in all places, most noble Felix, with all thankfulness:"

And this is, I believe, the only place in which the word occurs in scripture.

Now, considering the variety of lovely and appropriate designations of our Lord supplied in scripture, it strikes me as rather unaccountable that we should stoop to borrow from heathen orators and poets, either the general and vague term "NATURE," or the equally indistinct one of "PROVIDENCE," as phrases by which to speak of either the stated or the occasional operations of God's hand. Yet as we are constantly told, on the one hand, that *Nature* supplies, provides, compensates, and regulates all the visible machinery of the universe; so, on the other, it is constantly *Providence* that is said to watch over the doings, deservings, errors, and dangers of human beings, and to punish or recompense, as far as this life is concerned, their misdeeds or good endeavours.

Now it shall be admitted at once, that these phrases *may* be justly and properly employed;—as, for instance, when Mr. Leigh Richmond speaks of studying the character of God in three books,—the book of Nature, the book of Providence, and the book of Grace. But the question is not whether such terms may be safely and profitably adopted in such a form as this, and by such a man as Mr. Richmond, but whether the manner in which they are ordinarily employed does not savour somewhat of a device of Satan, tending to banish the name of God himself as much as possible from men's conversation, and thus to keep it as far as may be, out of remembrance.

The apostolic language is, "if the Lord will:" "if the Lord permit:" "the Lord stood with me and strengthened me:" "Prepare me a lodging, for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you." Men, now-a-days, even of some religious profession, think they show an equal sense of the divine superintendence and government by sometimes slipping off the tongue a "please providence," or "providentially, it happened so and so." Now I cannot help thinking that in most cases there is a greater evasion of the apostolic injunction in such cases, than in the brief sign (D. V.) upon which an esteemed correspondent of the Christian Lady's Magazine some time back animadverted.

But it is time I passed on to observe—

2. That there is probably a still greater practical evil in the second point to which I have alluded, than in the first. The point I mean is this;—the substituting, in the place of the Saviour, and the Gospel, as the only way of salvation, a something which is called "RELIGION."

Again I ask, is this, in the sense in which it is constantly used, a scriptural phrase? Not at all. The word occurs in *Acts* xxvi. 5, and in *Galat.* i. 13, 14, with reference solely to the performance of the Levitical rites and ceremonies. It is again used in *James* i. 27

thus, “ *Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this ;—to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.*” Thus we see that, in the best sense in which the word is used in scripture, it applies to nothing beyond the outward walk and conversation of a believer. Yet one of our popular hymn-writers tells us that

’Tis *religion* that can give  
Sweetest pleasures while we live :  
’Tis *religion* must supply  
*Solid comfort when we die.*”

And I cannot but fear that there may have been some persons perhaps many, who having this stanza strongly impressed on their minds, and remembering well the words of St. James, have gathered together, on their death-beds, the remembrance of their alms-deeds, and their unspotted lives, and have thought to pass the dark river leaning on this bundle of reeds.

Thus unquestionable is it, that in the too indiscriminate use of this word, so sparingly employed in scripture, great evil is apparent. Yet let no one suppose that either in this, or in the former case, I am proposing to cast out these terms as unfit for use. It is the *loose* and *unscriptural* use of them which I wish to bring under view. Against this I would ask Christians to be on their guard, not only adhering to more distinct and more scriptural expressions themselves, whenever they can with propriety be substituted; but also warning others, on all fitting opportunities, not to put ‘Nature’ and ‘Providence’—two expressions which, in fact, often have no Christian meaning—in the place of God; and not to imagine that ‘religion,’ or a Christian’s outward walk and conversation,—which is the *effect*, not the *cause*, of salvation,—will form even so much as any part of a believer’s *title* to “the inheritance of the saints in light.”

---

## CHRISTIAN MORALITY.

### PARENT AND CHILD.

THE relationship considered in the former number was that of Husband and Wife, the most intimate and permanent known on earth. The next to it, both in permanency and intimacy, is that of Parent and Child, of the giver of human life and the receiver of it.

Mere instinct will teach the young to be subject to the authors of their being, during the helplessness of early years; the consciousness of weakness, the want of a protector and provider, attach the offspring even of brute beasts to those who gave them existence. But the rules given in the Bible comprehend this relationship as subsisting in all its force long after the period of infancy and youth; the term *child* is used only in reference to the mutual connexion, and not in

reference to age : so long as both parent and child are in the flesh, will the relative duties of each remain an obligation.

Since this branch of duty is co-existent with the duration of life ; and since that instinct which binds the young to the parent ceases to operate forceably when the age of immature weakness is past ; some *fresh* motive, not depending on years or wants, is requisite to influence us lastingly in this manner,—After the physical bond is weakened, the union must be maintained by a *moral* bond. And this is supplied by the scriptures : “ Children obey your parents *in the Lord* ; honour thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise, that it may be well with thee.” (Eph. vi. 1—3.) “ Children obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing unto the Lord.” (Col. iii. 20.)

There cannot be a doubt, that the *manner* of shewing obedience and honour to parents must vary with our years : common sense, as well as our Saviour’s example, with regard to his mother, establishes a difference between the implicit obedience of a boy, and the considerate obedience of a man. Restrictions such as this are generally implied in the pithy precepts and maxims of the Bible. But, after admitting such a restriction, the above-quoted passages evidently relate to the whole period during which our parents may survive ; they establish that it is the child’s duty to shew them undiminished honour and obedience to the latest hour of their mortal existence.

The phrase “ *in the Lord* ” expresses the permanent Christian motive of filial obedience. “ *Lord*,” in this passage, appears to mean Christ as our supreme master, both by creation and by redemption. *His* will and appointment are to be so constantly regarded in our filial duties, that they become acts of direct obedience to the Lord Jesus.

The parent is one whom the Creator has placed in a certain situation as his representative, to act in his stead, and to receive a portion of the honour and obedience due to himself. At the birth of an infant, the father does indeed stand to the unconscious little one in the place of God. The mother stands in the relative situation of the church, which is the mother of us all as Christians, and to whom the rearing of the Lord’s children in righteousness and godliness is entrusted. The parent’s religious faith becomes almost necessarily the faith of the child : in the Christian faith, therefore, the father and mother are entrusted by the Lord Christ with the power and duty of bringing up her child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Though a family constitutes a real dominion or sovereignty of the smallest possible extent, the authority committed by God to its head is, in many respects, the most extensive upon earth. There is no other power, not even the monarch of the land, who either does or can interfere with the parental management of children. Parents are, in this matter, immediately next under God ; they are his undoubted delegates : consequently, the obedience and honour paid to them by their children are paid to God.

Their office being so high and honourable, parents are very remiss, when they do not require from their children outward marks of respect. The outward habit will greatly influence the inward feeling. In the present day there appears a general relaxation of family discipline in this respect, which promises no good to society hereafter. Not a century back, no child in a well-ordered family would have been allowed to remain seated when a parent entered the room. In primitive times no rank or honours exempted a son from rising at his father's appearance. Consistently with the principle here set forth, parents lower their proper dignity, and undermine their necessary authority, when they allow their families to continue the same boisterous behaviour in their presence as in their absence. Children should grow up with the feeling, that outward "honour" is due to the very presence of their father or mother. All rude and noisy rushing in and out of a father's or mother's company, should be habitually felt to be unmeet, and contrary to family etiquette.

There is an evil too often fostered by persons with pious intentions, namely, encouraging children to make themselves teachers of religious knowledge to their parents. That which is an utter subversion of God's ordinance; and a violation of the practice of mankind from Adam to the present hour, cannot be a trifling matter. God is a God of order, not of disorder; and we must beware of infringing his institutions under the impulse of an ill-regulated zeal for religion. However God's grace may sometimes flow to individuals through unusual channels, that is no reason for his creatures to despise his ordinances, or to anticipate a blessing when acting in opposition to them. As the unbelieving husband is to be won "without the word," by his wife's Christian deportment, so must the unbelieving parent be worked upon for his soul's good, not by the child usurping authority, (which teaching will be, without great caution,) but by the powerful force of *example*. It is not meant that wife or children are never to venture on suggesting a religious truth to the unbelieving husband or father; this is quite different from an assumption of the office of religious teacher. Satan often attacks children in this manner; he plays upon their pride of knowing something more than their parents do, until he leads them to violate that honour and deference, the shewing of which would have been the most probable means of rescuing their parents from the power of Satan.

The apostolic directions to parents are; "Ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," (Eph. vi. 4.) Fathers are addressed here without express mention of mothers, because bodies are addressed in their head, who is responsible for the evil of the whole. But the Apostle's injunction indicates that parents are often tempted to irritate their children by harsh language, or by capricious severity; and there is little doubt but that much of the bad tempers exhibited by children, are reflections of those into which the parents have been betrayed.

The latter should take care ("in the Lord") never to use their power of punishing, or even of rebuking, while under the blinding influence of passion.

If the pre-eminent honour which God has put upon Christian parents, to be the source of life to immortal beings, whom they are to rear up to be partakers of the throne of Emmanuel, and "equal unto the angels;"—if this view of their responsible office had not been lost sight of, Christians would not so universally have followed the practice of the world, in lightly abandoning the education of their offspring to other, and too often to ungodly hands.

One chief source of delusion in this matter is confounding *education* with mere *instruction*, terms, the import of which is essentially different. Instruction is a duty of far inferior importance to education; the former refers to the *intellect*, the latter to the *affections*; the former may, without sin, be delegated, the latter seems hardly susceptible of it; it is the former only that can be attended to in schools, the latter is the province of the parent alone. Education is habit derived from the united powers of example, affection, and discipline. You may engage numerous masters to *instruct* your children in many useful things, but you must *educate* them yourselves.

Education, in its largest sense, as it is enjoined in the word of God, includes the training up of a child—the bringing him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; it is the whole process by which a responsible human being, destined for immortality, is formed in principles and habits of every kind. By far the most valuable part of this education cannot, by any possibility, be purchased with money, this parental department cannot be transferred, or undertaken by others; for how can the family constitution, its affections, associations, and relations, all sanctioned and enforced by the word of God—how can these be transferred? And these are the powerful elements for a right education. Parents should be assured that their example will educate their families; their conversation with friends in the hearing of their children, the likings and dislikings they express, the society they select and live in, the domestic table, behaviour, and occupations—all these things will educate their children. The influence of the parental character on children is beyond calculation.

Nor will God suffer his ordinances to be despised with impunity. He has appointed certain duties, as annexed to certain relationships, which are types of the relationships he himself has assumed for the benefit of his creatures. If his blessings were usually to accompany an abandonment of the duty growing out of any relationship, he would bless disorder, he would unsettle the system of his own ordaining.

Before quitting the subject of parent and child, we may refer to our Lord Jesus Christ, in his capacity of second ADAM to the whole human race, (1 Cor. xv. 45 - 49). As the first Adam was the general father of us all, so will JESUS stand in that parental relation to us at

the resurrection, by imparting his own principle of life to vivify the dead in their graves. He is therefore termed by Isaiah (ix. 6.) "the Father of the everlasting age," the Father or second Adam of redeemed man in the age without end, which will commence for him at the resurrection. This relation of Jesus to mankind, and to every Christian in particular, is shadowed forth by the parental relation between man and man; and the obedience and honour which the redeemed will owe to Christ, is shadowed by the obedience and honour due from the child to the parent.

---

*To the Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.*

L—, Va.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

Although I am conscious of my inability for preparing communications for the press, not having been in the practice of it; yet having been a spectator, for some time, of the controversy between yourself and the religious community, I am, from a sense of duty, induced to express my astonishment to you—and, if you please, to the public—on two accounts.

I am not a little astonished to hear from all quarters that you deny that the Holy Spirit has any influence upon the soul in converting it. Of this sentiment I acknowledge I have found no indications in your writings; nor did I understand any thing of the kind from you during my personal interviews with you last winter, when on a tour through this country. Indeed, I feel confident you cannot believe such a proposition: for certainly you cannot think that the Spirit of God is inferior to the spirit of man. Have not Luther, Calvin, Arminius, and Wesley influenced and inspired their followers with their respective spirits? Are not their followers more ardent in their aspirations to resemble their masters, than to resemble *the Chief among ten thousands*, who was holy, harmless, and undefiled, full of mercy and of good fruits? And do they not breathe forth the spirit of the founders as fully as ever did child resemble parent?

I am also, on another account, astonished that your opponents should deny the sufficiency of the written Oracle of God to make disciples to the Lord, while they contend that you have disciplined many, and inspired them with your spirit, by your written word, though they have never seen you. Strange that they should feel your spirit and power to the ends of this country, put forth in your written word, and that God could not make men feel his Spirit and power by his written word? Your opponents, if they saw it, honor your word more than the word of God: for they say it is a more potent instrument! I sometimes think that if the advocates for sects and creeds were to contend for them as zealously as your friends contend for the New Testament, they would be considered as influenced by the Holy Spirit.

Indeed, sir, I have always considered God as speaking to me by his Spirit whenever I read or hear his word; and I think myself influenced by his Spirit in proportion as I am disposed to obey his word. For example: Suppose some known, or unknown friend, living in some land or country superior to this, superabounding in all the good things necessary to human comfort; should write to me, stating all the advantages I should gain by going to it, and withal pressing me and entreating me to emigrate to it; I should consider myself influenced by his word just so far as I felt disposed to remove thither; and I should suppose myself speaking quite as intelligibly to my neighbors when I told them that I was moved and drawn on by this friend thence, as if I said I was induced by his writings.

It has been urged that the sacred records are read by many on whom it has no influence, while on others it has great power. This is made a great mystery by many. Some explain the mystery by saying that God has, by some mysterious influence, operated independent of the word, and has given them a revelation of it; while having withholden that influence from others, they cannot understand it, and can feel no power in it. Were the question put to me, Why all who read the Scriptures do not alike obey them, or are not alike influenced by them, if there be no divine influence separate from the word? I would answer the query by proposing another, viz.—Why has the *Christian Baptist*, or why has the *Millennial Harbinger* such influence on some, and none on others who read them? Will they answer this question by alleging that you are omnipresent, acting or operating upon the mind of your favorites to make them understand and obey your writings and exhortations, intended to induce them to return to the ancient order of things? Or will they answer this question by saying, that a rational, sober, and honest investigation of facts, induces many to return to the ancient order of things. Let them answer this question as they may, they cannot fail to find in their own answer a refutation of their own objection.

As to the difficulty of exercising faith, of which some so often speak, the whole difficulty is found in the want of a disposition to obey. Our Saviour said respecting some in his day—“*how can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?*” John v. 44. There would be no obscurity attached to the word *faith* and there would be no difficulty in *believing* were it not for that little word *obey*, which God has inseparably connected with it. Ah! here lies the mystery. Many will say, “Good Master, what shall I do that I may enter into the kingdom.” And when they are told about denying themselves and taking their cross, or obeying the gospel, then they exclaim, ‘How hard it is to believe! I wish I knew what faith, true faith, means!’ The *obedience of faith* is that which makes faith unintelligible to many.

Suppose you should propose to me a certain reward for a certain piece of mechanism, I might believe that it was you that promised it, but I could not believe that I should receive the reward unless the mechanism was performed according to your stipulation. But should I agree to perform the labor required, I should anticipate the reward, and rejoice in hope. And is not this analogous to that saying. "Not every one who says to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom; but he that does the will of my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. vii. 21; Luke vi. 46. &c.)

Nothing, my dear sir, has induced me to trouble you with these remarks, but a desire to cast in my mite, while the rich are casting in of their abundance, for accelerating the general reign of our Lord and King. In christian affection, I subscribe myself yours,

ELIHU.

ORTHODOXY.—Orthodoxy, says a writer, will cover a multitude of sins, but a cloud of virtues cannot cover the want of the minutest particle of orthodoxy: whatever you do, be orthodox. Nevertheless it might be easily shown, that all Christian churches have suffered more by their zeal for orthodoxy, and by the violent methods taken to promote it, than from the utmost efforts of their greatest enemies.

A family where the great Father of the universe is duly revered; where parents are honored and obeyed; where brothers and sisters dwell together in love and harmony; where peace and order reign; where there is no law but the law of kindness and wisdom; is surely a delightful and interesting spectacle.

Like snow that falls where waters glide,  
 Earth's pleasures melt away;  
 They rest on time's resistless tide,  
 And but a moment stay.  
 But joys that from the Gospel flow,  
 Like stars that gild the night,  
 Amid the darkest gloom of woe  
 Shine forth with sweetest light.  
 The Gospel's ray no clouds obscure,  
 But o'er the Christian's soul,  
 It sheds a radiance calm and pure,  
 Though tempests round it roll;  
 His heart may break 'neath sorrow's stroke,  
 But to its latest thrill;  
 Like diamonds shining when they're broke  
 THAT RAY WILL LIGHT IT STILL.