

"THE WISE TAKEN IN THEIR OWN CRAFTINESS;"

OR,

THE WISDOM OF THE CLERGY

PROVED TO BE

FOLLY,

IN A COLLOQUY UPON THE

"GORHAM CONTROVERSY," THE BISHOPS, "THE CHURCH,"
REMISSION OF SINS, REPENTANCE, ETERNAL LIFE,
AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

Richmond, Virginia, U.S.A.

"The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, 'He taketh the wise in their own craftiness;' and again, 'The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain, therefore, let no man glory in men.'"—Paul.

LONDON :

Published by the Author; and may be had of A. Muirhead, 25, Nicolson Street, Edinburgh; W. Anderson, 32, High Street, Dundee; J. Mowatt, 7, Flour Mill Brae, Aberdeen; W. Linn, 90, Argyle Street, Glasgow; J. Hage, Stodman Street, Newark; Stevenson and Co., Middle Pavement, Nottingham; J. Balley, 96, Great Hampton Row, New John Street West, Birmingham; and R. Robertson, 1, Berwick Place, Grange Road, Bermondsey; or of the Author, 5, Brudenell Place, New North Road, London.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

1850.

PREFACE.

THE origin of these pages is as follows. In April of the current year the author was at Plymouth, a chief town in the Diocese of Exeter, delivering a course of lectures on "*the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ.*"¹ He sojourned there about eighteen days. This was sufficiently long to discover that the principal topic of public interest was "*the Baptismal Regeneration of Infants*" as dogmatized by Henry Philpotts, D.D. "the Right Reverend Father in God, and Lord Bishop of Exeter;" and disputed by his undutiful son in the faith, the "Reverend" Mr. Gorham of "*prevenient grace*" celebrity. As some of the author's lectures were upon the regeneration of individuals and society at large, he did not fail to exhibit the "Gorham controversy" before the assembled multitude according to its deserts; and to express his utter astonishment that men esteemed "learned, wise, and great," could, with the scriptures in their hands, perpetrate such puerile absurdity as is exhibited on both sides of the dispute.

Having had the honor of pleading for the faith originally delivered to the saints,² and of testifying against the popular superstition in this renowned Diocese of Satan,³ the time arrived for the author's return to London. Soon after taking his seat in the carriage, a gentleman entered having in his hand a pamphlet of considerable thickness. With the absence of all ceremony he informed us that he had just received the pamphlet from his bookseller, and that it was upon the Gorham controversy. A gentleman wearing a moustache, and who, from the fishing tackle in his possession, appeared to be a sporting character of the Isaak Walton school of arts, made a more pertinent observation on the Puseyite Bishop than might have been expected from a person of his pursuits, which led to a response from Mr. B., in which he styled "his grace of Exeter" "a rascal." From this the author inferred that the owner of the pamphlet, if a clergyman at all, was certainly not a Puseyite. The author maintaining his customary reserve among strangers, contented himself with being "swift to hear, and slow to

¹ Acts viii. 12. ² Jude 3. ³ Rev. ii. 18.

speak."¹ Mr. B. entered freely into conversation on "infant salvation," "the immortality of the soul," "baptismal regeneration," and other kindred topics with another person than Isaak Walton's disciple, who was more inquisitive than dogmatic upon the topics of discourse. Mr. B. was evidently a reader, though not a student of the scriptures, for he quoted them with considerable facility, though inappropriately; the subjects, therefore, of conversation soon led him beyond his depth, and getting into the whirlpool of speculation, he was brought to the avowal that "not being a clergyman, but only a tradesman, he did not understand metaphysics," and therefore could not explain the difficulty started by the inquirer. He was then, neither a Puseyite, nor a dealer in metaphysics, which he rightly regarded as the peculiar calling of the clergy, whose business it is to obfuscate the minds of the people with their vain and unprofitable, and incomprehensible subtleties and disputes. His conversation, however, revealed him to be an ingenuous, though bewildered man. Mr. B. having lost himself in the mazes of school divinity the author now felt disposed to break the silence he had maintained; and to endeavour to fish him out² of the eddy into which he had been imperceptibly drawn. He remarked that this foolish controversy about infant baptismal regeneration might be put into a nut shell. That the sprinkling was said to be for the remission of sins; which, if it meant any thing must signify either for the forgiveness of *actual* sins, or the "original sin." But it was not contended that it was for actual transgressions, because infants were manifestly incapable of disobedience. That the remission, therefore, could only be for original sin; and if for this, it must be for remission of the *consequences*, which were said to be death, natural, spiritual, and eternal as affecting the body and "immortal soul." But what did we see? We see that infants, though sprinkled with "holy water," and "signed with the sign of the cross in the name of the Holy Trinity," are nevertheless subject to disease and death, the punishment of the original sin, and are therefore not regenerated at all, for if "forgiven," or regenerated, they ought not to die. Thus stubborn fact destroys this miserable conceit, and stultifies its patrons before God and men.

This statement seemed to commend itself to Mr. B's understanding. He said, he had never thought of it in that light, and begged that the author would repeat his words. He complied, while Mr. B. made a note of what he said. After this a conversation ensued which lasted about two hours. Mr. B. became deeply interested, and in the course of it inquired of the author, "Are not you the gentleman that has been

¹ James i. 19. ² Matt. iv. 19.

lecturing at the Plymouth and Devonport Mechanics' Institutes?" Being answered in the affirmative, he expressed the hope that the author would return, and lay the topics he had conversed upon again before the people; for though he did not believe them, being so new and strange, yet he should much like to hear them discussed anew.

Being a few weeks afterwards at Newark in Nottinghamshire, the author was relating the substance of the conversation he had had with Mr. B. to a friend, who became as interested in it as he. He expressed a wish that he could have it in writing, and requested the author to oblige him with it before he left the town. He consented, and proceeded to fulfil his promise; but in so doing found it growing into a manuscript of some importance. He thought that the time, labor, and information bestowed were too much for individual monopoly; he, therefore, suggested to his friend whether he would not forego his claim to the manuscript and receive a printed copy instead? He readily agreed to this, being anxious that the information he had received should be circulated far and wide. Accordingly, while sojourning for a few days in Birmingham, Derby, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Glasgow, the author occupied some of the leisure moments at his disposal, in writing the following pages, which contain the subjects in a more extended form, but substantially the same as colloquially submitted to Mr. B. Having read the manuscript to several friends, they were pleased to say that it was just the sort of thing demanded by the times; and urged its publication with the least possible delay.

With respect to the controversy which has originated it, its subject and consequences are highly important, though the handling of it by the clergy is supremely ridiculous. The dispute is a question of regeneration and therefore of salvation; so that it resolves itself into the inquiry, "What must a man do to be saved?" High churchmen reply, "You must be sprinkled, and signed with the sign of the cross in the name of the Holy Trinity; so that being thus 'born of water and the spirit' you will 'enter into the Kingdom of God.' But if you neglect this, and die unbaptized, you will be damned to the flames of hell for ever." This is substantially expressed by the Bishop of Exeter in his letter to "his grace of Canterbury," page 19, saying, "There is one baptism by Christ's institution—one only. 'One baptism for the remission of sins.' If the one opportunity of their receiving that 'one baptism' to their salvation was flung away by the faithlessness or heedlessness of those to whom their infancy was confided, what, on the terms of the covenant of Christ, any longer remains to them? *I shudder at the answer.*" Not a word about faith in this. The

"terms of the Covenant of Christ" are, "He that believes THE GOSPEL, and is baptized shall be saved."¹ It suits the Bishop's creed to mutilate "the terms." He is right that there is "one baptism" and "only one water baptism;" but he is profoundly ignorant of what it is. He vainly imagines that it is *the sprinkling and signing of a babe*; not knowing that there can be no christian baptism to any one who is without faith in "the exceeding great and precious promises" of the gospel. Seeing then that the Bishops and their clergy are so blind, and incompetent to teach the way of salvation, the people should look into the matter for themselves. The controversy has commenced, but the end is not immediately. The clergy are battling one another. One party has appealed to "lay authority," which has made the other more belligerent than before. The last appeal has yet to come, namely, *to the people*. It is important, therefore, that these should be enlightened, that they may be prepared to judge effectively when the season for their action shall arrive. What do they want with "ravening wolves in sheep's clothing?" Salvation is predicated on faith in and obedience to the gospel, not on allegiance to a hireling priesthood, and the perpetuation of a hierarchy of clerical extortioners, who wallow in wealth and luxury obtained from the hard earnings of the industrious classes, on the hypocritical pretence of "*curing their souls!*" "While they promise them liberty they are themselves the slaves of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage:"² and assuredly the bishops and their clergy are thoroughly subdued by "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life."³ Give light then to the people, and when the appeal comes, they will veto the longer continuance of the harlotry which now exists between "the Church" and the State in the abused name of Christianity. Without light their action would be pernicious, and the mere substitution of one form of evil for another. To contribute, then, to the preparation of them for their work, and to answer the question scripturally which the clergy have failed to do, this Colloquy is published; and, as a sort of warning of "coming events which cast their shadows before," served upon the lords and others, spiritual and temporal, who figure most prominently in the sentimental puerilities of the age.

In conclusion, then, O Reader, fear not the clergy neither regard them; but turn thou from their darkness to the light that shines forth from the word of God; and deliver yourself from the power of Satan incarnate in the hierarchies of the world. "Come out from among them, and be separated, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my Sons and Daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."⁴

¹ Mark xvi. 15, 16. ² 2 Pet. ii. 19. ³ 1 John ii. 15, 16. ⁴ 2 Cor. vi. 17.

COLLOQUY.

BOANERGES and HERESIAN.

Boanerges soliloquises. This Albion reminds me much of ancient Ephesus. It is full of craftsmen who have their wealth by making shrines to a strange god. Mammon, and not the God of Israel, is the deity whom Britain and the world adore. Some of his worshippers cry one thing, and some another; for their assemblies are confused; and the more part know not wherefore they are come together. Money, the golden statue "that fell down from Jupiter," is the motive principle enthroned in the hearts of priests and people, who at least concur in hymning its praise as the almighty, wonder-working power of their system. With "Mother Church" for their goddess, and Mammon as their image, the Demetrian shrine-makers of "Christendom," are true sons of the ancient craft, which stirred up the multitude against Paul and his companions, whose doctrine destroyed the books and "cunning arts" by which they made "no small gain" of a deceived and confiding people. Such is the relation of the clergy to the public purse, the public conscience, and the "things of the spirit of God." They rob the people on false pretences; pervert their minds; handle the word of God deceitfully; and raise a clamor where truth their craft endangers. But, thanks be to God, the signs of the times are propitious to the speedy overthrow of their ascendancy over the minds of men. The masses are uncharmed by the cry of "Church and King." The great example of America has taught them, that God's religion is independent of them both; and that were kings and clerical establishments to be abolished from the nations, the sun would rise and set, the earth yield its fruits in season, trade and commerce thrive, men become "heirs of the Kingdom of God," and the hearts of the people rejoice,—aye, as they never joyed before in this beautiful island of the sea!—But here comes a friend. Ah! Is it you, Heresian; what news dost thou bring to day?

Heresian. I know not if it be news to you, but I have just heard that the holy bishop of Exeter has lost his case. The Privy Council has decided against him in his dispute with Mr. Gorham. For my own part, I cannot see what business laymen have with doctrinal matters in a judicial capacity at all. These are too high for them, and should be left to spiritual persons, whose peculiar province it is to define what is proper for the laity to believe.

Boanerges. That notion of yours, Heresian, is very well suited to the dark ages in which it had its origin. The distinction you make between "lay" and "spiritual" men, in the popular sense, is unscriptural. All believers of "the gospel of the kingdom" who have put on Christ Jesus, are equally lay and spiritual. They are all God's laity (*λαοι, people*) and being "born of the spirit" in an intellectual and moral sense, are also spiritual. The Privy Council is as spiritual as your holy bishop of Exeter, or any of "the Bench"—a spirituality, however, in relation to the truth, whose influence is only evil and that continually. But come, Heresian, as you are "a churchman," and a resident in this country, be so good as to explain to me, who am but recently arrived here, what is the ado about between "the Right Reverend Father in God," and Mr. Gorham, a "reverend" of less degree?

Heresian. It is soon told. Our venerable bishop is a rigid constructionist of the letter of the creed, while Mr. Gorham is indifferent to the literal, but a great stickler for its spirit. The bishop maintains that an infant is regenerated in the act of baptism by the spirit; but Mr. Gorham objects to this, because of the inference deducible from it: for if regeneration solely in baptism be admitted, the immortal souls of all infants that die unbaptized must be lost; because it is written, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God."² He contends, therefore, that to be born again is to be born of the spirit, and that to this end water is not essential. That it is the infant's soul that is the subject of the regeneration, and which cannot be affected by the water. Hence, he considers that the Spirit of God operates directly upon the spirit of the babe before and independently of the use of water. For this reason he terms the operation "*prevenient grace.*"

Boanerges. So then, *regeneration by prevenient grace and regeneration by water made holy by the spirit* in the case of infants, is the "tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee" of this great episcopal dispute! Exeter is right enough in contending for the letter as the only way of getting at the spirit of the creed; for *the spirit of a discourse is the meaning of its words.* He is also right in contending for spirit and water in regeneration; but, both he and Gorham are equally wrong in assuming that an infant is a fit and proper subject of "the New Birth." They are both wrong in supposing that the begetting influence is physical. Generation is physical; and so is regeneration when it is perfected; but in the first stage of the process, which is restricted to the present life, it is *the result of the truth believed;* and a matter of heart, or disposition, and not of physical change. Pray tell me, my dear friend, what spiritual benefits their reverences, great and small, suppose are conferred on their regenerated infants?

Heresian. They have the remission of sins, "are ingrafted into Christ, made children of God, and heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven." So that dying in infancy they ascend to God.

Boanerges. This is, indeed, a royal road to heaven! A kind of

¹ Mat. iv. 23; Acts x. 36, 37; Mat. xxiv. 14; Mark i. 14, 15; xvi. 15, 16; Acts ii. 22—33; viii. 4, 5, 12, 35, 38. ² John iii. 3.

short cut to glory! The age
at the house of God; and
and another says, that it is the
Kingdom of God." But of
with Protestant and Romanists
they would surely never have
been to die in infancy, have a
"prevenient grace," which
will save, having been shown
about equivalent to a firm
desire to see, I would do
have avoided the "mark on
has now numbered among
the, what else would her
generation?
Heresian. If it be a sin to
it is not also a sin to cry? I
of evening and residing in a
number to his her hole on
your legislators of New En
they are guilty to the great
"original sin," which is very
low much more, therefore, to
Boanerges. O Sir, Heresian
is it that! You do not see
they otherwise, I should have
regeneration in the dark and
and the Newman of no claim
positive sense of the word a
scripture sense that of soul on
is true to an effect; which
scripture language in a man
truth, even to transgression in
fact, and corruption, when
before he transgressed the
But was then involved in his
because the evil was the power
"Flesh and blood" is certainly
doctrine, called "sinful the
made man," is not, that in
the absence of goodness is an
and blood being turned "sin
which Paul explains
and John the Baptist, who has
of his own self have our sin
"sinful the," in the sense of a
and blood; so that having the

short cut to glory! The apostle saith that "judgment must begin at the house of God;" and that the righteous are scarcely saved:¹ and another says, that it is through much tribulation they enter the Kingdom of God.² But if these holy men had been acquainted with Protestant and Romish theology as the Lord's way of salvation, they would surely never have spoken thus. It would certainly be better to die in infancy, having been regenerated with holy water, or "preventient grace;" salvation would then be sure. But to live to adult age, having been trained up in the leaven of the doctors, is almost equivalent to a foreordination to reprobation. If your doctrine be true, I would that I had died in infancy that I might have avoided the "much tribulation" and "judgment," and have been now numbered among the angels of God! But had I died then, what *sins* would have been remitted in my baptismal regeneration?

Heresian. If it be a sin to laugh, as some divines have thought, is it not also a sin to cry? Infants by their naughtiness are a cause of swearing and scolding in others. This is as sinful in them as for a mother to kiss her babe on the sabbath, which was forbidden by the pious legislators of New England.³ Besides these *sins* of which they are guilty to the great annoyance of their guardians, there is the "original sin," which is weighty enough to sink a ship of 1000 tons, how much more, therefore, the infant soul.

Boanerges. O fie, Heresian; I thought you had more sense than to talk thus! You do not seem to know what *sin* is. If I did not know otherwise, I should have concluded that you had been studying tractarianism in the dark and mystic groves of Isis among the Puseys, and the Newmans of its cloistered halls. You ought to know that the primitive sense of the word is "*the transgression of law*;" and the derived sense that of *evil in the flesh*. Transgression is to this evil as cause to an effect; which effect re-acts in the posterity of the original transgressors as a cause, which, uncontrolled by belief of the truth, evolves transgression in addition to those natural ills, disease, death, and corruption, which are inherent in flesh and blood. Because he transgressed the Eden-law Adam is said to have sinned. *Evil* was then evolved in his flesh as the punishment of his *sin*; and because the evil was the punishment of the sin, it is also styled *sin*. "Flesh and blood" is naturally and hereditarily full of this evil. It is, therefore, called "sinful flesh," or flesh full of sin. Hence, an apostle saith, "in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing."⁴ The absence of goodness in our physical nature is the reason of flesh and blood being termed "*sin*." "The word was made flesh;" a saying which Paul synonymizes by the expression, "God hath made Jesus *sin* for us, who knew no sin;"⁵ and Peter, by the words, "He his own self bare our *sins in his own body*."⁶ "God made Jesus *sin*," in the sense of making him of a woman,⁷ or of flesh and blood; so that having the same nature, its evil was condemned

¹ 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18. ² Acts xiv. 22. ³ See the Blue Laws of Connecticut. ⁴ Rom. vii. 18.
⁵ 2 Cor. v. 21. ⁶ 1 Pet. ii. 24. ⁷ Gal. iv. 4.

in his flesh; and consequently the sins of those who believe the gospel of the Kingdom were then borne away, if they have faith also in the breaking of his body for sin.¹ Besides this, John says, that "all unrighteousness is sin;" and another apostle that, "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Now, Heresian, I should like you, or some of your spiritual lords, to inform me what sins, actual or original, are remitted to an infant in the "baptismal regeneration" they talk so much about?

Heresian. Really, I must confess that in view of the premises you have laid down, I am at a loss to say. They cannot be actual; because they have transgressed no law. May it not, however, be the original sin? They committed that sin when in the loins of Adam. Their souls then contracted a liability to the pains of hell for ever; but by regeneration they are freed from that liability, and become "heirs of the grace of life."

Boanerges. Who told you that men, women, and babes became liable to eternal torments in hell-fire because Adam transgressed the Eden law? There is no such absurdity in the Bible; it is but a fiction of the schools. Adam's offence entailed upon us *subjection to vanity*,² or to the ills that flesh inherits in the present state, which are terminated in death and corruption. If after the Lord God had sentenced man to this,³ he had interposed between him and his destiny no more, his race, by the operation of natural causes, would have become as extinct as though it had never existed. But God's philanthropy is preparing a better state for man, to which they of this and past generations stand related *by faith in the truth concerning it*. Infants die because they are born of mortal flesh, and not because they have committed sin, or are responsible for Adam's sin. If this were remitted in baptism *they ought not to die*; for when God remits sin he also remits the punishment, or consequences, it entails.

Heresian. Really, I never thought of that before. The consequences of the original sin must affect the infant's body or soul, or both. The baptismal regeneration certainly does not cure the body of its evil; or if it cure the soul, one would think that after a divine curing it ought to remain cured for life; instead of which it is invariably found sadly diseased long ere it "comes of age." I confess I am puzzled what to think. Perhaps after all its regeneration saves its immortal soul from hell. I have read of something like this in sermon-books and creeds.

Boanerges. Upon that hypothesis the services of those who sprinkle babies are of vast importance to the human race! I do not wonder that the fair sex are so devoted to "the dear men," seeing that their reverences are supposed to be able by a peculiar application of holy water to their infants to save their souls from the torments of the damned! You may well be puzzled, for you have got hold of a subject that cannot be explained upon rational or scriptural principles. The baptismal regeneration of the schools is a crotchet

¹ Rom. viii. 3; Luke xxii. 19. ² Rom. viii. 20. ³ Gen. iii. 17-19.

[Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

of certain fleshly minded dunces of former times, who with their associates were "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth."¹ It is a part of that "wisdom of our ancestors" in which they glory who are "destitute of the truth, and suppose that gain is godliness." But, Heresian, I am also puzzled to conceive how they make out that the water gets at the infant's soul to regenerate it. Can you explain?

Heresian. The water does not find access to the soul, but the spirit contained in the water which makes the water holy.

Boanerges. Then "*Holy Water*" is spirit in solution?

Heresian. Yes; for as the great Tertullian says, "All waters acquire by the invocation of God *the sacramental virtue of sanctification*; for the spirit immediately descends from heaven, rests on them, and *sanctifies them* by itself, and being thus sanctified by union with the spirit, they acquire the power of sanctification. For as the waters of Bethesda were imbued with a medicinal virtue by the intervention of the angel, so the spirit is diffused through the waters of baptism, and *the person to whom they are applied is spiritually purified by them.*" This great father of the church was the venerable Dr. Pusey and holy bishop of Exeter of the third century. The Church of Christ glories in him as one of her apostolical and brightest lights.

Boanerges. The church of Antichrist you mean. The burning lamps of Christ's church, "shine as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life;"² and not by making that word of none effect by such absurd and pestilent tradition as Tertullian's by which material spirit is substituted for belief of the truth. In view of the Tertullian hypothesis how do you dispose of the testimony that "without faith it is impossible to please God; for he that comes to him must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him;"³ in what sense is this applicable to infants?

Heresian. The church has ordained that faith in the parents, or in default of this, faith in godfathers and godmothers, is a sufficient substitute for want of it in the infant.

Boanerges. A church that modifies or supersedes the oracles of God by its traditions is a synagogue of Satan, and a blasphemer of the truth. Will you show me where the scripture authorises "the church" to change times and laws?

Heresian. As a faithful and obedient son it is sufficient for me to know what Mother Church decrees. It is no part of my business to sit in judgment upon her. She is "the pillar and support of the truth," and is appointed of God to declare what ought to be believed, and what should be rejected. Hence, I and the church are "of one heart and one soul;" for the church believes what I believe, and I believe what the church believes, and therefore we both believe alike.

Boanerges. That is a very "holy catholic faith" indeed! It is,

¹ 2 Tim. iii. 7. ² Phil. ii. 15. ³ Heb. xi. 6.

however, by no means a satisfactory reason why you and the church should make the truth of God of none effect by your tradition. I wish to know by what scriptural authority you affirm that a proxy-faith is a sufficient substitute for faith in the creature that is said to be presented before God.

Heresian. An apostle says, "we are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."¹ There is no mention of faith here. The proxy-faith you speak of is not indispensable; for multitudes of parents are without faith, and as to godfathers and godmothers they are often dispensed with; or, if required, they are frequently hired in London at a shilling a head without regard to faith. They are merely supernumerary adjectives which the finess of things is sometimes thought to render needful. I do not, however, pretend to make the subject clear. The archbishop of Canterbury himself does not understand it; how then can I who am no dignitary of the church! He says, "*unquestionably there is much difficulty, much mystery in the case, as regards the baptism of infants.*"

Bonnerges. The archbishop is quite right in that opinion. The rite of infant-sprinkling is "*a mystery*" utterly unrevealable upon christian principles, and irreconcilable with the testimony of God. No wonder it is "difficult" to set forth its scriptural import, seeing that there is not one word about infant baptismal regeneration from Genesis to Revelation. It is an element of "the Mystery of Iniquity." When, therefore, "spiritual or temporal lords," priests, and ministers, attempt to explain its import by a reference to "the Law and the Testimony of God," they proclaim to heaven and earth their imbecility of mind, and profound ignorance of the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

Heresian. You do not mean to say that the Right Reverend Fathers in God, their graces of Canterbury and York, and the holy bishops of the church, together with the reverend clergy and ministers of the land, are ignorant! Are they not all highly skilled in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; in the mythologies of the heathen world; in logic, metaphysics, and the opinions of all the learned commentators of past and present times? Are they not as familiar with "the Fathers," with the decrees of popes and councils, and precedents of law, as they are with the common prayer book, or the Westminster confession, and shorter catechism? How, then, say you they are ignorant and imbecile?

Boanerges. I grant that their heads are well crammed with all this learned lumber; and so much the worse for them. It is by this sort of learning that their hearts and intellects are completely paganized, and rendered impervious to the light of truth. Like the old pharisees and hypocrites, they see, but do not perceive; and hear but do not understand. The "Baptismal Regeneration" controversy proves them to be grossly ignorant of the gospel; and surely imbecility must be characteristic of his mind who really

¹ Tit. iii. 5.

believes that an infant's soul is regenerated by sprinkling its face with "holy water." He that can swallow this must be one of three things—a knave, an idiot, or an ignorant man.

Heresian. Well do you deserve the name you bear. A "son of thunder" indeed are you! You hurl your bolts at mitred and spiritual heads without respect of persons. I am your friend; but remember, Boanerges, they are the office bearers of my religion, the clergy of the most High God, and the servants of Jesus Christ. I cannot endure that you should treat them thus. My loyalty to him may disrupt our friendship in their behalf.

Boanerges. Were they such as you suppose, Heresian, my veneration would be as profound for them as yours. They arrogate to themselves all you claim for them, and more; but when I scan them by the light of scripture, I can only see in them perverters of the gospel of Christ;¹ and "deceitful workers, transforming themselves into his apostles."² But without regard to their professions look at their practice. Behold them as wine-bibbers, fox-hunters, flatterers of the rich, traders in livings, covetous, blasphemers, hypocrites. "By their fruits ye shall know them;" and do not these prove that they are evil? The only "interests" they are zealous for pertain to their own selfishness. I know of no passage so descriptive of them as the words of the prophet concerning the "watchmen of Zion," saying, "they are all ignorant; they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand; they all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter. Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine: and we will fill ourselves with strong drink: and to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant."³ Such are your priests and prophets—light and treacherous characters, who teach for hire, and divine for money; yet they lean upon the Lord, and say, "Is not the Lord among us? Hapless is the people that confides in such "spiritual guides" as they! Their baneful influence is best observed in those districts of Britain where clericalism is most unchecked and rampant. The darkest spots in Albion are cathedral towns, and agricultural villages.

Heresian. You admit that the clergy are learned, and yet you say they are ignorant. This is a paradox I cannot understand.

Boanerges. I am surprised at that! Do you not know that a man may be learned in one department of knowledge and ignorant in another? The shame and disgrace of the parsonocracy of Britain is that they are learned in most things *but what they profess to teach!* In this they are "blind leaders of the blind." They undertake at an enormous charge on the people's pockets, to teach them the "great salvation"—to show them what they must believe and do to be saved—while they are themselves the slaves of sin, and with all their learning ignorant of "the first principles of the oracles of God."

Heresian. But how do you know that they are ignorant of the gospel of salvation?

¹ Gal. I. 7-9 ² 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. ³ Isai. lvi. 10.

Boanerges. Because they do not speak according to "the word of this salvation." It is written, "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to *this word*, it is because there is no light in them."¹ "Preach the word,"² says an apostle to the instructors of the people; an injunction which they utterly disregard. Now it is contrary to that word to affirm that any one, man, woman, or infant, is "ingrafted into Christ, made a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven" *without faith*. There is no such doctrine in the Bible; and the man that says there is, expressed or understood, be he metropolitan or provincial, lord spiritual or temporal, clerk or layman, is a blasphemer of the truth.

Heresian. Do you mean to say that the saints, the pious and devout members of the hierarchies of Britain, are blasphemers? Pray what do you mean by blasphemy?

Boanerges. It is any thing by which the way of truth is brought into disrepute. This is the sense put upon the word by an apostle, who says, "There shall be false teachers among you (Christians) and many shall follow their pernicious ways; on account of whom the way of truth (*βλασφημηθησεται*, *blasphemethesetai* shall be blasphemed, or) evil spoken of."³ Your "holy bishops," and all others, who declare that they sprinkle the face of an infant in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit for its regeneration, or for any other purpose whatever, by divine authority, affirm a falsehood in the name of God, take his name in vain, and cause mankind to speak evil of the way of truth. They are therefore blasphemers.

Heresian. But, my dear friend, do you mean to say that "Baptismal Regeneration" is not taught in the Bible?

Boanerges. If by "baptism" you mean "*sprinkling*;" and by "regeneration," a renewal of "soul" by the physical influence of the Holy Spirit, without hesitation I deny that there is any such regeneration of man, woman, or infant, to be found in the oracles of God. If any man speak, let him speak according to these oracles⁴ and show where it is.

Heresian. How then did "Baptismal Regeneration" come into being?

Boanerges. In the same way that other abominations have been introduced. It was *invented* by "men of corrupt minds who were reprobate concerning the faith," in a time "when they would not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts heaped up to themselves teachers having itching ears which they turned away from the truth unto fables,"⁵ These men were the grievous and ravening wolves in sheep's clothing, against whom the Lord Jesus and his apostles warned the believers to be upon their guard; for they would speak perverse things to draw away disciples after them.⁶ They styled themselves "philosophers," and "professors of science," of whom were Hymeneus and Philetus, who substituted for the truth,

¹ Isai. viii. 20

² 2 Tim. iv. 2.

³ 2 Pet. ii. 2.

⁴ 1 Pet. iv. 11.

⁵ 2 Tim. iii. 8; iv. 3.

⁶ Mat. vii. 15; Acts xx. 3.

"profane vain babbling which some professing inherent existence and which after the name immortal soul." When the resurrection of the Land of Israel under and great glory, was an the skies;" into which men, women, and infant duly clericalized; othe molten and flaming bri Gospel of the Kingdom the notion of "a spirit the evangelism of those Philetus should fill.ocracy, who call them are their successors, bri and philosophy; whic Pergamos are styled "which," saith the Le *Heresian.* But, my fismal Regeneration?

Boanerges. Much you hear me out. The his brethren became th raised its temple. The ness"; and "their wor Fathers," as they are Clemens Alexandrinus of perverting "the wa mated all at once, but darkened by the adu doctrine of the apostle by which are given to by (faith in) these we having escaped the coi They ceased to look to inner man of the hear the Spirit diffused th immersed their prosely this. He says, that "the sacramental virtue He tells you, "by the them; and making the acquire the power of whom they are appl Anglicanism of the th

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii.

"profane vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing erred from the faith."¹ They taught the inherent existence and hereditary propagation of a thing in the flesh, which after the nomenclature of the heathen they styled "the immortal soul." Wherever this "vain philosophy" was received, the resurrection of the body was denied. The Kingdom of God in the Land of Israel under the Lord Jesus at his appearing in power and great glory, was superseded by a phantom "kingdom beyond the skies;" into which the ghosts, or disembodied immortal souls of men, women, and infants were translated at death, if they had been duly clericalized; otherwise they consigned them to a cauldron of molten and flaming brimstone for ever. Having destroyed "the Gospel of the Kingdom of God" by these traditions, they fabricated the notion of "a spiritual millennium on earth" to be introduced by the evangelism of those upon whom the mantle of Hymeneus and Philetus should fall. The Greek, Roman, and Protestant parsonocracy, who call themselves the ambassadors and ministers of Christ, are their successors, being for the most part teachers of their science and philosophy; which in the letters to the christians in Ephesus and Pergamos are styled "the deeds" and "doctrine of the Nicolaitans," "which," saith the Lord Jesus, "I hate."²

Heresian. But, my dear friend, what has this to do with Baptismal Regeneration?

Boanerges. Much every way, Heresian, as you will discover, if you hear me out. The "profane vain babblings" of Hymeneus and his brethren became the foundation of sand upon which clericalism raised its temple. Their speculations "increased to more ungodliness"; and "their word eat out the truth like a gangrene."³ "The Fathers," as they are styled by the Apostacy, such as Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Cyprian, &c., succeeded to their work of perverting "the way of truth." The perversion was not consummated all at once, but gradually. Their foolish hearts having become darkened by the admixture of Judaism and Platonism with the doctrine of the apostles, they lost sight of "the knowledge of God by which are given to us exceeding great and precious promises; that by (faith in) these we might become partakers of the Divine Nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."⁴ They ceased to look to faith in these promises as regenerative of the inner man of the heart; but attributed it to the physical agency of the Spirit diffused through "the Bath of Water" in which they immersed their proselytes. Your quotation from Tertullian proves this. He says, that "all waters acquire by the invocation of God the sacramental virtue of sanctification." If you ask him "how?" He tells you, "by the spirit descending from heaven and resting upon them, and making them holy by itself;" and that in this way, "they acquire the power of sanctification," or of making them holy to whom they are applied! Tertullianism was the Romanism and Anglicanism of the third century; and may be summarily stated as

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 20; ² 2 Tim. ii. 16. ³ Rev. ii. 6, 15. ⁴ 2 Tim. ii. 16; 17. ⁵ 2 Pet. i. 3, 4.

sanctification by holy water! The water was made holy by prayer and spirit, and the person by the water; not by water alone; for saith Cyprian, "water alone cannot cleanse away sin and sanctify the man *unless the water have the Holy Spirit.*" A wonderful thing is holy water! It has done great marvels in the hands of the clergy. "The Devil," they say, "hates it;" and the witches, and evil spirits in the air, are scared out of their wits when they hear the village bells, sanctified with holy water at their "baptism," sounding forth their sacred chimes! A baptismal regeneration of bells! Quite as reasonable, and altogether as scriptural as the regeneration of babes and sires by holy water without faith in "the things of the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ."

Heresian. Do I then understand you to say, that the Baptismal Regeneration of infants grew out of the engrafting of the Nicolaitan doctrine upon the doctrine of the apostles?

Boanerges. Even so. The Nicolaitans, of whom were Hymeneus and Philetus, engrafted the heathen speculation of immortal soulism upon the doctrine of Christ; and then taught the regeneration of the pagan "soul" by a physical operation of the Holy Spirit upon it. In this way was substituted by men of corrupt minds like "the Fathers," a *physical spiritual* agency for an *intellectual and moral* agency upon the heart in the regeneration of individuals.

Heresian. But the apostle saith, we are saved by "the renewing of the Holy Spirit."¹

Boanerges. He also says, "we are renewed by knowledge."² In this, however, he does not contradict himself, but rather makes the one phrase explanatory of the other; as if he had said, "*we are renewed by the Holy Spirit through knowledge.*" The Holy Spirit renews or regenerates man intellectually and morally by the truth believed. "Sanctify them by the truth," says Jesus; "thy word, O Father, is truth."³ "Ye are clean," said he to his apostles, "*through the word* which I have spoken to you."⁴ God's power is manifested through means. His Spirit is his power by which he effects intellectual, moral, and physical results. When he wills to produce intellectual and moral effects, it is by knowledge revealed by his Spirit through the prophets and apostles. This knowledge becomes power when received into "good and honest hearts;" and because God is the author of it, it is styled "the Knowledge of God,"⁵ or "the word of truth,"⁶ by which he begets sinners to himself as his sons and daughters. "The word of the truth of the gospel," "the gospel of the kingdom," "the incorruptible seed," "the word," "the truth as it is in Jesus," "the word of the kingdom," "the word of reconciliation," "the law and the testimony," "the word of faith," "the sword of the spirit which is the word of God," "the word of Christ," "the perfection of liberty," &c.—are all phrases richly expressive of "the power of God" by which he saves his people from their sins, and translates them into *the Hope* of the kingdom and glory to which he invites them. The truth is the

¹ Tit. iii. 5. ² Col. iii. 10. ³ John xvii. 17. ⁴ John xv. 3. ⁵ 2 Pet. i. 2. ⁶ James i. 18.

power that makes men free indeed.¹ Hence Jesus says, "My words are spirit, and they are life." The prophets, Jesus, and the apostles were the channels through which it was transmitted to mankind; and the spirit the agent by which the knowledge was conveyed to them. Hence, the knowledge or the truth being suggested to the prophets by the spirit is sometimes styled "the spirit."² The spirit is to the truth as cause and effect; and by a very common figure of speech, the one is put for the other in speaking of them relatively to the mind and heart of man. So that the phrase "renewed by the holy spirit" is equivalent to "renewed by the belief of the truth testified by the Holy Spirit."³

Heresian. In that case babes and ignorant men and women are not the subjects of a renewal by the spirit?

Boanerges. Babes are out of the question. God's institution is not a baby-religion. It has to do with men of good and honest hearts capable of reasoning, and of examining and believing testimony; and who can be operated upon by high intellectual and moral considerations. A baby-religion is a thing for clergymen to trifle with when they play at hocus-pocus with the ignorant. Babes without sense, and a gaping multitude without knowledge of the word, are the subjects of the pranks they perform in the name of God before high heaven which make the angels grieve. Their power is maintained by keeping the people in ignorance of the truth. They profess to desire the enlightenment of mankind; but however sincere their professions may be, their own minds are so dark that they are unable to give them light, and those that are able they hinder. The clergy and their flocks are all walking in "the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart."⁴ The consequences of ignorance are fatal. An ignorant man cannot be saved in his ignorance of the gospel of the kingdom of God and name of Jesus; because it alienates him from God's life, which is obtainable only through a possession of that kingdom. The spirit renews an ignorant man by enlightening him. When such an one comes to understand and believe the truth his ignorance is dispelled; the blindness of his heart is cured; and a spiritual relation established between him and God. He is then in a prepared state for salvation by the grace of God through faith.⁵

Heresian. But doth the Spirit of God exert no physical energy upon man in his regeneration?

Boanerges. Certainly it does; but not in the renewal of his character. It will operate physically upon "the new creature in Christ Jesus," when through Jesus it raises him from the dead.⁶ For the apostle saith, "If Christ be in you (dwelling in your hearts by faith⁷) the body is dead in respect to sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But (though your body be dead being under sentence of death) if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus

¹ John viii. 32, 36. ² Rom. ii. 29. ³ John xv. 26; xvi. 13, 14. ⁴ Eph. iv. 18. ⁵ Eph. ii. 8.
⁶ 2 Cor. iv. 14. ⁷ Eph. iii. 17.

from the dead dwell in you (by faith) He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also make alive your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." ¹

Heresian. Then if I understand you aright, regeneration is not an instantaneous mesmeric action upon an immortal soul; but a process beginning with the truth understood and believed, and ending with the resurrection of the believer from the dead?

Boanerges. Precisely so. The order of the process is to *hear* the truth, *understand* the truth, *believe* the truth, *obey* the truth in baptism, *walk* in the truth, and *inherit* the truth by obtaining possession of its promises at the resurrection. When this process is completed the believer will then have been "born of water and the spirit," ² and be a fit and proper person to inherit the kingdom preparing for such as he from the foundation of the world. ³

Heresian. Really, I begin to feel quite interested in your exposition. There appears to be an intelligibility about it, which, I confess with the Archbishop of Canterbury, is not observable in the baptism of infants. But, when "the Fathers" let go their hold upon "the form of sound words" delivered by the apostle; ⁴ and embraced the philosophy and vain deceit after the tradition of Hymeneus and Philetus, as you have stated—what was their next step in the development of Baptismal Regeneration? I should like to know.

Boanerges. Having "let slip" the things delivered by the apostles, and allowed the doctrine of Christ concerning the "Great Salvation" to fall into oblivion, ⁵ their fleshly minds settled down upon the dogma of *sacramental efficacy*. They called baptism a sacrament, which they taught was efficacious to the cleansing from all past sins, and to the impartation of a right to the regenerated soul to a phantom kingdom beyond the skies at the instant of death. The cleansing they attributed to *the spirit in the water*. Firmilianus, bishop of Cæsarea Cappadocia, says that Stephen, who boasted that he had succeeded to the chair of St. Peter, was not animated with any great zeal against the heretics, but conceded to them "*the greatest powers of grace*." Firmilianus was very indignant against him on this account. His holy ire flared up at the idea that baptismal waters could be made sanctifying by the spirit descending into them in answer to the prayers of heretics. He charges pope Stephen with "saying and asseverating that they (the heretics) by the sacrament of baptism wash away the pollution of the old man, remit all former deadly sins, make sons of God by a celestial birth, and renew them unto eternal life, *by the sanctification of the Divine Bath*. After ascribing these great and celestial prerogatives of the church to the heretics," continues Firmilian, "what else can he do than to communicate with those to whom he attributes such grace?"

Heresian. But when spirit in aqueous solution, as you say, was substituted for the truth as the sanctifier, would not this "*holy water*" be as regenerative of infants as of men and women? Is not infant regeneration, then, more than hypothetical?

¹ Rom. iii. 10, 11. ² John iii. 5. ³ Mat. xxv. 34. ⁴ 2 Tim. i. 13. ⁵ Heb. ii. 1-5.

Boanerges
apes and
baboons
village
Episcopi
ground
spirit to
does not
that they
regenera
the new
which is
in a pro
of Engl
conceive
"Holy"
of all
of the
holy wa
women;
spiritual
in scrip
regener
assured
Here
some
Regene
Boan
eration
cation
public
apostol
ditions
"the
Christ,
were th
gate o
allied i
all Sta
from t
tinal
and ch
fathers
becam
men
there
power
truth
"He"

Boanerges. Yes, Heresian, "holy water" is as regenerative of apes and infants as of men and women! I see no reason why baboons should not be sanctified by this spirituous solution as well as village bells. But I suppose the right reverend fathers of the Episcopal Bench, and "the Church" would object to this on the ground that apes had no "immortal souls" in their flesh for the spirit to act upon! The same objection, however, they would contend does not lie against the sanctification of infants. Yet, I cannot see that their objection is valid, seeing that, though the bell-metal is not regenerated or transmuted into any thing else, yet it is said to acquire the *new property* of purifying the air of diabolical enchantments, which the vibration of unsprinkled, and therefore unsanctified bells in a profane factory, cannot do! The clergy of the Roman Mother of England's "Venerable Church" have sprinkled asses; which I conceive, being thus "converted" from the profane crowd to a "Holy Order" of asses, may be taken as a most appropriate emblem of all "bishops, priests, and deacons," who in the august presence of the Bible preach the regeneration of babes by holy water! This holy water, I admit, is *as* regenerative of infants as of men and women; and that is just not at all. Infant regeneration aqueous or spiritual, whether moral or physical, has not the shadow of a testimony in scripture to found even an hypothesis upon. There can be no regeneration without faith in the baptized; and that faith must be the assured belief of "things hoped for" and "things unseen."¹

Heresian. Am I then to understand that faith in the gospel came to be deemed unnecessary as preliminary to Baptismal Regeneration?

Boanerges. Yes; for the innovation of church-baptismal regeneration could not have been received so long as the doctrine of *justification by faith of the gospel of the kingdom* held possession of the public mind. It was necessary first to supersede this,—to transmute this apostolic gospel into "another gospel"² by mixing it up with the traditions of the Judaizers and philosophizing Greeks. In this way, "the key of knowledge" was abstracted from the congregations of Christ, and an assent to human dogmas substituted instead. They were thus converted into "Synagogues of Satan,"³ and in the aggregate constituted "THE APOSTASY,"⁴ (*ανορθωσια*) which in later times allied itself with the Roman government, and became the parent of all State Churches, and the numerous progeny which has descended from them. When Satan thus became lord of "the Church" baptismal regeneration was decreed to be God's truth; and his bishops and clergy, (I mean Satan's, not God's) such as the right reverend fathers of London, Exeter, and Oxford, and their adherents, became the zealous sticklers for the fable. So long however as men "held fast the form of sound words" delivered by the apostles, there was no scope for the ideas contained in "the strife of words and perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, and who supposed that gain was godliness."⁵ "Infant

¹ Heb. xi. 1. ² Gal. i. 6; 7. ³ Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9. ⁴ 2 Thess. ii. 3. ⁵ 1 Tim. vi. 5; 2 Tim. i. 13.

baptism," "baptismal regeneration," "immortal soul," and a multitude of like phrases, do not belong to "the form of sound words." There is nothing about them in the Bible. They belong not to "the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus Christ," nor to "the doctrine which is according to godliness."¹ They are the vain questions upon which the "proud, know-nothing" dignitaries of Satan's state synagogues and meaner men of the same spirit, have been "doting" from the days of the apostles till the present times. "He that believes the Gospel, AND *is baptized*, shall be saved; *he that believes not shall be condemned.*" These are "the wholesome words," "sound speech which cannot be condemned," which the Lord Jesus who uttered them has never modified nor repealed; and plainly show that his proclamation has no saving benefits for unbelievers, nor for believers either who do not obey,² but stumble at the word.⁴

Heresian. Then there is no need of baptism at all; for "the wholesome words of the Lord" do not say "he that is not baptized shall be condemned?"

Boanerges. You do credit to your teachers; for none but the disciples of the clergy would reason so absurdly. You have yet to learn the utter impossibility of baptizing an unbeliever. *Faith is essential and indispensable to baptism*; for without faith in the subject neither sprinkling, pouring, nor immersion, is baptism. The subject-matter of that faith must be the gospel of the Kingdom, and Name of Jesus as its Christ, with a disposition of heart constituting the true-heartedness of the scripture. Reason teaches every man unspoiled by "metaphysics" that if belief of the gospel and baptism be the affirmed conditions of salvation, as they are, no man since the Day of Pentecost can inherit the kingdom of God and of his Christ, who, though a believer, is unbaptized. The dictates of reason are here in harmony with the divine testimony, which, in "the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus," declares that "Except a man be born out of water (*εξ υδατος*) and of Spirit, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*"⁵ No man can be born who is not first begotten; therefore it was enough for Jesus to say "he that believeth not shall be condemned."

Heresian. Thank you, Boanerges, I see it now, and therefore stand corrected. But to return. If "he that believeth not is condemned" what becomes of the infants? Will not their immortal souls fall into "the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone," and be there tormented for ever and ever?

Boanerges. It was this hideous conceit that originated the baptismal regeneration of infants. The Philpotts and Puseys of other days argued that as all unbelievers would be condemned, therefore infants would be damned, seeing they were faithless in the nature of things! The idea was horrible especially to mothers. Hence it was deemed necessary to invent something for their benefit. Infant damnation having got possession of their carnal minds, the dogma of infant salvation in some way came in to the rescue. The "immortal

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 3. ² Mark xvi. 15, 16. ³ Heb. v. 8, 9. ⁴ 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8. ⁵ John iii. 5.

souls" of the infants of the heathen were supposed to be monopolized by the devil who rejoices in horns, hoofs, and forked tail; but those of christian parents were imagined to be salvable upon the ground of their being born of holy flesh; although Jesus had said that "the flesh profiteth nothing." But they who "love and invent a lie" care nothing more about Christ and his words than is convenient. To work they went, and in process of time taught that the "immortal souls" of infants were as precious as those of adults; that "of such was the kingdom of heaven;" and that when they died, if properly attended to by the clergy before death, they would be translated, and become little winged angels there. But as there were several scriptures quoted against their theory by those they styled "the heretics," they were obliged to invent interpretations to reconcile their fictions with the word. This reconciliation, however, they found as difficult as his Grace of Canterbury admits it to be even now. But, by straining at gnats and swallowing camels they at length became such adepts at mystification, or religious juggling, that there was nothing the absurdity of which was too immense to go down, hoofs, bunches, and every thing. They proclaimed "holy water" to be as sanctifying and regenerating for babes as for adults. It was not faith, but a sort of mesmeric aura called "grace," that regenerated "the soul." Nor was this physical grace "*prevenient*," but in the water. It was not a Gorhamite afflation before immersion; but a regular Philpott-solution of spirit in "the Divine Bath!" When the water evaporated, or was wiped off, the spirit in spite of a known law in physics remained behind, and saturated the soul! A wonderful discovery this, and worthy of the dark minds that invented, and still defend and believe it! The souls of infants saved from fire and brimstone by mesmerized water, the laceration of maternal feelings healed, and the babes clutched by griffin claws almost at birth, to be marked, and trained in priestism as the way in which they should go!

Heresian. Then you deny the truth of the following lines in relation to infants, that

"God his dire decree did seal
Their fix'd unalterable doom:
Consign'd their unborn souls to hell,
And damn'd them from their mother's womb?"

Boanerges. I do unquestionably. Such a fiendish notion is akin to the dogma of "infants in hell a span long," an "article of faith" which could have only found place in the dark and cruel natures of men under the dominion of sin and "vain deceit."

Heresian. If then "infant damnation" be as you intimate a mere invention of ignorant priests, what becomes of their immortal souls, for they cannot be saved by faith?

Boanerges. So long, Heresian, as your mind is darkened with the pagan tradition of immortal soulism you will be unable to see the truth. You must dismiss this "foolish notion," and reduce your convictions to the limit of the divine testimony if you would under-

stand "the gospel of the kingdom of God."¹ The Platonic speculation of the immortality of the soul is not the immortality taught in the Bible. The Bible doctrine is the immortality of man and not of an immortal soul in flesh and blood capable of an unembodied existence after corporeal death. If we admit that immortal soulism be true, then we must also admit that immortality was "brought to light" by Plato in his philosophy. I say by Plato, because he is the great authority of the heathen, catholic, and protestant, worlds upon the subject. But an apostle says that "*life and incorruptibility* (*ζωή καὶ ἀφθαρσία* not *ἀθανασία*) were brought to light by Jesus through the gospel."¹ Now this being unquestionable how could Plato's theory be true? It was part of "the wisdom of the wise" which God proved to be foolishness by the doctrine of "the Hope and Resurrection."² There is no alternative, and can be no compromise between Jesus and Plato. If we profess faith in the immortal soulism of the heathens we practically reject the doctrine of Christ; if we believe this, Plato's speculation must be rejected as mere foolishness. There is no neutral ground between them.

Heresian. Will you be kind enough to inform me what is the scriptural import of *immortality*?

Boanerges. The word signifies *deathlessness*. This is affirmed of *body*. A *deathless body* is the scriptural idea attachable to the words *immortal soul*. Hence "*immortality*" implies *life manifested through an incorruptible body* as opposed to "*mortality*," which is *life manifested through a corruptible body*. Life and corruptibility are the result of sin; "*life and incorruptibility*," of obedience to the gospel. They both have relation to body the nature of the life being predicable of the quality of the body through which it is manifested. Incorruptibility does not necessarily imply *life*; but *endless life* necessitates incorruptibility of body. The body of Jesus might have lain in the tomb until this day unchanged. This, however, would only have proved its incorruptibility thus far; but for him to have become immortal something more would be necessary, namely, life must have been superadded. An incorruptible body animated by the Spirit of God direct is the immortality of the scripture; and is styled "*spirit*," "*spiritual body*," and "*nature of angels*." Such is the "*life and incorruptibility brought to light by Jesus through the gospel*."

Heresian. What is the gospel?

Boanerges. The glad tidings³ that God intends to set up a Kingdom and Empire on earth which shall comprehend all people, nations, and languages;⁴ that mankind shall then be in a state of blessedness which shall continue uninterruptedly for one thousand years;⁵ during which they shall be ruled by a king and government of His appointment; all the members of which shall possess the glory, honor, and majesty of the dominion from its establishment to the end. This is summarily expressed in the words, "Abraham shall

¹ Mar. i. 14; ² Tim. i. 10. ³ 1 Cor. i. 10, 20; ii. 7, 8; Acts xxiii. 6. ⁴ Isal. lxi; Luke iv. 18.
⁵ Dan. ii. 44; vii. 14, 18, 27; Eph. i. 10. ⁶ Rev. v. 10; xx. 3, 4.

become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him."¹

Heresian. Ah! this is a glorious future; what must a man do that he may share in it?

Boanerges. Believe the testimony of God concerning it, and in "the mystery" which belongs to it.

Heresian. But what am I to understand by "the Mystery of the Gospel?"²

Boanerges. "The things concerning the Name of Jesus as the Anointed One of God." Repentance, remission of sins,³ and eternal life⁴ are offered to believers of the gospel *in his name*. They are required to believe that Jesus is the king God intends to set upon the throne of his future kingdom, which is David's throne; that he is Son of David and Son of God; that he died for the sins of believers, and was raised from the tomb to life for their justification;⁵ and is now sitting at the right hand of God.⁶ If you believe these things with "a good and honest heart" your faith and disposition will be counted to you for repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus as Lord and King.

Heresian. Suppose then I believed the Gospel, or as you show it is defined in Acts, "the things of the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ," WHEN and HOW would my *faith and disposition* be reckoned to me for repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus?

Boanerges. In your being immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. By this action you would be united to the name of Jesus, and become entitled to all his name is able to impart.⁷ Being released from your past sins you are translated from under a sentence of death, and are placed under a sentence of life. You are said to be passed from death into life, and to have become "heir of the kingdom of God."⁸ The nature of this kingdom demands that its heirs should become immortal; because flesh and blood, or mortal men cannot inherit for ever that which is indestructible. This immortality is brought to light as a necessity through the gospel of the kingdom; and is exhibited, not as an essence in man, but as a gift to such believers of God's truth as shall be accounted worthy of the kingdom and age to come.⁹ Immortality is a good thing and promised only to the righteous. It is part of the reward for good character. Infants are without character having ability to do neither good nor evil. They are, therefore, eligible for neither rewards nor punishments, for both of these are predicated on well or evil doing. They are simply physical beings innocent of right and wrong as were Adam and Eve at the epoch of their creation; but being descended from them after they became sinners and were sentenced to mortality, infants inherit no more than pertains to flesh and blood. They sojourn here a little while, and then slip

¹ Gen. xviii. 18; Gal. iii. 8. ² Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. vi. 19; iii. 3-6, 9. ³ Luke xxiv. 47. ⁴ John. x. 21. ⁵ Rom. iv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 1-4. ⁶ Acts ii. 34-36; iii. 19-21. ⁷ Acts ii. 38; iv. 12; viii. 12, 16; x. 48. ⁸ James ii. 5. ⁹ Luke xx. 35, 36.

out of life as unconsciously as they came in. They brought nothing with them into the world and take nothing away with them; so that in their exit they become as though they had never been.

Heresian. This is a very different account of things to that implied in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, especially of infants! If these things be indeed so, I can only say that the world must have been egregiously befooled by the right reverend fathers and the Church. I confess that my veneration for their wisdom, piety, and authority has very much diminished since I have conversed with you. Immortal soulism seems to be the chief corner-stone of all their speculations.

Boanerges. You are beginning, I perceive, to put a true estimate on spiritualism. The religion of the day is mere superstition, and "the church" nothing more than a system of ecclesiastical police. The clergy are a necessary evil; they abuse religion to purposes of their own selfishness and glorification, but use it also for the maintenance of order in society. They are a more dignified, though less honest, kind of policemen than the civil force, inasmuch as they rule by imposing fictions upon popular ignorance for the sake of gain. They are traders in religion, unblushing soul merchants, "who think that gain is godliness," "walking after their own lusts, and speaking great swelling words, and having men's persons in admiration for the sake of advantage."¹ They vapor about the Bible being their religion, which is about as true as that the Koran came from God. This is evinced by the fact that when they try to sustain their creeds by appeals to its divine testimonies it antagonizes them and throws them all into confusion, as in the case of Messrs. Fust, Exeter, Gorham, Privy Council, and company; so that though they all believe what "the Church" believes, they can none of them agree upon what it is! Skilful doctors these for the cure of the people's souls!

Heresian. You do not seem to entertain any more respect for the Church than for the Romish and Protestant ministries. Are you not aware that the Church is a most august institution, and that, in the words of the Lord Bishop of Oxford, "its vocation is resistance to innovation?" He says that "what was handed down as christian doctrine was true, and that the office-bearers of religion had no right to admit the question of private judgment, but were called upon to declare heretical all dogmas not sustained by that venerable authority. If the House of Lords supersede the church's function of deciding what was truth, it would promote the infidel spirit of the age, which denied the existence of truth itself."² This is apostolical, for it is the judgment of a right reverend successor of the apostles. He says, that it is the church that is to decide what truth is; hence the laity of course have nothing to do but to believe what the church decrees; and to exercise private judgment to ascertain whether what the church teaches is really truth or not is sheer presumption. The church has handed down "baptismal regeneration," "infant damnation," "infant salvation," "immortal soulism," &c., and declares them to

¹ Jude 16. ² Dispatch, June 9, 1850.

be a part of the truth; therefore, although you seem to have the better of the argument I cannot release my hold upon them, until I am convinced that the "venerable authority" of the church is unworthy of respect.

Boanerges. His lordship's opinion is a piece of prelatical arrogance and absurdity. "The Church" is a mere fiction; a phrase signifying nothing definite in the use of it. "The Church says" is of the same force as "they say;" a sort of ecclesiastical *on dit*, which signifies anybody, somebody, or nobody says. North of the Tweed, the church says that prelacy is abomination; on the South, that it is a true and wholesome apostolic institution. It pronounces a thing to be truth in one latitude, and error in another. If by "the church," he means the church of England, his assumption is preposterous. What order of its communion has authority to lord it over men's consciences? The Episcopal? The Bench of Bishops? Are these the men to decide what truth is? Proud, fleshly minded, worldly men, ignorant of the gospel and reprobate concerning the faith! Men so dark in the mysteries of their own craft that a council of laymen are obliged to interfere to prevent them from becoming the by-word and laughing stock of the people?

Heresian. But, my dear friend, do you mean to say that the Church of Christ is a mere fiction? If not, please define it.

Boanerges. The Church of Christ, or as it is also styled, "the Church of the living God" is easily defined. *Church* is a word representative of the Greek noun *ecclesia*. This is formed of $\epsilon\chi$ "out of," and $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega$ "to call," and signifies an assembly convened by a call or invitation. An *ecclesia* of Christ is a congregation called together out of the world by the invitation contained in the Gospel of the Kingdom. Such is in general terms a Church of Christ. The national churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland have no affinity with such a church. These national establishments constitute "the world" in contradistinction to "the Church of the living God," being composed of "all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life."¹ Their bishops, priests, and ministers are men of the world, who "love the world, and the things that are in the world;" therefore, "the love of the Father is not in them."² They are proud, carnally-minded, men, especially the bishops, who owe their wealth and dignity to the friendship of the world. Being of the world, the world loves them; for "it loves its own."³ If the world did not love them, it would not make them dignitaries of a worldly, or state-church; but because it loves them, it promotes them to glory and honor. The State finds them to be useful tools in promoting its policy; therefore it makes use of them on the principle of you fiddle to me, and I'll dance to you! These are stubborn and notorious facts. Clergymen are made bishops on political grounds. Whig ministers turn whig clerks into bishops for whig purposes. Whig and tory premiers never think of translating one of "the meek,"² or "the poor,"³ to a seat in "the House" as a

¹ John ii. 16, 15. ² Matt. v. 5. ³ James ii. 5.

spiritual lord however well-skilled they may be in the truth. The principles of these "Heirs of the Kingdom" and inheritors of the earth would be too independent, too just and honest, for their crooked purposes. In truth, premiers would not know when they had found a disciple of Christ; for "the world knoweth them not:" neither would a disciple condescend to sit in such "a Synagogue of Satan" as the House of Lords. It is a fit place enough for bishops; for being the enemies of God and the blasphemers of his name, they are at home there with the hereditary folly and incarnate wickedness of the age.

Heresian. Why, Boanerges, you strike me dumb! What! our holy bishops, the office-bearers of the religion of England's venerable church the enemies of God whose special heritage they claim to be?

Boanerges. It is even so; for it is written, "the friendship of the world is enmity with God; whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God."¹ This is an apostle's testimony against them who claim to be his successors; and I have already proved that they are blasphemers of God's name in pretending to regenerate an infant by sprinkling it with mesmerized water, which they call "holy," in "the name of the ever-blessed Trinity" as their phrase is! They are the devout worshippers of Mammon; for they love money and are covetous. They cannot therefore be the servants of God.² They dare not deny the applicability of these things to themselves; for if they did the world whom they serve would with one voice pronounce them liars. The Bible, which they absurdly and impiously proclaim to be their religion, condemns them as idolators; as it is written, "Covetousness is idolatry."³ It therefore excludes them from the kingdom of God. "Know this," saith the scripture, "that no covetous man, who is an idolator, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ, and of God."⁴ Your clergy are notorious friends of the world and servants of Mammon. They may cry "The people of the Lord are we!" But it is a vain cry. They may prophecy in his name; cast out demons in his name; and do wonderful works in it too; but while they "work iniquity" as idolators and blasphemers the Lord repudiates all relationship with them. Whatever offices, therefore, they bear belong to Mammon's church, and not to God's.

Heresian. If then I understand you in relation to "church," the word in the Bible sense does not signify the Bishops and their clergy; a parish house, kirk, or conventicle?

Boanerges. In no case. The Bishops and their men have arrogated to themselves the word *clergy* which in scripture is applied to a church or ecclesia. But it does not belong to them, for it is a word that pertains only to an aggregation of christians, which they are not either in faith or practice. The word is used by the apostle Peter⁵ in the plural number, as, *μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τον κληρον*, *med' hos katakaurieuontes ton kleron*, that is, "neither as being lords

¹ James iv. 4. ² Matt. vi. 19-21, 24; Luke xii. 15-21; xvi. 13. ³ Col. iii. 5. ⁴ Eph. v. 5. ⁵ 1 Pet. v. 3.

over the *clergies*" or heritages, "but being examples of the flock"—*ποιμνιον*. The "Flock of God" is made up of "the heritages" or congregations—an aggregation of the *clergies* or churches which are constituted of all the faithful, both men and women, and not of a particular order of men ruling over the flock. Those whom Peter exhorted to feed the flock were "shepherds," not wolves in sheep's clothing like the clergy of the Apostasy. They were servants, not lords; servants of God and fellow-servants of *his* laity. As to "houses made with hands" God has none such upon the earth at present. There is an instance in the clerical version of the Bible where "religious houses" are termed "churches."¹ But the word used by the writer was *ιεροσυλος*, *hierosylos* from *ιερον*, *hieron*, a temple, and *συλαο*, *sylao*, to despoil; and not a compound of *ecclesia*. It should, therefore, have been rendered "robbers of temples" and not "robbers of churches," as king James' bishops and clergy have given it. According to their carnal notions "church" was a capital rendering for *hieron*; for when clericalism got the upper hand of paganism under Constantine and his successors, it seized upon the temples of the gods and turned them into temples of saints. Hence through their teaching the idea has fastened itself upon the public mind, that these houses dedicated to saints are "houses of God" where he dwells in spirit and meets with the people in prayer; so that when they go up to the parish temple, or conventicle even, they vainly imagine that they are going up to the House of God. In this respect they are as blind as the old Athenians, and like them have got to learn that "the Lord of heaven and earth dwelleth not in temples made with hands,"² but in the heavens.

Heresian. But what better name could have been given to the houses in which parishioners meet for Divine Worship than that of "church?"

Boanerges. A better name hath been bestowed upon them by the Spirit of God. If the churches or heritages of God met in the parish temples there might be some "show of wisdom" in naming the house after the company it contained. They are in truth *mausolea of the dead*—tombs of the mouldering dead, and places of resort to "the dead in trespasses and in sins." You err, Heresian, in styling the worship "performed" there "Divine Worship." It is a mere "show of wisdom in will-worship and humility" according to act of Parliament, which authorizes certain "commandments and doctrines of men" to be observed throughout the land. "Divine Worship" is worship of divine appointment such as that of the Mosaic Law, and the worship of the primitive christians. God never appointed the English and Scotch parochial and cathedral worship; it is therefore not divine; and as he has not required it, it is vain and useless having the divine reprobation stamped upon it in these words, "in vain do they worship me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."³

The better name for the clerical temples is recorded in Daniel,⁴

¹ Acts xix. 37. ² Acts xvii. 24. ³ Matt. xv. 9. ⁴ Dan. xi. 39.

namely, *Betzari Mauzzim* or BAZAARS OF PROTECTORS. This title defines them exactly. The steepled houses are Bazaars or places of spiritual merchandize. The parochial and cathedral clergy are the merchants;¹ and tithes and souls of men, which they drug with their spiritual nostrums under pretence of "curing" them, the merchandize in which they traffic.² They have carried on an enormous trade in these things ever since the Roman emperors, the chiefs of the Dragon power,³ enabled them to open shop. They have acquired vast riches by the sale of their trumpery. But, God be thanked, a time is rapidly approaching when "no man buyeth their merchandize any more." Their occupation will soon be gone, and men will have a glorious day after God shall have destroyed the craft by which they have their wealth.*

I saw a remarkable illustration of the appropriateness of the name "Bazaar" to religious meeting houses the other day while sojourning in Derby. There were bills with the word "Bazaar" in large capitals stuck up in nearly every window announcing that a Bazaar would be held there for the sale of fancy articles, and the exhibition of a model steam engine, for the pious purpose of raising the wind to enable "the church" to pay off the debt incurred in building a house for God! People of all denominations were invited to "come and buy" wares, which might doubtless be obtained for two hundred per cent. less at any *other* shops in the town. A bazaar was to have been held at Saint Warburg's, one of the national temples, but was deferred for a year!

Vast numbers of these clerical bazaars are dedicated to *Mauzzim* or *Protectors*. When the clergy seized upon the temples of the pagans they changed their dedications. While in the hands of the pagans they were inscribed to Mars, Bacchus, Apollo, Diana, Venus, and so forth, who were regarded as the protecting gods and goddesses of the temples bearing their several inscriptions; but when the clergy got possession of them they changed the protectors' names. By an

¹ Rev. xviii. 23. ² Rev. xviii. 11—18. ³ Rev. xiii. 2, 4.

* The following passage from Scott's Commentary may not be without use in this place, seeing that he is an "orthodox" authority. In commenting upon the merchandize of the Harlot as described in Rev. xviii. 9—19, he says:

"To number 'the persons of men' with oxen and horses is no doubt a most detestable and antichristian practice, fit only for 'Babylon the great.' Yet even this, cruel, unrighteous, and hateful as it is, must not be considered as the worst traffic *even of this our land*, for 'the souls of men' are traded for by those, who take the cure of them for the sake of the emolument, and the abundance of delicacies obtained by it; and then either leave them to perish in ignorance, or poison them by heresy, or lead them on the road to hell by a profligate example: strenuously and by every calumny, if stronger means are withheld, opposing all who attempt to prevent the dire effects of their vile conduct. Many of these spiritual wickednesses, and this merchandize of souls—*by feigned words, equivocating subscriptions and declarations, nay, worshipping God in Lucre's sake*—will be found under different forms *even in the protestant churches*: and perhaps no denomination is quite free from the guilt of rendering religious profession and sacred functions subservient to worldly interest, credit, ease, and indulgence. In these things we ought to come out and separate from Babylon, if we would not partake of her plagues."

"This is strong enough, coming as it does from a churchman; but the notorious fact is that the cure of souls is sold at the auction marts in England on the same principle as shares in banks or railways. The same office, which will give you information as to the one, affords information for the most eligible investment of money as to the other." So much for one sample of the Harlots' merchandize in England: and the harlot may be known by her wares."—*Andrew Jukes.*

apotheosis common to themselves and the heathen they deified the "souls," or ghosts, of dead men and women, called them "saints," and adored them as guardians or protectors. Diana and Venus were superseded by the Virgin Mary, Veronica, &c.; Mars, Jupiter, and others, by Peter, James, John, &c. Men and women, temples and nations, statues and pictures, have all their Mauzzim or protecting saints and saintesses throughout "Christendom" to this day; and so excessive and gross is this superstition that lest any should be omitted, Church-of-England office bearers for certain handsome sums of gold, have dedicated and consecrated Bazaars to "*All Saints*," and "*All Souls*!" Precious "graces" and right-reverences these to declare what is heretical or true! It is such as they that are alone the real promoters of the infidel spirit of the age, causing as they do the way of truth to be denied and blasphemed by their pernicious practices.

Heresian. Then you deny that cathedrals, parish houses, and conventicles are "churches" in any scriptural sense, and that the worshippers at their altars are the people of the Lord?

Boanerges. I do in all good conscience before God. There has been no temple on the earth made with hands since the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem by the Romans belonging to the Lord; and there will be none until "the Man whose name is the Branch shall build the temple of the Lord" described by Ezekiel.² Among the Gentiles the Lord's temple is his people, and not a house of wood, stone, or brick. Addressing those in Corinth who had been washed, sanctified, and justified by the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God,³ the apostle inquires, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. * * * The temple of God is holy, which ye are."⁴ And to the same class of people in Israel, he says, "We are Christ's house if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end."⁵ And another apostle saith to the same class of people, "Ye as living stones are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ:" "ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."⁶ These things are affirmed of the men and women who had "purified their souls in obeying the truth through the spirit unto unfeigned love of one another." There were no clergy then as distinguished from "the laity." All the *laoi*, *laoi* of Christ were God's lot, inheritance, or clergy. The elders, overseers, and rulers among them were inspired men—men supernaturally endowed "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ;"⁷ still they were no more than brethren highly esteemed for their work's sake. There are no such divinely qualified men now in or out of the "*one Body*" of Christ. Bishops, priests, ministers, apostles, angels, prophets, evangelists, pastors, elders, teachers, or preachers; whether

¹ Zech. vi. 13; Jer. xxiii. 5; Isai. xl. 1. ² Ezek. xxxvii. 28; xl. 5; xli. 1. ³ 1 Cor. vii. 11.
⁴ 1 Cor. iii. 9, 16, 17. ⁵ Heb. iii. 6. ⁶ 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. ⁷ Eph. iv. 12.

state or nonconformist, Irvingite, Mormon, or Southcotite, and all such—are but a miserable imitation and counterfeit of the meek and humble men through whom the Holy Spirit manifested itself for the *profit of all* their faithful brethren.¹ Instead of being the Lord's people they are mere interlopers and usurpers who have started into life out of that "Mystery of Iniquity" which was concocted by their reverences. Hymeneus and Philetus, Phygellus and Hermogenes, Alexander the coppersmith, Demas and Diotrephes, Nicolas, and other "dogs," of whom, saith the apostle, "beware."²

Heresian. You bring strange things to my ears, and with a boldness and weight of testimony which shakes my faith in the whole ecclesiastical establishment of Christendom. You speak as though it were impossible you could be mistaken in what you say. None of our divines talk to us of these things; how is this?

Boanerges. Because they are too high for them, they cannot attain to them. "How can they believe who receive honor one of another; and seek not the honor that comes from God only?" Fettered by their creeds and articles which they must stomach or lose their stipends, they dare not do otherwise than *profess* to "believe what the church believes" whether they can understand it or not. The "office bearers" of their superstition will not admit the right of private judgment. They must swallow the whole herd of camels, or renounce the service of "the church." This church-authority is their ruin; for seeking to please men they renounce the service of Christ.³ "The fear of man bringeth a snare." It is by this that the clergy are bound hand and foot; so that they can and dare only to speak as the scribes. It is "yea and nay" with them; but with those whom the truth has freed it is "amen in Christ Jesus." I believe, therefore do I speak; it is for you to judge what I say. If I speak "according to the Law and the Testimony" it is at your peril to reject what is said; but if I speak not according to these, then my speech is no more to be regarded than the opinions and assumptions of your "divines" of Exeter, Oxford, and Canterbury.

Heresian. Seeing then that you have upset all my notions of "Church" will you be kind enough to define it in such particular terms that I may be able to know when I have the happiness of forming the acquaintance of one of those "living stones" of which the Lord's "spiritual house" is built?

Boanerges. A very reasonable request. The Holy Oracles, then, teach us that a *Church of Christ is an assembly of men and women who, believing the Gospel of the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus, separate themselves from sinners, and are imbued with the spirit of the truth, as illustrated by the disposition and lives of the prophets and apostles; and who, upon an intelligent, love-working, and heart-purifying, faith, have been immersed into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: and thenceforth perfect their faith by walking in the steps of Abraham's faith which he had being yet uncircumcised.* Nations and their kings, bishops,

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 7. ² Phil. iii. 2. ³ Gal. i. 10.

and clergy, have nothing to do with such a church as this but to do their best to corrupt or suppress it. It is composed of "the poor of this world, rich in faith whom God hath chosen to be the heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him."¹ "He scatters the proud in the imaginations of their hearts; he puts down the mighty from their thrones, and exalts them of low degree. He fills the hungry with good things; and the rich he sends empty away." The dignitaries of church and state, and the wealthy of the land are in their life-time now receiving their consolation. It is as impossible for them to enter into the kingdom of God as it is for a camel to go through the eye of a needle.² They must renounce the world and the flesh, and humble themselves that they may be exalted in due time. They must come to regard themselves simply as stewards of the riches they possess, and make such a use of them as God has marked out in the scriptures of truth.³ A man cannot lay up for himself and his heirs treasure upon earth as the clergy and sons of pride are wont to do, and have treasure also in heaven.⁴ If a man be parsimonious toward God he will give sparingly to him.⁵ It is he only shall become fat who deviseth liberal things.

Heresiam. I perceive, then, that the church of Rome and the family of churches that has been born of her, do not constitute "the Church of Christ which he hath purchased with his own blood."⁶

Boanerges. You are perfectly correct in this; and therefore to none of them in whole or in part has God committed the high office of "deciding what is truth," as Oxford saith, or of "making known to the principalities and powers in the heavens the manifold wisdom of God."⁶ Their clergies do not know what it is, therefore it is impossible they can declare it to the princes and potentates of the nations. They can make known to them the mysteries of Romanism, Calvinism, Lutheranism, Wesleyism, and so forth; but then these schisms are no part of "the manifold wisdom of God." The church of Christ fulfilled its mission in this particular in the first century of its existence; but the circumstances under which it is placed in the 19th, render it impossible to do so now. The "principalities and powers in the heavens" are inaccessible to the members of the One Body. They are hedged in by the resistances of the State-Churches—the harlot-daughters of the drunken woman—whose "office-bearers" take good care that nothing shall get at them but their own "philosophy and vain deceit." Were a man now to stand in their presence and explain to them the manifold wisdom of God in regard to his kingdom and the name of Jesus, they would not believe; for there would be Satan standing at their right hand in the persons of the archbishops and bishops of their respective superstitions, ready to withstand him and to turn them away from the faith by perverting the right way of the Lord. Imagine the Queen of these realms listening to me upon the subject of "baptismal regeneration" and "the church," and then turning to their right reverences of

¹ James ii. 5. ² Matt. xix. 23, 24. ³ Luke xvi. 9—18; Acts iv. 23; 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10, 17—19.

⁴ Matt. vi. 19—21. ⁵ 2 Cor. ix. 6. ⁶ Eph. iii. 10. ⁷ Rev. xvii. 5.

Exeter and Oxford, and saying, "My lords, are these things indeed so? Am I in very deed only the "head" of a synagogue of Satan whose "transformed ministers"¹ ye are? The "*Defender of the Faith*," not of Christ, but of the apostasy that was to come?"² Is this the spirituality of which ye are lords and myself the "queen?" What else would they reply but, "Certainly not your Majesty, this Boanerges is a pestilent fellow, and ring-leader of heretics, whose doctrine if received would turn the world upside down. Ours is the true church which your majesty and all your predecessors from the great and pious Henry VIII (except the bloody Mary and that rascal Cromwell) so highly adorn. What it has handed down as true is true and not to be disputed. Whatsoever is contrary thereto is false and heretical; and he that utters it ought to be turned over to Satan that he may learn not to blaspheme."

Heresian. If the bishops and their clergy had you at their disposal you would have no reason to rejoice in their tender mercies! But returning to baptismal regeneration, I should like to know in few words the order in which believer's regeneration was changed into infant-regeneration.

Boanerges. The "*bath of regeneration*,"³ (λουτρον παλιγγενειας, *loutron palingenesias*), as the apostle styles "*the bath of the water*,"⁴ (λουτρον του υδατος, *loutron tou hydatos*) was first converted into "holy water" by a supposed admixture with spirit. This spirit in the water was then assumed to be a sufficient substitute for faith in the gospel; which led to the change of the subject to be bathed from an adult to an infant. *Baptismal* regeneration was then complete consisting of the dipping of an infant in the bath instead of a believing adult. A further improvement, however, was deemed expedient on account of its convenience in the countries subject to the pope. On the ground that a few drops of holy water "rightly administered" were as sanctifying as an ocean, "the church" decreed its homœopathic, or infinitesimal, exhibition! *Sprinkling*, or rhan-tism (ραντισμος) was to be called *baptism* (βαπτισμος), and "the sign of the cross" was to be added. In this way a distinguishing "mark"⁵ was set upon the pope's subjects, both loyal and rebellious; so that wherever the spirit of the system of which he is the head prevails, there the sprinkling of infants is practised, and stoutly maintained in the face of scripture, reason, and common sense.

Heresian. You deny then that infants can be regenerated?

Boanerges. I affirm that the Scriptures do not teach regeneration of infants. The regeneration taught there has relation to men and women,⁶ to the Twelve Tribes of Israel,⁷ and to the nations⁸ as such. They record the *generation* of things and their *degeneration*; and predict also their *regeneration*. The order of the degeneration is revealed as the order of the regeneration, and

may be stated

1. The understa
2. The moral se
3. Disobedience and unbell
4. God's displea
5. Death and ce

Before men and the knowl for mere hur man. Divine assurance,"¹⁰ union with his ration between lost by unbel opposite, that begins with th practice of the law of sin"¹¹ testimonies I

Heresian. doctrine of b for the remis

Boanerges. pouring, or di name, &c., wi determined by of sins in bap without belie that works by for righteous "one faith,"¹¹ of God and t that believes

Heresian. *Boanerges* of things un

Heresian. *Boanerges* *Heresian.* in the heart

Boanerges concerning thing know them, *Heresian.*

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. ² 2 Thes. ii. 3. ³ Tit. iii. 5. ⁴ Eph. v. 26. ⁵ Rev. xiii. 10. ⁶ John i. 12, 13; iii. 5. ⁷ Mat. xix. 28. ⁸ Psalm lxxii. 11, 17.

⁹ Gen. iii. 1-6; Gal. v. 6. ¹⁰ 1 P. xvi. 20; iii. 27.

may be stated thus—

DEGENERATION.	REGENERATION.
1. The understanding darkened. ¹	1. The understanding enlightened. ⁵
2. The moral sentiments, or heart defiled. ²	2. The heart purified. ⁶
3. Disobedience, or sin, the fruit of lust and unbelief. ³	3. Obedience the fruit of faith. ⁷
4. God's displeasure incurred. ⁴	4. The favour of God regained. ⁸
5. Death and corruption the consequence. ⁴	5. Life and incorruptibility the result. ⁹

Before men or nations can be regenerated they must be enlightened; and the knowledge by which this is effected must be *divine* knowledge, for mere human knowledge is incapable of purifying the heart of man. Divine knowledge, which is God's, when believed with "full assurance,"¹⁰ works obedience to his law, which is the point at which union with him ensues, as the disobedience was the crisis where separation between God and man occurred. Thus the favor of God was lost by unbelief and transgression, and may be regained by the opposite, that is, by faith and obedience. This "obedience of faith"¹¹ begins with the gospel of the kingdom obeyed, and continues in the practice of the truth until death terminates the conflict between "*the law of sin*" and "*the law of the spirit*"¹² within us. Read the testimonies I have adduced, Heresian, and then say if you find infant regeneration taught in the word of God.

Heresian. I admit that I do not; but do you in rejecting the doctrine of baptismal regeneration also reject the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins? Is it not a scriptural doctrine?

Boanerges. If by "baptism" is to be understood the sprinkling, pouring, or dipping of a man in water, saying, "I baptize thee into the name, &c., *without regard to faith*, or the *quality* of the faith, which is determined by *the things believed*, I say that the dogma of remission of sins in baptism is unscriptural. There can be no remission of sins without belief of "the truth as it is in Jesus;" for it is the "faith that works by love and purifies the heart" that is counted to a man for righteousness. He must not only have faith, but it must be the "*one faith*,"¹³ even the belief of "the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ;" for the condition is, "He that believes *the gospel*"¹⁴ and is baptized shall be saved."

Heresian. What is faith?

Boanerges. "The substance of *things hoped for*, and the evidence of things unseen."¹⁵

Heresian. How does it come?

Boanerges. "By hearing the word of God."¹⁶

Heresian. Then it is not a sort of mesmeric aura called "grace in the heart" that comes over a man?

Boanerges. No. It is the belief of the testimony of God concerning things past, present, and to come. You cannot of yourself know them, for "they are spiritually discerned."¹⁷

Heresian. What is meant by that?

¹ Gen. iii. 1-6; ² 7-10; ³ James i. 14, 15. ⁴ Gen. iii. 16-19. ⁵ Acts xxvi. 18. ⁶ Acts xv. 9; Gal. v. 6. ⁷ 1 Pet. i. 22. ⁸ Acts ii. 38; x. 43. ⁹ Rom. vi. 22. ¹⁰ Heb. v. 11; x. 22. ¹¹ Rom. xvi. 26; iii. 27. ¹² Rom. vii. 23; viii. 2. ¹³ Eph. iv. 5. ¹⁴ Mark xvi. 15, 16; Rom. i. 16-17. ¹⁵ Heb. xi. 1. ¹⁶ Rom. x. 17. ¹⁷ 1 Cor. ii. 14.

Boanerges. It imports that men to whom God has not spoken are unable of themselves to search out or discover the riches of Christ; and that if they come to know, or discern them, it must be by a revelation from God.

Heresian. Is this revelation made to every man by or through the spirit?

Boanerges. No. It was conveyed from God to the prophets of Israel, to his son, and to his apostles, to be by them made known to the world. God's revelation, therefore, is a matter of testimony, and not an afflation, or aura, termed "grace" by those dark bodies called "the schools." God has revealed all he intends to reveal until the revelation of Jesus Christ in his kingdom, when he will send a new law forth from Zion, and a word from Jerusalem.¹ Hence, the faith that regenerates, sanctifies, and justifies must embrace this testimony, which presents the "one hope of the calling" to view, belief and adhesion to which are indispensable if we would be saved.²

Heresian. But is not baptism connected in some way with remission of sins?

Boanerges. It is. The remission of sins is granted to a believer of the gospel of the kingdom through the Name of Jesus as the king or Christ:³ and no such believer can get at that name without immersion in water into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Heresian. Ah! I perceive how it is. If a lady wish to take on herself a man's name that she may have a legal right to all that belongs to his name, she must come lawfully to the marriage ceremony. The instant this is performed his name is named upon her, and she acquires new rights and privileges on account of his name, but not simply on account of the ceremony; for the ceremony is only valid where all things are according to law. If she be married to another, the ceremony imparts nothing to her; but if she be legally eligible, then the ceremony gives her every thing on account of her husband's name.

Boanerges. Your perception of the matter is according to truth. If "repentance and remission of sins" were "granted"⁴ on account of the ceremony of immersion without regard to faith or its quality, then any man, woman, or infant, dipped according to form would have remission of sin or sins. This would be sacramentalism such as the ignorant contend for. But the doctrine of Christ recognizes no such absurdity. Immersion into "the Name" is an indispensable ceremony; but it can only unite or marry those to the name of Jesus who believe the untraditionized gospel of the kingdom of God and of his Christ.

Heresian. It must be even so; and it appears to me that those who profess to be married to Christ, but have not submitted to the ceremony appointed by his law, are living in sin. Collectively they constitute a harlot and not a married wife. For the benefit of such will you be so good as to define true, scriptural, baptism as it stands opposed to church sacramental-rhantism?

¹ Isai. li. 2. ² Col. i. 22, 23; Rom. viii. 24. ³ Mat. ii. 4, 2. ⁴ Acts v. 31; xi. 18.

Boanerges. No baptism is subject of that baptism in a true sense. Paul and the rest of the apostles of it in the word are a washing with water, and not such as that which the subject is made to be in immersion in water. In view of the immersion in water and the name of the Holy Spirit, of one who speak the things of the kingdom of God into salvation that Jesus is Christ, Father! Such a baptism will give remission of sins, and eternal life: only name under heaven given to save.

Heresian. A thought occurs to baptism be correct, and I have no the disciples do not profess in the they are an unscriptural, and harmful "churches" "harlots," and are as much as the state-churches of Europe.

Boanerges. This is a pretence to admit that "baptism" is a necessary rite are correct, and I have no the here presented, and which no man can set aside, those who "baptize" they themselves consequently to be Christ in baptism; and when the operation of God; and when the uncircumcised in the putting of flesh; and planted in the likeness of be in the likeness of his name inevitable from the previous condition therefore no ground of boasting a particular. If there be such as, it is an antagonism to the doctrine of I should as soon expect to witness Mohammedan as by becoming a faith ending in sin.

Heresian. If that you be with churches are divorced, you will like to know?

Boanerges. And there are no find in the scriptures of baptism, answer they give I am willing to a

Heresian. But divine truth, a

¹ Rom. x. 13; Mat. vi. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

Boanerges. No baptism can be christian baptism unless the subject of that baptism be a true believer of the gospel preached by Paul and the rest of the apostles; and as the figures used in speaking of it in the word are a washing, a burial, a planting, and a birth, with water, and not earth or flesh, as the receptacle or mould into which the subject is cast—the ceremonial action can only be an immersion in water. In view of these premises, then, *baptism is the immersion in water into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, of one, who with the heart believes unto righteousness the things of the kingdom of God, and with the mouth confesses unto salvation that Jesus is Christ the Lord to the glory of God the Father.*¹ Such a baptism will entitle the subject of it to repentance, remission of sins, and eternal life² through the name of Jesus as the only name under heaven given among men, whereby they can be saved.³

Heresian. A thought occurs to me here that if your definition of baptism be correct, and I have no reason to doubt it, then, although the dissenters do not profess the dogma of "baptismal regeneration," they are an unbaptized, and therefore an unclean people; and their "churches" "harlots," and not of the betrothed wife or bride, just as much as the state-churches of England, Scotland, and continental Europe.

Boanerges. This is inevitable from the premises. The dissenters admit that "baptism" is necessary; at least they do so if their creeds are correct exponents of their opinions. But the definition I have presented, and which no man, be he bishop, priest, or minister, can set aside, shows their "baptism" to be no baptism at all; and they themselves consequently to be *unborn* of water;⁴ *unburied* with Christ in baptism;⁵ *unrisen* with him through the faith of the operation of God; *unbaptized* into Jesus Christ and into his death; *uncircumcised*⁶ in the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh; nor *planted* in the likeness of his death, and therefore will not be in the likeness of his resurrection.⁵ These conclusions are inevitable from the premises contained in the definition. They have therefore no ground of boasting against the state-churches in this particular. If these be black so are they. Dissenterism is very well as an antagonism to state-churchism; but as a way of righteousness, I should as soon expect to inherit the kingdom of God by turning Mohammedan as by becoming a professor of any of the forms of faith ending in *ism*.

Heresian. If then you be neither Greek, Roman, nor Protestant, churchman nor dissenter, pray what are you, Boanerges, for I should like to know?

Boanerges. Ask those men and women, whose names you will find in the sixteenth of Romans, what they were; and whatever answer they give I am willing to abide by.

Heresian. But divines teach, and men repeat it after them, that

¹ Rom. x. 9—13; Acts viii. 5, 13, 35, 38, 39. ² Luke xxiv. 47; John xx. 31. ³ Acts iv. 13.
⁴ John iii. 5. ⁵ Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. ⁶ Col. ii. 11, 12.

if a man be "born of the Spirit," it is quite unimportant for him to be "born of water."

Boanerges. "Divines" teach many very foolish and pernicious dogmas, and this is among the number. The Lord Jesus, who is to possess the kingdom, says that no man can enter it unless he be born of two things, namely, "out of water"—*ἐξ ὕδατος, ἐξ ἕδατος*, "and of the spirit." The spirit is the begetter. He is the Father of lights, and begets men and women by the word of truth,¹ through the belief of which they are brought into the water. Hence, they are said to be "sanctified and cleansed by the bath of the water with the word;" and thus "by one spirit they are all baptized into one body." It is good evidence that a man is not born of the spirit who is not born of water.

Heresian. I apprehend that few will be willing to admit that. Would you say that all who are born of water are born of the spirit? Are there not many pious people who have not been baptized, who are far more circumspect than multitudes who are very zealous for water?

Boanerges. I do not mean to say any such thing. The vast majority who go into the water come out of it as they went in, namely, "dead in trespasses and in sins." No immersed man is born of the spirit who does not understand and believe with "a good and honest heart" the things of the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ. A man who is begotten of the Spirit believes the truth, and his faith "works by love" and purifies his heart, and induces him gladly to submit to whatever "the law of faith" requires. Many people are "pious," or have an ignorant zeal of God; but such piety is not the fruit of the Spirit. The piety engendered by the Spirit is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit," which results only from an intelligent belief of the "exceeding great and precious promises" contained in God's knowledge,² styled "the word of the Kingdom." The only persons that illustrate this piety in a scriptural manner are those whom "the word" has caused to pass through "the bath of the water," which has thus become to them and to them only, "the bath of regeneration" on account of their having been renewed by knowledge after the image of Him that hath created them.³

Heresian. I understand you to teach then, that to be "born of God" is to be "sons of God," and that like children of the flesh, they are begotten first, and born afterwards. That they may be begotten many months before they are born; or they may be begotten, and never come to the birth, and so prove to be mere abortions. That God who is spirit, begets them by his "word of truth," which is "incorruptible seed;" and that when this seed becomes Christ formed within them by faith, they seek to "fulfil all righteousness," and gladly descend into the bath that they may be born of water into the family of God as it now exists among men. Am I correct in understanding you thus?

Boanerges. You are, Heresian; and will now, I doubt not, clearly perceive how it is, that in the word no one is recognized as born of the Spirit of God until he is born of water, seeing that no child can be born of its father until it is born of its mother.

Heresian. This then accounts for water being put before spirit in the discourse of Jesus with Nicodemus. The water first yields the child of God from its womb in its appearing in his family. It appears there for the first time in connexion with the water, having been previously begotten and planted there by the truth assuredly believed. But is this intellectual and moral begettal and birth the full import of the phrase "born of the spirit?"

Boanerges. By no means. The true believers are "children of promise as Isaac was."⁴ Isaac was "born after the spirit," that is, *begotten of the spirit* (ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα γεννηθείς, *ho kata pneuma gennethis*.) Had his birth depended upon the procreative vigor of Abraham and Sarah he could not have been born.⁵ It was necessary, therefore, that they should both be energized. This was effected by the Spirit as really and physically as the formation of Adam from the dust. Hence, he is said to have been "born after the spirit" a child of promise, as distinguished from Ishmael who was "born after the flesh" in the ordinary course of things. The Lord Jesus was also "born after the spirit," and a child of promise as Isaac was; with the difference that Isaac was from the loins of Abraham, but Jesus was

¹ James i. 18; ² 1 Pet. i. 22-25. ³ 1 Cor. xii. 13. ⁴ Mat. xiii. 19, 23; Luke viii. 15. ⁵ Rom. xiv. 17. ⁶ 2 Pet. i. 2-4. ⁷ Col. iii. 10. ⁸ Eph. iii. 17; Gal. iv. 19. ⁹ Gal. iv. 28. ¹⁰ Rom. iv. 19.

not from the loins of Joseph, but from the energy of God. The Spirit is present in the primary and mortal bodies shall be born of Christ to be children by whom will have become "children so equal to the angel revealed in the world—*from the dust to live*" as it is written, "Thou shalt beget sons and daughters of all things; shall they be, they will be like their birth of spirit will be Heresian. To be born of God at that time. It appears that it occurs to me, that conclusion?

Boanerges. You are, Heresian; and will now, I doubt not, clearly perceive how it is, that in the word no one is recognized as born of the Spirit of God until he is born of water, seeing that no child can be born of its father until it is born of its mother.

¹ Rom. viii. 11. ² Heb. i. 2. ³ Heb. i. 2. ⁴ Heb. i. 2. ⁵ Heb. i. 2. ⁶ Heb. i. 2. ⁷ Heb. i. 2. ⁸ Heb. i. 2. ⁹ Heb. i. 2. ¹⁰ Heb. i. 2.

not from the loins of Joseph; but "made of a woman" by the spirit, or creative energy of God. The true believers, or *believers of the promises*, have not yet attained to sonship upon this principle. They are "children of the promise" at present in the primary sense of believing the promises, one of which is that their mortal bodies shall be made alive by the Spirit.¹ By faith they are *elect* in Christ to be children by a resurrection to life. When their faith becomes fact they will have become "children of God, being the children of the resurrection," and so "equal to the angels."² This is the highest sense in which divine sonship is revealed in the word—a *believer and doer of the word begotten of the spirit from the dust to live for ever*. Jesus attained to it in being raised from the dead, as it is written, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee."³ When the sons and daughters of God elected for his kingdom, being joint-heirs with Jesus of all things,⁴ shall "be planted in the likeness of his resurrection" as they hope to be,⁵ they will be "like him"⁶ sons of God begotten by his spirit from the dead.⁷ Their birth of spirit will then be complete.

Heresian. To be born into the Kingdom of God, then, requires a considerable time. It appears that a man cannot now be translated instantaneously into it; yet it occurs to me, that there is a passage somewhere which justifies an opposite conclusion?

Boanerges. You refer, doubtless, to the words "the Father hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son."⁸ This sounds something like it. A person unacquainted with "Moses and the prophets" might infer from this that the passing into the kingdom was now, and instantaneous; but no man whose eyes have been opened would come to that conclusion. Even the context forbids it. The antithesis of the text is "the power of darkness," to "the kingdom," or *the power of light*. In the interpretation of the word, especially of the epistles, we must always bear in mind the subject being discoursed upon by the writer. In the chapter before us "the Hope that is laid up for us in heaven" is the theme; which "Hope" when it gets possession of an honest and good heart, becomes the power of light to it. The subject-matter of this hope is the Kingdom of God, into which hope the believer of it is "translated" when he is "baptized in the name of Jesus" as the Lord and King of the kingdom, which the God of heaven will set up when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of Jehovah and of his Christ.⁹ The doctrine of the kingdom of God believed is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit"¹⁰ as all can testify who believe it; and into which they are translated when they obey the gospel of the kingdom and the name. The true believers who are living at the coming of Jesus to smite the imperial image upon its feet, will be corporeally changed in an instant, in the twinkling of an eye;¹¹ but even then they will not instantaneously "enter the kingdom of God," but with the resurrected dead will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air;¹² after that they will descend,¹³ and cooperate with him¹⁴ in the work of subduing the nations and establishing the kingdom, which they will possess during the second millenary of its existence. As you say, it takes a considerable time to enter into the Kingdom of God. It is not an instantaneous translation. Instantaneity belongs to the kingdom of the clergy. The sprinkling of an infant's face with holy water in the name of God, or the dipping of "a penitent believer" in the existence of Christ—is enough to translate such into the kingdom of Antichrist; but it is utterly inefficacious for translation into the kingdom of God and of his Christ. To enter into this kingdom a man must believe the truth concerning it,¹⁵ be of a humble and contrite spirit,¹⁶ and be immersed into the name of the Holy Ones.¹⁷ This is beginning to do well. He must thenceforth "patiently continue in well doing, seeking for glory, honor, and incorruptibility."¹⁸ In so doing he acquires a character which reflects the image of God as from a mirror, and secures to him his approbation. From baptism to death is the period of a true believer's probation, and is therefore not of equal duration in all cases. Being "after the Spirit he minds the things of the Spirit," and is thus stamped, marked, or sealed of God for eternal life. He dies because of sin, or of the evil that came by sin into the flesh, and sees corruption mouldering into dust. After death such persons may

¹ Rom. viii. 11. ² Luke xx. 36. ³ James i. 22. ⁴ Psalm ii. 7. ⁵ Rom. viii. 17, 29, 32; 1 Cor. ii. 22; Heb. i. 2. ⁶ Rom. vi. 5. ⁷ 1 John iii. 2. ⁸ Rom. i. 4. ⁹ Col. i. 13. ¹⁰ Rev. xi. 15; Dan. ii. 44; vii. 9. ¹¹ Rom. xiv. 17. ¹² 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; Phil. iii. 21. ¹³ 1 Thess. iv. 17. ¹⁴ Rev. xxi. 2, 9, 10; xix. 7, 8; xi. 2. ¹⁵ Psalm. cxlix. 6-9; Dan. vii. 26. ¹⁶ Mark. xvi. 15, 16. ¹⁷ Mat. xviii. 3. ¹⁸ Mat. xxviii. 19. ¹⁹ Rom. ii. 6, 7, 16; James i. 25.

"dwell in the dust"¹ sleeping there,² for hundreds of years; yet they are not forgotten of God. Not one of them will be lost. For "the same Jesus who was taken up into heaven will come in like manner as he was seen going into heaven,"³ when "he who raised him up shall raise them up also by Jesus."⁴ At the epoch of his descent from heaven with a shout,⁵ he will "build again the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and raise up his ruins, and build it as in the days of old."⁶ In doing this he will "restore again the kingdom to Israel."⁷ This restoration constitutes "the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets from the age"⁸ (*ἀπ' αἰῶνος, ἀπ' αἰῶνος*) when the Mosaic Code was promulgated. These "times of the restitution" are the era of "the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory;"⁹ and of "the Economy" (*οἰκονομία, oikonomia*) when God shall gather together in one imperial dominion all kingdoms, people, nations, and languages under his king.¹⁰ At this great crisis of the world's history, Christ's brethren will appear before him, and be welcomed with the benediction, saying, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."¹¹

Heresian. Such blessed ones, then, are "spirits" when they become "equal to the angels," and possess the kingdom?

Boanerges. They are, even as Jesus is by his resurrection "a spirit giving life"¹² (*πνεῦμα ζωοποιου, pneuma zoopoion*;) for "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," or spiritual body, as "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," or animal body.¹³ "Flesh and blood" and "spirit" are used in these texts in relation to man in different states. Their qualities differ materially. The former is corruptible, and therefore mortal flesh; while "spirit" is incorruptible and therefore when vivified immortal flesh. The first belongs to man in the present state of existence; the last also to man, but in a future, higher, and eternal state. Flesh is the germ of spirit, which is produced from the mortal flesh after the analogy of an oak from an acorn. The transmutation of flesh into spirit was illustrated in the change of the mortal body of Jesus into a body incorruptible and living; and will be hereafter on a larger scale when the true believers among the living shall be changed in the twinkling of an eye at the coming of the Lord.

Heresian. I understand then, from what you have adduced, that men are not now in the kingdom in any sense; but that the kingdom is the subject of the "one hope of the calling" from which are irradiated as from a common centre all the things which constitute the great recompense of the reward promised to the righteous? Am I correct in this?

Boanerges. You are. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" because "corruption cannot inherit incorruptibility."¹⁴ It is physically impossible; for those "who are accounted worthy" of the kingdom are not to vacate it, and leave it to other people as the kingdoms of the world are left, that is, to successors;¹⁵ but being once appointed to its glory, honor, and power, they are to possess them "for ever, even for ever and ever."¹⁶ Can mortal man, whose feeble existence with difficulty ekes out threescore years and ten, possess such a kingdom and glory for ever? Assuredly not. He must first become immortal, or endued with incorruptibility and life. He will then be physically qualified to share or "enter into the joy of his Lord."¹⁷

Heresian. You used the phrase "penitent believer" just now; does that mean a believer of the truth in a state of sorrow or distress, anguish or remorse, on account of his past sins and of the torment due to them?

Boanerges. The phrase belongs not to me, nor to the scripture, but to the jargon of the schools. A penitent with them is one who believes so much of what they call "the truth" as to confess that he is a sinner who deserves to be tormented in fire and brimstone eternally, which produces in him the state of mind you speak of. If he have got so far in mysticism as to "experience a hope" of being saved from this torment through Christ, he is then regarded as being an evangelically penitent believer—one who is the subject of "evangelical repentance," as they term it. This, however, is not the "repentance unto life"¹⁸ spoken of in the word: but "the

¹ Isaiah. xxvi. 19. ² Dan. xii. 2. ³ Acts i. 2. ⁴ 2 Cor. iv. 14. ⁵ 1 Thes. iv. 16; Phil. iii. 20, 21. ⁶ Amos ix. 11-15; Acts xv. 16. ⁷ Acts i. 6. ⁸ Acts iii. 20-23. ⁹ Mat. xix. 28. ¹⁰ Eph. i. 10; Dan. vii. 14; Zech. xiv. 9. ¹¹ Mat. xxv. 34. ¹² 1 Cor. xv. 45. ¹³ John iii. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 44. ¹⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 50. ¹⁵ Dan. ii. 44. ¹⁶ Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27. ¹⁷ Mat. xxv. 31; Heb. xii. 2; Acts xiii. 34; Isai. lv. 3. ¹⁸ Acts v. 31; xi. 18; Luke xxiv. 47.

sorrow of the world of heart, or soul, resulting evinced by a faith as in Jesus and his apostles styled in scripture "by the word of truth. Holy Ones this faith is the remission of all positions though possession remission of sins" were only granted in Christ until he has obedience in all the Abraham, and is then promises made to him of the word and born creature in Christ Jesus of God by his new kingdom." Though it was to such babes children, because you "I thank thee, O Father things from the wise whose mouth God has truth." Babes and Bible. Regenerated, lectually and morally great and precious it has left on record the little children ye shall

Heresian. If the people are altogether irreclaimable by any fear that I have lost some extent learned their darkness visible branch; and seeing that they say "we see," I ration by obeying the

Boanerges. You by all good and honest body, high or low, carnally-minded are the church "they will have their wealth, create and sustain them and the air in honest consciences as a body of the "honors," and If the State would wrested from the M daughters, and leave the public would be about infant baptism kingdoms beyond immediate delicta clergy for a few years subsequently will end of their career, to see by him when come to him from the

¹⁹ 2 Cor. vii. 10. ²⁰ 2 Cor.

sorrow of the world that worketh death." Repentance unto life is purification of heart, or soul, resulting from a faithful appreciation of the goodness of God,² and evinced by a *faith* and *disposition* such as shone forth in Abraham, in the prophets, in Jesus and his apostles. This meek, humble, childlike, and faithful disposition is styled in scripture "the divine nature," and characterizes those who are begotten by the word of truth. So that when such an one is immersed into the name of the Holy Ones this faith and disposition are "granted" to him for "repentance and the remission of all past sins" through the name of Jesus. This faith and disposition though possessed would not be granted to a man for "repentance and remission of sins" who refused to be immersed into the name of Jesus; for they are only granted *in* his name, not *out* of it. A believer of the gospel is out of Christ until he has been baptized into him; and until his faith brings him to obedience in all things commanded, he has neither the faith nor disposition of Abraham, and is therefore, not of his seed, and consequently has no right to the promises made to him.³ A "partaker of the divine nature," one who is begotten of the word and born of water, is a converted man—one turned into a new man or creature in Christ Jesus; and truly repentant. Having entered into the elect family of God by his new birth, he has become "a little child,"⁴ and "an heir of the kingdom." Though fifty years old when born of water he is but a babe in Christ. It was to such babes as this that John wrote, saying, "I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake." And Jesus said, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes;" out of whose mouth God has ordained strength to put to silence the perverters of the truth.⁵ Babes and sucklings of this class are the "regenerated infants" of the Bible. Regenerated, not by clerical conjuration and sleight of hand, but intellectually and morally by a love-working and intelligent belief of "the exceeding great and precious promises of God" concerning his kingdom and his Christ, who has left on record the notable saying, that "except ye be converted, and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of God."

Heresian. If these be so then is the world undone! The clergy and their people are altogether gone out of the way; and in the nature of things are utterly irreclaimable by any human means that can be brought to bear upon them. I confess that I have lost all faith in them and their traditions. They are, doubtless, to some extent learned in college lore, but their learning serves little else than to make their darkness visible. I renounce all such dogmas with those who teach them root and branch; and seeing that it is hopeless for me to attempt their illumination as already they say "we see," I shall at least endeavour to save myself from this untoward generation by obeying the gospel of the kingdom of God in the name of Jesus as the Christ.

Boanerges. Your resolution is both a wise and good one, and worthy of adoption by all good and honest hearts. There is nothing to be expected from the clergy as a body, high or low, national or non-conformist. The systems bequeathed by our carnally-minded ancestors have made them what they are; and like "true sons of the church" they will contend to the death for their old mother by whose craft they have their wealth. They are paid enormous sums to perpetuate the systems which create and sustain them; and so long as their errors are profitable, their shouts will rend the air in honour of the deities they adore. There is no getting at their consciences as a body except through their covetousness. Stop their pay, and abolish the "honors," and the saying will soon be verified in them "no pay no preach." If the State would appropriate to the necessities of the poor, the property it formerly wrested from the Mother of Harlots, and bestowed upon her English and Scotch daughters, and leave them to support the clergy who appreciate their ministrations, the public would be no longer distracted and perplexed by their foolish disputations about infant baptism and regeneration, "baptismal regeneration," immortal soulism, kingdoms beyond the skies, and questions of a like unprofitable character. But the immediate deliverance of mankind from these fictions is not to be expected. The clergy for a few years longer will retain their hold upon the public purse, and consequently will continue zealously to "pervert the right ways of the Lord." The end of their career, however, is certain. The blind whom they lead will be made to see by him whom Jehovah hath appointed to "enlighten the Gentiles;" who will come to him from the ends of the earth, and say, "Surely our fathers have inherited

¹ 2 Cor. vii. 10. ² Rom. ii. 4. ³ Gal. iii. 28—29. ⁴ 1 John ii. 12. ⁵ Mat. xi. 25; Psalm. viii. 2.

lies, vanity, and things in which there is no profit."¹ When they make this confession, the Lord will have "destroyed the face of the covering cast over *all* people, and the veil that is spread over *all nations.*"² by "teaching them of his ways." They will then "speak a pure language, and call upon the name of the Lord to serve him with one consent."³ In this way "they will walk in his paths,"⁴ and "and walk no more after the imagination of their evil heart."⁵ The occupation of the clergy will then be gone, and their heaven will have passed away. They will no more have it in their power to collect tithes and annuity taxes by means of infantry and dragoons; but, excluded from the kingdom of God, those of them who survive the judgments coming upon them, will be reduced to the lower ranks of society to which they properly belong. Their kingdom will be abolished, and its obsequies celebrated by a jubilee of nations.

Heresian. That is an interesting testimony of Zephaniah. If the nations all come to serve the Lord with one consent, as he testifies, where will be the religions and denominations which now divide the world? Will they not all be abolished from the earth?

Boanerges. Assuredly they will. The schisms of apostate "Christendom," Greek, Latin, and Protestant, national and nonconformist, Mahomedanism and Paganism, will all fall with the kingdoms that sustain and patronize them. Not one of them will survive the fierce anger, indignation, and jealousy of the Lord. They are the "*lies*" and unprofitable "*vanities*" of the Gentiles which result from their evil imagination. A believer of the gospel of the kingdom has no sympathy with any of them.

Heresian. But if nothing save omnipotence can set the world to rights, why do you labor by word and pen to convince men of what you believe to be the truth?

Boanerges. The apostles command all true believers to "fight the good fight of faith," and to "contend earnestly for it as once for all delivered to the saints."⁶ This contention is a matter of duty, the performance of which is not optional, nor dependant on the prospect of success or failure. We have nothing to do with consequences. If no one will obey the faith it is still our duty to contend for it. We are exhorted to save ourselves, and others if we can; and it contributes to this salvation of one's self to "contend for the faith." If others will not be saved we cannot help it; we shall have done the best we could, and there we must leave it. But as to "converting the world" in the popular sense, by preaching, such a result is not contemplated in the scripture. The gospel was not preached for the purpose defined by the clergy; but as a *call or invitation* to glory, honor, and immortality in the Kingdom of God. That is to say, God intends to set up an indestructible kingdom among the nations which shall rule over them all. The king and peers of its realms are to be holy, just, and immortal, which naturally the sons of men are not. They are to be "equal to the angels, and the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." This is a high and holy degree, and a requirement which necessitates the postponement of the setting up of the kingdom until God has provided such "a people for his name." To collect this people, he sent an invitation to the Jews first, and then to the Gentiles by Jesus and the apostles. As they were *invited* to this holy degree it is styled "a holy calling;" and the degree itself the subject of "the one hope of the calling;" and those who accepted the invitation are said to be "called to God's kingdom and glory,"⁷ and sometimes simply "the called."⁸ The time allotted to this work of collecting together the future rulers of the nations to the gospel invitation *in the name of Jesus Christ*, is from the day of Pentecost till his return. The work is almost accomplished, and will be entirely finished when the few who are still needed to fill the Lord's house shall be brought in.⁹

Heresian. That being so, I shall without further delay put off the clergy and their foolishness, and accept the gospel call.

¹ Jer. xvi. 19. ² Isai. xxv. 7. ³ Zeph. iii. 9. ⁴ Isai. ii. 5. ⁵ Jer. iii. 17. ⁶ 1 Tim. vi. 12; Jude 3. ⁷ 1 Thes. ii. 12. ⁸ Rev. ii. 26, 27; v. 10; xx. 4; xxii. 5. ⁹ Luke xiv. 23.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

ELPIS ISRAEL, —450 pages 8vo, price 7s. "There is much truth in this volume forcibly put forth." — *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*.

HERALD OF THE KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME, A Periodical of 24 pages, monthly, issued from Richmond, Virginia, U. S. A.: price 8s. 4d., invariably in advance. Postage at the cost of Subscribers.

The above works may be obtained through the reference at the foot of the title page of this pamphlet