

The following articles appeared in August, September, October, and November, 1832 issues of the *Millennial Harbinger*, edited by Alexander Campbell. They are in response to a book published by S. C. Jennings, which was his interpretation of a debate which took place between Obidiah Jennings and Alexander Campbell, in Nashville, TN. (This book is also included on this CD). There are also two articles in response to a Dr. Cleland, on the same theme as the discussion. (BWJ)

### THE DEBATE IN NASHVILLE.

FROM a late "*Christian Herald*," edited by the nephew of the late Obadiah Jennings. It appears that the deficiencies in the unfinished manuscripts of Dr. Jennings' version of that discussion are to be supplied by the Pittsburg Editor, and that *Matthew Brown*, D. D. President of Canonsburg College, is to prefix memoirs of the deceased to the translation, so that the book is insured to sell for 75 cents per copy—for the benefit, too, of the family of the deceased! All this may do very well for the purposes contemplated; for if the General Assembly were to select out of their 1500 preachers a fit person to finish off the said version to the liking of that church, or if they wished for an instrument well accomplished in the art of personal abuse, and who knows every man according to the flesh, they could not in seven ballotings have chosen a more trusty or accomplished agent than the said S. C. Jennings, Editor of the *Christian Herald*, Pittsburg, to complete the report, or to offer remarks upon a discussion which he never heard.

EDITOR.

# CHARACTER OF "THE DEBATE ON CAMPBELLISM,

*By OBADIAH JENNINGS, D. D."*

*SINCE the preceding Extra was written and printed, and after I had written and prepared the August number of the Harbinger, on the day before yesterday, (July 12th,) fell into my hands, for the first time, Mr. Jennings' book, of 252 pages, 12mo. I have devoted six hours to the perusal of it, "and hate thought it expedient, before issuing Extra, No. 4, to append to it a short extra on the CHARACTER of the aforesaid Debate on Campbellism. ? This Extra is paged to be bound after number 8, M. H. while the preceding is to be bound after number 7.*

## PROLOGUE.

I have risen from the perusal of this work with a worse opinion of human nature, and of what Doctor Owen called the "indwelling sin of Christians," than I have been conscious of, on the reading of any book of controversy which has ever fallen into my hands, I can say, in all sincerity, before God and man, if such be the fruits, the proper fruits, of the metaphysical regeneration of the holy spirit of Doctors of Divinity and of the schools, from such may the good Spirit deliver me! If the spirit of slander, detraction, and false accusation, be the spirit of truth, then is this book written under the direction, and infused with large measures of the spirit of truth. If the "evangelical sect" of its author is to be sustained by attempts to blast the reputation, to blot the character, and to abuse the persons, of those who question its reasonableness or its divinity, then is the author entitled to the gratitude and admiration of the order to which he belonged. He has indeed, rendered it an essential service, and if he is now beyond the reach of its rewards, his nephew, the editor and annotator, and his own family, will surely never be forgotten by it. But it is one thing to defend a political religion politically, and to please its partizans— and another to be a Christian, to defend the Christian cause, and to speak, and write, and act, in

accordance with the Holy Spirit of Christianity.

### TITLE OF THE BOOK.

*"Debate on Campbellism."* Where is this debate found? Not in this book. It is a sly stroke at deception. It is the title of a catch penny. Debate on Campbellism! The purchaser fancies he has got a debate; but when he reads it to the last page, he will find what he has got for his money. *Seventy-five cents worth of slander against*

*Alexander Campbell*— That is the true and proper name. There is no debate in it. Not a speech of mine. Not in 252 pages is to be found one page of all that I spoke in two days. "Campbellism" is the subject, but who are the debaters, and where are the debates, the speeches, the arguments? It is a false flag to protect contraband goods—a false label to sell a spurious specific.

Nor is it a *narrative* of a debate—the report of a debate—nor even remarks upon a debate. The author alludes to something called a Debate; but the reader will be puzzled to find out what it was, unless he regard the author as both the debate and the debaters. What he now gives us in these pages, is as truly the discussion which I held with him in Nashville, in December 1830, as was the English reports of the battle of New Orleans, the battle itself.

If I forget not, in his prospectus he proposed to give a *true account* of said debate, alledging that in my narrative there was a *false account* of it. A *true account* means, with him, no account at all; or else that mere allusions to certain sayings and incidents are a *true account*. All the world would laugh at the historian or reporter who would propose to give a *true account* of the war of the American Revolution, whose true account would be a few allusions to the battle of Bunker Hill, and the surrender of Cornwallis. Such exactly is the Doctor's "*true account*" of the said discussion, with this small difference, that he who would propose to give a true account of a litigated matter, would rely upon something more than his own testimony; but the Doctor thinks his account must be regarded as *true* because it is *his* account. Now I will call it neither a true nor a false account, but no account at all of said discussion; and will, moreover, add that the representations given of some incidents, or certain allusions to some parts of that discussion in this book, are *exceedingly false*: and for this I offer my testimony—as all that

Mr. Jennings had to offer is his own testimony. Where we are both known and unknown this will pass as it ought to do, just for as much as it is worth. If it be replied that both are promissory notes, and not a legal tender- I rejoin that although neither can be by law forced upon our creditors, still the paper will be as current amongst our friends and acquaintance, as the responsibility and integrity of the endorsers are known to them.

The Doctor has the advantage over me in appearance—His nephew endorses for him, and vouches that it is a true account. But there are two objections against his signature: the first is, that he is rather a *drawer* than an *endorser*, depending upon the *quid pro quo* for the editorship, &c. and also that if even he could prove that he bestows his labor, press, and type, &c. and derives nothing from the sale of the "Debate on Campbellism," yet we can prove an *alibi* in this case—that is, that he was not within hearing of the discussion; being, at that time, more than five hundred miles distant, and this, it will be conceded, is rather an inconvenient distance to hear distinctly, go that notwithstanding the endorsement of *Nephew S. C. Jennings, Editor, Pittsburg*, still the credibility of the *true* account rests upon the defendant's own testimony, without a solitary witness. Strange, too, that, having had my narrative of said debate in his hands for nearly a year, and living in Nashville, he could not find two disinterested witnesses to prove my narrative false, and his account true! In looking back I perceive he proposed a "*History of Campbellism*," as well as a *true* account of said debate. But he changed his plan, and resolved to call his book a "*Debate on Campbellism*," thinking, no doubt, that title would sell it better, and the purchaser would not find the cheat till he had got through the book, and then he might laugh at his simplicity. After all, this may, perchance, be a trick of the editor rather than of the author: for, indeed, the book makes its appearance under such suspicious circumstances, and so long after date, that we know not whether the living or the dead is most to be blamed for these pious frauds.

### **THE DESIGN OF THE BOOK.**

As the reputed author of this book (and we shall regard it, in the aggregate, as the work of its reputed author, ) has passed "that bourne from which no traveler returns," I find myself obliged to say as little as possible, nothing, indeed, touching either his motives or character. They have both undergone the scrutiny of that Judge who never errs, and from whose

decision there is no appeal. His work, posthumous as it is, however, lives; and whether its life be short or long, potent or impotent, it has in it a design, and that design is to impede, and, if possible, to withstand the cause of which I am but one humble pleader. But unfortunately for the author's design, he seems to have identified myself and the cause to which I have devoted the prime and vigor of my life, and which, in my youth, I vowed to God, at all hazards, to maintain. Having, then, identified myself and the cause, he imagined that whatever wounds and reproaches he could fasten on me, would cleave, like a leprosy, to the whole cause. Egregious mistake! The alleged sacrifice of Servetus, did not destroy Calvinism. Were I as great a reprobate as he would seem to have *wished* me to be; (for he that seeks to asperse any character, always desires documents, ) still the cause would prevail athwart and in defiance of all that any one friend or foe can do. But he seems to have fallen into this mistake, and, therefore, the book is but a tissue of abuse, interspersed with an elaborate defence of his own theory, and an attack upon what he either imagined or wished my views to be.

He, however, overacts his part, and discredits himself. According to his representation the spread of this obnoxious heresy is not owing to the talent, learning, moral character of its pleaders; nor to the scriptural evidence of its truth and reasonableness. The philosopher will ask how can this be? He can imagine how a cause exceedingly plain, intelligible, and scriptural, may seize the public mind without either learning or talent on the part of its advocates; or, perchance he may be able to comprehend how a cause not very plain, intelligible, or scriptural, may spread by the learning and talent of those who plead it; but how it can succeed alike destitute of character talent, learning in its pleaders; simplicity, evidence, authority in itself, will be to him wholly incomprehensible.

But we have said the prominent and most apparent design of this book is to lessen and impair my reputation, in the hopes of saving the "evangelical sects" and impeding the cause of reform. This, rather than argument, is relied on by this champion of orthodoxy. Over the pages of this volume I find myself accused of certain high crimes and misdemeanors, which are comprehended in the following characteristics: —I come from the pencil of Mr. Jennings depicted as *one ungrateful to Presbyterians, sinister in my designs, a false accuser, a disguised infidel, a false teacher, a mere natural man, unregenerate, unitarian, and deceitful.*

Surpassing strange, that a decent book cannot be written by one of these

defenders of the "evangelical sects," and that we cannot be met according to the ordinary rules of common courtesy, on the arena of fair and manly (to say nothing of gentlemanly) discussion. Is it so that sectarian religion can be sustained in no other way? that the man, the citizen, the gentleman, the Christian, must always be interred in the partizan polemic. To hear or see persons professing spirituality, heavenly mindedness, illumination and inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, seizing the carnal and worldly weapons of slander, detraction, evil surmising, and evil speaking, to defend what they are pleased to call the "spirituality of religion," is not only nauseating to a Christian taste, but in battle array against all pretensions to the Holy Spirit of him, who, when he was reviled, reviled not again.

How to treat such charges coming from such a quarter at this time of the day—whether to smile at the folly, pity the imbecility, or bewail the frailty of the author—whether to reason in serious mood, or in irony against such impertinence, or to pass by in dignified silence such gratuitous detractions, is a question which Solon, perhaps, would have answered one way and Solomon another.

For our own part we have sustained the continued cannonading of all the big and little batteries in the "evangelical sects" for so long a time without loss of limb or of blood, that we cannot be frightened with such musketry and noise as now comes from the fort of Presbyterianism, manned and governed as it is. But as a matter of courtesy to our readers, we shall give them a very brief view of the specifications by which these accusations are sought to be sustained. And we shall set them before them in the order which has already been sketched: —

1. *Ingratitude to the Presbyterians.* —This I choose to place first on the list, because the nephew and the uncle have both reiterated the charge. It has been, I am told, a constant theme in the paper edited by S. C. Jennings, so often as my name is introduced. Ingratitude! This is a crime of no ordinary magnitude. An ungrateful man, with me, is a man that is devoid of all that is manly, good, and fair – of every noble, and generous, and magnanimous feeling and sensibility. But before there can be ingratitude on the one part there must be favor conferred on the other. And what claims have Presbyterians on me? I never received from them any Presbyterian favor. I have received from them no favor more than from Methodists, Quakers, Baptists, or any other sect in Christendom with which I am acquainted. But this Mr. Jennings says, is susceptible of proof that certain favors were

bestowed upon my father by different branches of the Presbyterian church. And on inquiry I have found what the favors alluded to were. That the foundation of this charge may appear in all its logical and rhetorical force, beauty, and magnanimity, I will state the case as I have learned it.

*My* father labored as a minister of Presbyterianism among "different branches of the Presbyterian church" for some two or three years before his family arrived in the United States. He came to see the country before he would conclude to adopt it for himself and family. The embargo, and finally the non-intercourse measures of Jefferson's administration occurring, prevented for a time the possibility of their migration. They finally seized an opportunity, by no means eligible, of embarking, and were at a very inclement season of the year shipwrecked on an island on the coast of Scotland, with the almost entire loss of every thing save life. On hearing this, the congregations where he was accustomed to labor, not only stately, but occasionally, did, of their own accord, make a specific contribution with a reference to this calamity—to what extent, whether considered as an equivalent for his labors, or transcending them, I have never ascertained. But so it is, that these same high-minded and generous Presbyterians have not forgotten it, and, as it would appear, yet regard it in the light of a retaining fee, binding on father and son and their descendants forever to the interest of the Presbyterian church, and do now hold me in the second generation, and, for ought I know, will hold my children and grand children bound by an everlasting covenant to preach Presbyterianism! For my part, I have some few feeble reasons to offer why I should not regard it in this light. I do know that my father, whom I have not seen for eight months, did, while in the Presbyterian connexion, sacrifice always his temporal interests to the interests of that church; and though never very rich, yet always having it in his power to have much more than a competence, did so much set the spiritual interests of men above his own temporal interests, that I hold the Presbyterian church in some of its branches greatly indebted to him, both in Ireland, Scotland, and these United States; and as these spirits value every thing in gold, silver, or brass, I doubt not, should they come to settle their accounts with him, they will find themselves much, in his debt, a large balance on the other side.

But yet it seems Mr. Jennings the editor, and his uncle, regard me as ungrateful to the aforesaid amount, according to the meaning and design of their covenanted blessings by virtue of the Abrahamic charter. Well, now, to meet them on their own premises, if the said S. C. Jennings will ascertain the

amount due from me, or how much was fixed upon my services, that I may cut off the entail and be honest in Presbyterian arithmetic, I will engage at proper intervals to "preach as many sermons" to the aforesaid congregations as there are units in the quotient of said sum divided by *six*. If any one ask the mystery of the figure 6, I will explain it. It is not that there are six working days in every week; but because some twenty-five or thirty years ago *six* dollars was considered a reasonable allowance for one sermon two hours long. For every sixty dollars in said sum I will deliver ten discourses, two hours each, as soon as the Presbytery furnishes me with a list of appointments. The interest due may be added to the principal; and that I may be honest and grateful in their arithmetical views of honesty and gratitude, I will pay the uttermost farthing in the true intent and spirit of their demands against me. In this way we repel this most puissant argument in favor of the soundness of the doctrine of "the evangelical sects," this most illustrious monument of the noble and *high-minded* policy of the Presbyterian church.

2. *Sinister in my Designs.* —Mr. Campbell, as the reward of his labors, is now richer than some ten Presbyterian ministers, and with a reference to this he commenced his operations, refused a salary amongst the Presbyterians because it was not large enough, and chose his present course because more likely to enhance his fortune. This is the substance of the specifications under this imputation. All my sins are venal except one. For more than twelve years before I became an editor, I labored in the word and teaching, traveled a good deal, and spent much time and money in the labors of what is usually called a minister of the gospel, for which I received no earthly remuneration. So soon as I commenced the editorship of the *Christian Baptist* I also wrote several essays against the hireling system. These two—my practice for so many years, and these essays, constituted a *mortal* sin against such men. as Mr. Jennings, who, within my own recollection, had the charge of three Presbyterian congregations, always migrating in obedience to a *louder call*. On one occasion, some seven years ago, in reference to some things written on the clergy, he is reported to have said that *I was as bad as the Devil* This sin has no forgiveness. It is infidelity, unregeneracy, unitarianism, and universal heterodoxy. I never did say that those who *labored* in the word and teaching ought not to be sustained by the brethren for whom they labored, or by whose appointment they labored for the benefit of others. But some cannot, or are unwilling to discriminate between him who prepares himself for the office, learns the trade, and him who comes forward at the call and solicitation of the brethren— between



supplying the necessary wants of him who *labors all his time* in obedience to the call and appointment of the brethren, and him who hires himself out for the Sabbath and the pastoral office at a certain per annum, in obedience to which he shapes his course through life. But this sin cannot be expiated. My motives are assailed, the most unjust suspicions uttered, and it is told that I am now richer than some ten Presbyterian preachers, and of course become so since I became an editor. This is the impression sought to be made; and yet he who knows so much of my circumstances as to declare to the world how rich I am, certainly knows that if I am *now* as rich as some ten Presbyterian preachers, I *was* ten years ago before I ever issued a prospectus?

Were any of our friends as ingenious in finding arguments to commend, as our opponents are to censure our course, perhaps they might find cause to show that we had as good a *chance* of receiving during the last twenty years as much as Dr. Brown or Dr. Jennings did receive per annum; and this *twenty thousand dollars*, the wealth of some twenty Presbyterian preachers, might have been superadded to the wealth of the ten: for had we been disposed to write and publish, we would have had better facilities in connexion with the *honorable, wealthy, and popular* Presbyterians, of obtaining both wealth and honor, than in our present or past ungrateful course. Could we not, if we had loved orthodoxy, been now as rich as Dr. Brown or Dr. Eli, or some of those Doctors who possess the wealth of some fifty Presbyterian preachers. I wonder if any of our opponents ever thought of this. Now if a bad cause can be made so plausible, might we not have made the good cause of Presbyterianism most attracting?

I never, indeed, wished for wealth, I never desired riches so much for any purpose as for that which has obtained this enmity—the means of exposing extensively the errors, faults, and rottenness of those systems which have been sustained by wealth and worldly policy. If our opponents could strip us of this means, they are aware they could do more for themselves than by all their logic and rhetoric; and this appears to us the real cause of this invidious, mean-spirited, and pusillanimous attack. Be assured, gentlemen, that we desire to be still richer, and to have it in our power to distribute, among other means of doing good, many ten thousand tracts like this, without charge, in reply to such speculations as this *75 cents worth of slander*, sold upon your avowal, so high for the benefit of Presbyterianism, or, what is the same thing, for the benefit of the family of a preacher of Presbyterianism! So we dispose of the second argument in proof of

Presbyterian orthodoxy.

3. *A False Accuser.* —My recklessness of truth, the false assertions with which my narrative of said debate abounds. This is often reiterated, and may be, from the consequence he has attached to it, placed No. 3. of the specifications against me. Serious charge against any man, even as a citizen; more serious against a professor of religion; most serious against one who publicly preaches Christ. — Ought it not, candid reader, to be well sustained? And is it? NOT IN ONE SINGLE INSTANCE. Even when he formally makes the charge, he 'alters on page 79. Was there ever from a lawyer, except Mr. Jennings, such a *come-off* as the following?—

"I am aware it has been alleged that I have, in my proposals for this publication, evinced not only a want of Christian charity, but of a due regard to decorum, by the allegation that the narrative of Mr. Campbell abounds with *false* assertions. And if such be not the fact, it is distinctly admitted that in making such a charge, I am justly reprehensible, and that in no slight degree, but my only apology or defence is that the *allegation* is TRUE. And for the truth of it, so far as it regards not only the assertion of Mr. Campbell, just noticed, but others which I shall, in the sequel, have occasion to notice, I can confidently appeal to the whole of the congregations who attended the discussion. Notwithstanding in his assertions, which are alleged to be *false*, Mr. Campbell holds the affirmative, and consequently the burden of the proof lies upon him, yet positive proof of the incorrectness of some of them at least, can, if required, be adduced. "

I must, then, prove my assertions true in order to aid Mr. Jennings, to prove them false. But if he is hard pressed he will hereafter prove it. So, then, himself being judge, the charge is not sustained in this book; but he says if positive proof of the *incorrectness* (a new modification of the word *false*) of some of them, at least, "can, if required, be adduced." Thus the "true account" and the "false assertions" are both yet to be made out—and proved if REQUIRED!!

"*Incorrectness*" only! Well I would not make oath to every comma, semicolon, nor note of interrogation in my narrative; for Mr. Jennings says he took *notes* only on one evening preceding the debate, and I may have been mistaken about the Sabbath evening when he was observed in attendance the second time. I then thought I saw him use his pencil once or twice; but he says he did not take notes till Friday the 24th. Now admit this, (and yet I have my doubts about it, ) on what ground is the charge of

abounding in false assertions to be sustained. "If *required*" it can be sustained. It is now required! for I repeat that my narrative is just, exactly, and truly what it purports to be. I add, that *no man can prove that I have given one false representation in the sense in which he charges me!* and I now say that I conscientiously think that my report does as much justice to Mr. Jennings as it does to my side of the question. Moreover, my narrative seems to have been the only guide to Mr. Jennings in making out his book as any judicious reader of both may perceive.

I will not now contradict Mr. Jennings's assertions about how we came to have this discussion; but were he here to answer for himself I would treat this part of his *true* account quite differently. On my return to Nashville on the 22d December, it was ringing through the city that Mr. Jennings wished to have a debate, and it was wondered whether I would give him an opportunity after the abruptness of his first attack and retreat. That he had been preparing for a debate, and his friends expecting it, were matters distinctly told me on the evening of my return.

From my previous knowledge of Mr. Jennings' didactic and preaching talents, I thought him not eminently qualified for such a discussion; and therefore could not flatter myself that it would be useful: but as it was so emphatically told me that if he did not get an opportunity, or if I would not give an invitation, offence and reproach would follow, I concluded to devote Christmas day to himself or any other who had ought to say on these matters. This is the true history of the origin of this discussion.

Mr. Jennings was a respectable lawyer, and Dr. Brown in his memoirs informs us that he would have been a pretty good preacher if he had had courage to *speak* and not to *read* his sermons. But what no little astonishes me, is, that he could have had the temerity to publish to the world that he carried any one point in that discussion, unless it was that he got matters generally arranged just to his own liking. But certainly his book shows all the strength put forth on that occasion. Yes, he admits himself that it is more forcible than the debate. If, then, in this book he has not sustained one proposition, all will agree that he did not in the *long talk*; and that he has not sustained one position in the book we may yet show in its proper place.

I hope I shall be pardoned for passing by his other insinuations, as they are unsupported by any specifications. They are the mere overflowings of an alienated mind, disappointed and chagrined at its own imbecility to refute by reason and argument positions hostile to its favorite system. If my work, and

labors, and the reproaches which I have the honor to sustain in my feeble efforts to restore the ancient institution of him who was insulted by the priesthood of his own time, with a very few exceptions; of him who was accused of leagues and treaties with the Devil and his emissaries; I say, if my feeble and unprofitable efforts with the calumny and reproach I have to bear, will not sustain me against the imputation of infidelity, unregeneracy, unitarianism, &c. I consider my saying that I am not a mere natural man, an infidel in disguise, an opponent of the true and proper divinity of the Son of God, will be wholly inadequate and unavailing. I may, indeed, deplore that such foul, ungenerous, unmanly, and *unchristian* imputations may keep some of God's bewildered children from hearing, of reading, or judging any thing which emanates from us; but I bless Emanuel the Lord Messiah, that they only enhance our standing among the saints of God, and cannot injure the cause we plead in the minds of any who either hear us speak, or read what we have to write on the Christian institutions.

I am now chargeable with *egotism* for having spoken so much in my own defence; for the policy of our opponents is to place us in a certain attitude, or to compel us into it, and then to censure us for appearing in that attitude. When my reputation is sought to be identified with the cause of reform, I should, in my judgment, be not only recreant to myself, but to the cause of truth and righteousness, were I not to defend myself from the tongue and pen of the slanderer.

Did I avail myself of the documents furnished by the authors of this book to show how hazardous they appear of the responsibility of waking round and unqualified assertions, I would be represented as-pursuing retaliatory measures. Did they not expose themselves to the detection of a child in this apparent recklessness of truth, it might be more necessary to dwell upon this theme. But I will only give an instance or two to put the reader on his guard.

Brother Jacob Creath whispered something into my ear, or I whispered something into his, previous to the introduction of one of our night meetings in Nashville; and Mr. Jennings, without presuming to have heard what it was, fearlessly asserts that I was suggesting to him what to say, and choosing my own subject for discussion. If he had said he *suspected* it, we might have ascribed it to a suspicious mind; but no, he boldly asserts it, p. 32. "Whilst he (Mr. Campbell) selected his *own* subject, he evidently wished that it might appear otherwise," &c. I simply say it is not a fact.

Again, on page 72, he roundly asserts that Mr. C. "*never has offered*, and never can with propriety offer the prayer of David, Psalm cxix. 18." How did he know what petitions Mr. C. had offered, and what he had not?

On page 82 he avows, "The great object of Mr. C's reformation is not to suppress vice, reprove wickedness, correct abuses of that which is evil, or warn sinners to repent and flee from the wrath to come; but to extirpate the most important doctrines and *institutions* of the gospel!" The book abounds in assertions and avowals as repugnant to truth, to fact, and to religion as these.

### CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.

The remnant of the book contains Mr. Jennings' views of *faith*, mysteries, divine influence, the natural man, defence of the sects evangelical, and of evangelical sectarianism; disquisitions upon the terms schism and heresy; call to the ministry; dissertations upon the new version, on the words *ekklesia* and *baptismos*; the Godhead; regeneration; the uncharitableness of our views—his views of John iii. 5. and of Titus lii, 5—his explanations of sundry texts of scripture—and baptism not essential to salvation. These are the prominent topics, in which he differs not materially from the great majority of the popular sects, whose views, reasonings, and arguments, have repeatedly been renewed and examined in our pages.

We have coveted objections to the new version, and are much pleased to see that Mr. Jennings has tried his hand as a critic upon it. Mr. M'Calla of Kentucky also tried his hand upon it some time since. We only have to regret that illiberality rather than genius, learning, or taste, characterizes these efforts. But such as they are, we shall make the best use of them in the work now under review. That these gentlemen were most incompetent to a work of this sort, will not require much proof. Mr. Jennings, in the work now before me, has, to every impartial linguist, proved his utter incapacity to decide upon even the syntax of a Greek sentence. See his efforts to make *tattle*, Eph. ii. 8. refer to *pistis*. His remarks on Gal. iv. 19. show that he never was initiated into a Grecian temple, or passed the vestibule of an Athenian forum. But these developements we reserve to our regular numbers of the Harbinger.

His very ingenious and unjust effort to censure the version as leaning to unitarianism, shall be placed in full light, with all his complaints against the association of Doctor Doddridge with Presbyterian doctors. It is the translation of *baptisma* which provoked his ire. This is what is most obnoxious to Paidobaptists. This is concealed as much as possible, but it is at the root of the whole matter. But the exposition of this management will appear in our future disquisitions upon this part of his book.

The perplexity of the Doctor on John iii. 5. is as apparent in this book as it was in the debate. At one time he says, "If the phrase "born of water" have any allusion to baptism (which it may or may not, for any thing we know, ) p. 182; and in page 183, baptism—"an attendance upon this ordinance it is not denied produces an outward change upon the condition of its subject, in so much as it is the *only method* of gaining admittance into the visible church or kingdom of God in this world." Reader, remember this. Yet in page 225 he says, alluding to John hi. 5. and to Titus iii. 5. "I think the opinion of others (Westminster Divines, &c. ) to the contrary notwithstanding, there is no allusion to baptism in either of these passages." This change in his views 40 pages of his own reasonings was sufficient to effect.

He seems, however, to settle down upon this position, that "born of water" and "born of the Spirit" mean one and the same thing. Hence he that is born of the Spirit is born of water, and he that is born of water is born of the Spirit. The first clause of the same sentence is to be understood figuratively, and the second clause literally!! and to be baptized in fire, in water, and in the Spirit, are all synonymous in the New Testament!!!

But I shall close the present outline of the character of the debate, with a review of that part of his book which treats of faith. Saving faith with him differs in its *properties*, and not in its quality or strength, from any other faith, page 40. It is the belief of testimony, and not the belief of history. A man can believe in one sense, and he cannot believe without help in an other sense. It is a mystery, and it is not a mystery. It is not historical faith, and yet it includes the belief of history; and what more than history it receives, he has not informed us.

The Doctor represents us as contending for a faith called *historic* faith, in preference to any other. This is not the fact. But we contend that nothing can be called faith that is not the belief of history, and this ground is assumed to show that they who discredit the belief of God's testimony, whether oral or

written, and contend for a faith wrought in the heart diverse from the belief of testimony, are deluded in that one thing, if in no other. If any doctor can tell me any thing which he believes that has not been reported to him in some way, I will concede that faith comes not by hearing, although Paul says it does—but by the Spirit working mysteriously in the heart. This faith he calls natural.

The scriptures on which he chiefly relies to prove his mystic faith, are John xii. 42; James on dead faith; the phrases which speak of "*believing - with the heart*;" faith is the gift of God; and Eph. i. 19. He has denied the quoting of 1 Cor. xii. 9!! but yet contends for Matth. xvi. 17, and adds to it Gal. i. 15, 16, and v. 19—25; 1 Cor. ii. 14; Phil. i. 29; Ps. cxix. 18.

He now says that I *prudently* took no notice of his having quoted and commented on Eph. i. 19. Of this he triumphs no little. Well, I confess I took no notice of it, because I forgot it: but sure I am, he ought rather to have blushed than to have triumphed here; and to thank, rather than to upbraid me for my silence on this passage. I shall now give the reasons for these remarks, and first let me quote the whole passage—"The eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that you may know what is the hope of your calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of his power to usward, who believe according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Jesus when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." Mr. Jennings viewed this great power towards believers as the power of enabling them to believe: that it requires the same power to work faith in the heart, which was necessary to raise Jesus from the dead. This is his argument— against which I give my vote most unhesitatingly. The connexion shows that the power here spoken of is indeed the power of raising dead bodies to life, of reanimating; and glorifying them, and that God will display the same almighty power towards them who believe, as he did in raising and glorifying his Son. This is in reference to the glory of his inheritance in the saints—this is *the hope of his calling*, as Paul assures the Ephesians in the words foregoing. A greater perversion of scripture to a sectarian purpose, I recollect not to have met with, than the Doctor's gloss upon this passage. It is a power *towards or in behalf of believers*—not a power put forth upon unregenerate men, working faith in their hearts.

The other passages have been so repeatedly shown not to teach that faith is as great a<sup>1</sup> miracle as the raising of Lazarus, that I cannot think of now

running the same round in pursuit of this phantom of man's utter inability to believe God, while it is confessed he is able to believe man. "If we receive the testimony of man, surely the testimony of God is greater." Mr. Jennings has not met in the written argument, (to which he acknowledges he has added so much, ) the arguments submitted, more fully, or pertinently, or convincingly, than in his *viva voce* efforts—indeed he has not attempted it.

The faith by which we are justified, we contend, is a belief of the testimony of God. wrought in the heart by the confirmations of that testimony which God has given to all men who hear his Son in the attestations of the Holy Spirit. It is a faith which *works* by love; *purifies* the heart; *overcomes* the world; comes by hearing, and *is* both supernatural and divine—because the evidence is supernatural and divine. And yet, because we will not say that it is mysteriously wrought in the heart, like no other faith—and that no man can believe, unless the subject of a miraculous power; we are represented as contending for a dead faith, no better than that of demons. Indeed we reformers plead for a living faith, as do not many others: for unless a man's faith is so living and impulsive as so bring him to the water, we affirm it to be no better than a dead faith, or so sickly as little to avail the subject.

We blame the religion, however, more than the man. The father of Presbyterianism was intolerant, and what wonder if his children, although disciplined in a more liberal school, should still inherit a portion of his spirit. Mr. Jennings was of this creation. "A Presbyterian by descent," and I doubt not a sincere one. But his own experience and the testimony of Dr. Brown concur in showing how impotent Presbyterianism is to renovate the man. Mr. Jennings says after he had first eaten the Lord's supper, he regarded himself "as a devil incarnate." "I gave up all for lost, and concluded myself to be a devil incarnate," p. 26. At another time he says, "How delicious, how sweet, how comforting the penitential tear!" This is the genius of the kingdom of which he was a citizen. If any one had then told him that it was the system of his fathers which gave him so much pain and so little enjoyment—that rendered his life little else than an alternation of hope and fear, of confidence and despair, a conflict between the glimmerings of light and the darkness of error, he would no doubt have accused himself and justified the system.

He was at first terrified into the pulpit, and no doubt it was not without reason he had to complain of the fruitlessness of his labors, (p. 11. ) If I had



an enemy, and could wish for him an affliction, it would not be more grievous than to have the last months of his life doomed to making such a book as that before me. "O that mine enemy had written such a book!" But how strange the modes of reasoning and influence of party spirit! Had I been summoned into the presence of my Lord. in the midst of such an undertaking to blast the reputation of the leaders of this "evangelical sect," it would have, no doubt, been regarded and published as a judgment upon me and a signal proof of the divine interposition in behalf of that *ism*, - but as Mr. Jennings was snatched off in the midst of an effort to oppose reformation, it is a consummation devoutly to be wished, to die in the harness, fighting the battles of the Lord; or, at least, only a "mysterious providence. "

It is to be wished that Mr. Jennings may, in his last moments, with a reference to this his last work, have been able to say, "How delicious, how sweet, how comforting the penitential tear!"

*xzx For a more particular examination of other parts of this look, the reader is referred to the September Number of the Harbinger—in which he will find a defence of the New Version, from the imputations of this author.*

EDITOR.

## **NEW VERSION DEFENDED:**

**AND**

### **O. Jennings, D. D. Exposed—No. 1.**

HAVING in our *Extra, No. 5*, given the prominent features of the moral character of Dr. Jennings' book, we now proceed to examine some of its arguments and criticisms. His criticisms on the Greek text and his strictures on the New Version first claim attention.

In our confabulation in Nashville, Mr. Jennings relied on Ephes, ii. 8. as proof that faith is the special gift of God in some supernatural way, to certain individuals. We argued that every thing enjoyed by man is the bounty or gift of God. Such are all his corporeal and mental powers. The five external senses, perception, memory, imagination, judgment, reason, are God's gifts to us: so are food, raiment, education, faith, hope, and charity. But he has his own way of giving us every thing. He bestows food, raiment, education, knowledge, faith, hope, and love, by the use of certain means, and in certain

channels. He gives us faith, knowledge, bread, and water, not by miracle or peculiar interposition; but by stated means or laws from which he does not depart. It is affirmed that he has sometimes fed and clothed men by miracle, and imparted faith, knowledge, and all other things by special interposition; but this is not now the order of things. Ravens feed not our Elijahs. The cruise of oil and the handful of flour of our widows become not barrels. Manna falls not round our tents, nor do our shoes and hats continue new for forty years. No longer can a thousand men feed on one loaf and leave more than two. No light from heaven above the brightness of the sun shines around our persecuting foes, nor are our modern Sauls converted into Pauls by a voice, and impulse immediate from the skies. Faith now comes by hearing the word of God.

Mr. Jennings and they of his school contend that faith in every instance is a special grace, wrought in the heart, by sending the Holy Spirit on a special errand to every elect man, woman, and child; and that unless there be this special errand, and work upon the heart, no man can believe to salvation any thing which God speaks. He affirms that it requires the same power to work faith in the heart which was requisite to raise Jesus from the dead. Consequently the resurrection of Christ is no greater miracle than was the faith possessed by Mr. Jennings and all other persons making the same pretensions!

To sustain this view of faith he quoted Eph. ii. &c. alleging that Paul said that *faith was the gift of God* in his sense of the word *gift*. To which we replied, that Paul no where said that faith was the special gift of God. Thus the reader has the matter fairly before him.

The common version of chap. ii. 28. was then quoted: "By grace you are saved through faith, and *that* not of yourselves, *it* is the gift of God." We replied, that the word *faith* could not be the antecedent to the word *that*: for one of the most common rules of syntax decides that "*the relative must agree with its antecedent in gender and number.*" PISTIS, the antecedent, is *feminine*; and TOUTO, the relative, is *neuter*. If, then, *that* refer to faith, the most general rule of Greek syntax is set at naught, and the meaning of ten thousand passages rendered matters of doubtful disputation; for if Mr. Jennings could have sustained his point, he would have subverted the laws of the Greek language, and made the New Testament no better than the dreams of Bunyan.

He quotes Doddridge as asserting that in order to save Paul from a "flat

tautology," it is better to make TOUTO refer to *pistis*, than to reject "the *weightiest* and most natural interpretation, <sup>1</sup> because "judicious critics" have laid so much stress upon syntax." Doddridge is at one time condemned, and at another approved by Mr. Jennings. On *ecclesia* he is heterodox; but in his note upon Eph. ii. 8. he is orthodox. All this is natural enough. Mr. J. in order to set aside this universal rule, goes in quest of exceptions to it, and concluded he had found five besides the text in dispute. Here they are: —

Eph. ii. 8. "For by grace are you saved through *faith*; and *that* not of yourselves; *it* is the gift of God." Phil. i. 28. "And in nothing terrified by your adversaries: which to them is an evident token of perdition; but to you of *salvation*, and *that* of God." Eph. vi. 18. "Praying always, with all *prayer* and *supplication* in the spirit, and watching *thereunto* with all perseverance." Gal. iii. 17. "And *this* I say, that the *covenant* that was confirmed before of God in Christ." 1 Cor. vi. 11. "Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers," &c. "shall inherit the kingdom of God; and such were some of you. "

Here are five instances of similar construction, four of them in proof of the first, in which this rule of syntax is said to be violated. In the first, *pistis*, (faith, ) feminine; in the second, *soteria*, (salvation, ) feminine; in the third, *proseuche* and *deesis*, (prayer and supplication, ) both feminine; in the fourth, *diatheke*, (covenant, ) feminine; in the fifth, *pornoi*, *eidolatria*, *moichoi*, (fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, ) all masculine: and in the four first we have TOUTO, *neuter*, said to *agree* with them; and in the fifth we have TAUTA, *neuter* and *plural*. To these he adds another instance of a different sort. Gal. iv. 19. "My little children (*teknia*, *neuter*, ) of whom (CMS, *masculine*, ) I travail in birth again." These six are adduced in proof that a *relative* may not agree with its *antecedent* in gender and number; or that because six exceptions are found, the rule is not general; and therefore we may make an exception whenever it suits our caprice or prejudice. Such in all fairness and honesty is the proof adduced to prove that Paul calls faith the *gift* of God in the most special import of the word *gift*.

Our objections to this are the *three* following: —

1. Were it fairly proved that there are exceptions to this general rule, it ought to be proved that Eph. ii. 8. (the text in dispute) is one of these. This Mr. Jennings has not attempted; consequently all

his other supposed exceptions can prove nothing in the case. It is absolute tyranny over language to call one word *an outlaw*, and then

summon five others called *outlaws* to prove that the word in dispute is also an outlaw.

2. On the principle assumed a disputant has nothing to do, when pressed with any difficulty, but to declare that what he cannot explain, or admit with safety to his scheme, is *an exception!*

3. But these instances are not exceptions to the above rule; consequently his premises are false. This we shall now prove.

In the first place TOUTO belongs to that class of adjective pronouns called in the grammars used in Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dublin, and in North America, *demonstrative*; and this class of pronouns being both adjective and relative, each of them is subject to the most general rule in syntax—*it must agree in gender and number with that to which it refers, whether antecedent or consequent*. There is not a rule more universal in the Greek or Latin language.

But there is another rule, of which our author seems to have been altogether ignorant, which sweeps off at one brush four of his six, and explains the mystery of these alleged exceptions. It is in the words following, to wit: —" *When the relative respects a whole sentence it is put in the NEUTER gender.*" No matter what gender precedes it: FOR A SENTENCE IS ALWAYS NEUTER! as, *Meus carus amicus mortuus est, QUOD est mihi summo dolori*—(My dear friend is dead, *which* is a very great grief to me)—*which affair or thing* is a grief to me. — *Me methuskesthe oino, en ho* [neuter] *estin assotia*—(be not drunk with wine, in which (*thing*, not wine, ) is profligacy. We place under this *general* rule four of his examples. "By grace you are saved through faith; and this [thing, or affair, ] is not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. The relative *touto*, [this. ] which is in the *neuter* gender, cannot stand for *pistis*, [faith, ] which is the *feminine*; but it has the whole sentence which goes before for its antecedent." So say Chandler, Macknight, and Dr. A. Clark. Phil. i. 27, 28. "Stand fast in one spirit, striving together for *the faith* of the gospel; and in nothing terrified by your enemies; which is to them an evident token of perdition; but to you of salvation: and this [thing] from God." I have just now examined Adam Clark, Thomson, Pierce, Halet, and Macknight, who concur with the above. But in Griesbach's pointing it is still more plain. He points it thus: —"Which is to them a manifestation of destruction, but to you of salvation: —and this from God, because this has been granted you for Christ," &c. Eph. vi. 18. falls under the same rule. "Praying always with all prayer and supplication;

and *for this purpose* watch," &c. So Macknight, Thomson, *cum multis aliis*. So also Gal. iii. 17. "And this (thing) I say, that the covenant," &c.

The example brought from 1 Cor. vi. 11. is a begging of the question altogether; for *touto* has not for its antecedent nouns of the same gender. The following rule disposes of this example: —"*Two nouns, one masculine and one feminine, are joined with an adjective neuter plural.*" Males and females are included in these nouns: thus some of them are of the common gender.

His sixth and last example falls very naturally under the following rule: "*Relatives often agree with their antecedents, not as to their arbitrary gender, but as to their sense.*" Matthew xxviii. 19, Convert the *nations*, (ta *ethna*, neuter) baptizing them, (*autous*, masculine) —Rom. ii. 14, Col. ii. 19, Rev. xvii. 16. See Parkhurst, page 63, in *Ins syntax*. So in the case advanced, *children* (*tecknia*) neuter, includes both males and females; and as the masculine is more worthy than the feminine, as grammarians say, *hous* refers to the masculine. Neither of these last examples belong to the subject in dispute.

Thus, by the unalterable laws of syntax, we refer each of his examples to well established rules, and show that Mr. Jennings was either ignorant of the genius of the language, or else wittingly imposed upon his readers. The former, we would opine, rather than the latter. Indeed, he asks with such apparent surprize, Where did Mr. Campbell get the word "*affair*" in Ephesians ii. 8? that we must suppose him ignorant of the whole matter.

Must we suppose that he did not know that not A. Campbell, but J. Macknight, found the word *affair*? And did he not know from the Latin grammar itself that an adjective or pronoun in the *neuter* gender, without a substantive, in construction always has *negotium*, signifying *affair*, or *thing*, understood? (In the Greek language, *pragma* represents *negotium*. ) So that *affair* or *thing* is, by the laws of Greece and Rome, comprehended in the word *touto*, standing as it does in Eph. ii. 8.

Macknight's version of this passage is thus sustained by unquestionable authority. It is in perfect conformity with Greek and Latin syntax. We know of no man of any literary pretensions who has presumed to question it. The Latin versions which we have seen agree with it: that of Arias Montanus reads thus—"Nam gratia estis servate per fidem; et *hoc* non ex vobis; Dei donum." The Vulgate, also, "Gratia enim ilia estis servati (et *hoc* non est ex vobis sed Dei donum est. )" The most heterodox English versions, as well as

the orthodox, so read it. One of this class lying before me thus translates it: "For by favor you are saved through faith; and this *salvation is* not from yourselves, *it is* the gift of God." Had the king's translators thought that *touto* referred to faith, they would not have rendered it *that*, but *this*, as referring to the last mentioned, as their manner was. So that we have all versions, and all authority, against Mr. Jennings. So plain is this passage, that I think Macknight's supplement redundant, and wholly unnecessary, though perfectly justifiable for explanation. I also think that the king's translators are awkwardly plain in preferring *that* to *this*. With Griesbach's punctuation it needs no supplement: "For by favor you are saved through faith; and this not from yourselves; the gift of God, not from works: so that no one can boast. "

Some Greek, Latin and English Testaments, like the anonymous version now lying before me, read and print it thus, on the authority of many old manuscripts: "For by grace are you saved through faith, (and that not from us: *it is* the gift of God) but not by works, so that no man can boast." Thus every thing in Christendom is against the gloss of our author.

Thus we dispose of one of Mr. Jennings' censures of the new version, and of the bulwark of his theory of miraculous faith. The above defence, on philological principles, we submit, with all confidence, to every impartial linguist; being persuaded that even among learned deists there cannot be found one, versed in the Greek language, who would hazard his reputation by denying its correctness.

We are of opinion that all Mr. Jennings' criticisms to which we shall object, are as futile and unfounded as this to which we have now attended. It appeared to us expedient to expose it as fully as we have done, although, intrinsically, it is but a very small matter. The reader will, no doubt, perceive how much labor an uncandid and bold opponent, hazardous of his assertions, may impose on any one who is disposed to examine all his glosses, and to dissipate the mist in which he hides the truth frequently from himself as well as from those whom he presumes to instruct. In my soul I pity those who are guided by such critics and theologians, who would vainly attempt to subvert all the established laws of language to carry a favorite opinion.

EDITOR.

## **NEW VERSION DEFENDED, And O. Jennings, D. D. Exposed.**

*No. II.*

### **EKKALESIA.**

MR. JENNINGS, in order to prejudice his readers, as he did his Presbyterian hearers, against the New Version, and myself as its publisher, declaims most vehemently on the injustice done the Presbyterian church in my ranking Dr. Doddridge with two Doctors of the Church of Scotland, in the first edition of that work. On the title page, Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, are called "Doctors of the Church of Scotland." Before the second edition of that work was completed, I ascertained that Dr. Doddridge was in England classified with the Congregationalists, and not with the Presbyterians, and accordingly noticed the fact in said edition. Now, as Mr. Jennings had seen the second edition, and used it during our interview in Nashville, he could not be ignorant (indeed he acknowledges) that we had made such a statement, and consequently he had no just ground for censure on that account.

Seeing the works of Dr. Doddridge in almost all the libraries of Presbyterian preachers; hearing him always quoted with approbation from the pulpits of Presbyterians, though I knew him to be an *Englishman*, I did not at the time of making out the title for the first edition recollect, if I did before know, that he belonged to the Congregational side of the Westminster Creed, rather than the Presbyterian; but as the Presbyterian and Congregational adherents of the Westminster Creed sit in one and the same General Assembly in America, I do not yet consider that any injustice was done Mr. Jennings' church by regarding Dr. Doddridge as a teacher of the Church of Scotland. But in a question of fact as to the sectarian standing of Dr. Doddridge, it is admitted and published in the very book which Mr Jennings used, that he was ranked amongst Congregationalists,

But the real cause of all this outcry is very obvious: Mr. Jennings was a *Presbyterian*, and violently opposed to rendering the word *ekklesia* congregation, as Dr. Doddridge had done. He contended for a church

representative, and Doddridge for an assembly of professed Christians meeting in one place, as filling up the meaning of the word *ekklesia*. Judging of others from his own rules of action, he supposed, or wished others to suppose, that we willingly concealed the fact for the sake of having the testimony of Dr. Doddridge against the Presbyterians. This would be censurable, indeed. But no man of candor can, from any thing found in the new version, admit it; for Dr. Campbell's translation and rule, so far as we thought necessary, are given in vindication of the translation. And although all Dr. Campbell has written on this word is not quoted, all that he has said is substantially given. And the very reason which Dr. C. gave for Detaining the word *church* in Matth. xvi. 18, affirms the very thing for which we contend, that it is there *unequivocally* applied, not to a church representative, but to the whole assembly "who should receive Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of the Living God." I still assert that there is no good reason for departing from the word *congregation* in any one place, because it is more unequivocal than the word *church*. And if Dr. Campbell thought that in Scotland, in his time, there was any more ambiguity in the word *congregation* than in the word *church*, certainly that ambiguity no longer exists, especially in these United States.

After all, our *learned Doctor* admits that the word *church* does not "*literally* translate the word *ekklesia*, but that it is an abbreviation of the words *Kuriou oikos*" but he asserts that it gives the true meaning of the original. That the phrase *house of the Lord* may be a *characteristic* representation of the congregation of Christians, never has been denied by any one, as far as I know; but that it is not a translation of *ekklesia*, is just as generally admitted; and that is the only point here in debate.

On this subject there is no lack of authority. I know of no critic who affirms not the following position: "EKKLESIA denotes an assembly met about business, whether lawful or unlawful." This definition is conceded by all parties. All Lexicons, all critics who have ever written upon the subject, affirm this. We wanted not to make Doddridge a Presbyterian for asserting this. The question is, What word in our language best represents this? church, congregation, or assembly?

Let the reader form a correct estimate of the following *facts* in deciding whether congregation, assembly, or church should be preferred: —

1. The Greek word EKKLESIA, supposed by some to be derived from *ekkalein*, to call out, but by others from the Hebrew *kahel*, an assembly, is



found in the Septuagint very generally applied to the whole assembly or congregation of Israel. Now as things that are equal to the same are equal to one another, and as the Greek and Hebrew-authors of the Septuagint have made *ekklesia* translate *kahel*, and both often represent that which King James<sup>1</sup> translators call *the congregation* of Israel, it follows that, in the judgment of the king's translators of the Old Testament, *ekklesia*. represents an *assembly* or *congregation*; and therefore, where we have *ekklesia* in the Septuagint, we often find congregation or assembly in the common version.

2. In the New Testament we have, in the common version, a very arbitrary departure from this rule. Psalm xxii. 22. we have *kahel* in Hebrew, *ekklesia* in Greek, and *congregation* in the common version; and yet the same translators, in quoting the same words in Heb. ii. 12, adopt the word *church*. Psalm xxii. 22, "In the midst of *the congregation*—(Heb. ii. 12, In the midst of *the church*)—will I sing praises to thee. "

3. The king's translators sometimes render the word *ekklesia*, in the New Testament, *assembly*. In Acts xix. it is found three times translated assembly; for the Greeks used the word *ekklesia* to denote any sort of assembly, whether lawful or unlawful, called out by the magistrates or by themselves.

4. The word *ekklesia* occurs 111 times in the New Testament, and is applied to every sort of assembly; to the Jews in the wilderness, an Ephesian mob, particular congregations or assemblies meeting in cities, villages, and private houses, and to the whole assembly or multitude of the redeemed of the Lord on earth and in heaven.

5. It is translated by the term *congregation* by Drs. Campbell, Doddridge, Macknight, Parkhurst, Adam Clarke, and by Dr. Stuart, the latest translator who has attempted any part of the volume; and time would fail me to tell by how many others, and on how many occasions.

6. Mr. Jennings, so reckless of assertions, says I have no authority from Macknight for this translation. But let the reader examine Macknight on the Hebrews, vol. 5. p. 59, Heb. ii. 12, and see how much dependence is to be put in the assertions of this violent partizan. It is a fact that Macknight translates the word *ekklesia* by our favorite term, *congregation*.

7. The word *congregation*, with us, covers the whole ground of the original term; but the term *church* does not. Any assembly, large or small, special or general, lawful or unlawful, good or bad, may be called an

*ekklesia*, a congregation, but every one knows that only one sort of an assembly can be called a church, incur common acceptance of the term. Besides, the word church, in England and America, as often denotes an assembly of bricks, or stones, or logs of timber, as of saints or Christians.

Now, courteous reader, put all these *facts* together, and then see how much the world is indebted to Mr. Jennings for his abusing me for preferring the word congregation to the word church as a general version of the word *ekklesia*.

But my strongest objection to the word church is because of the abuse of it by some of the sects. It is worried out of all sense and meaning by some of Mr. Jennings' party. With them a *kirk session*, a presbytery, a synod, and the general assembly, are called a church. "*Tell it to the church*" means, with them, tell it to the minister and village elders; in the session house, presbytery, synod, or general assembly in Philadelphia. "The church of God" means, with them, all baptized infants and servants, united with the adults; or any thing and every thing, meeting or not meeting for religious purposes—legislative, executive, or judicial.

To avoid all these cabalistic usages and mystic meanings, we prefer, with all authority from the highest literary tribunals, the word *congregation*, or *assembly*; leaving it to the *epithets* to ascertain what sort of a congregation or assembly it may be.

*Church*, like the word *synagogue*, first meant the *building*; and afterwards the people that met in it began to be designated by the name of the house. With us the term is now so vague that the phrases "Methodist church," "Presbyterian church," "Episcopalian church," as often mean the house belonging to the sect as the sect itself. In this way the word may be used by those who do not wish to discard it from the English tongue; but unless we use it figuratively, and speak of the Christian congregation as the temple or house of the Lord, we can see no propriety in retaining it in an English version of the New Testament, especially as a version of the word *ekklesia* which it is not, never was, and, from its prostitution in our time, never can be

EDITOR.

**NEW VERSION DEFENDED,  
And O. Jennings. O. D. Exposed.  
—No. III.**

**BAPTISMA.**

THE foul imputations which we have had to endure, because we presumed to translate this word, might have made it the bitterest word, to us, in the language of Greece, Rome, or England. What a heat and effervescence of passion has this question about *water* created! It has kindled fires which all the water in the ocean cannot quench. We had all our sympathies and predilections, as well as our interests and reputation, on the side of retaining it in Greek, and allowing it to be translated sprinkling, pouring, or dipping, as every one willed. But the Monitor from above, as well as that from within, said, 'Not so,' and we obeyed. But while obedience is always pleasant to the soul, it is often painful to the flesh; and we have been tortured, as in the Inquisition, for our presumption. If we were to be covered in parchment, scrolled over in the finest hand, the mantle would not contain the opprobrious epithets, hard speeches, and slanderous imputations which have been uttered against us for this our daring contempt of the authority of the Long Parliament, and the Court of St. James 1.

One of those delicious morsels, spiced and seasoned by one of our *warm*-hearted friends, yet stands upon record. Jennings' Debate, p. 144:—"Mr. C. pleads the authority of two of his Presbyterian Doctors in justification of this alteration [*immersion* for *baptism*] from the old version." Drs. Campbell and Macknight have not only *occasionally* translated *baptismos* and *baptisma* by the word *immersion*, but have contended in their notes that such is their meaning.

"What judgment will the reader form, not merely of the candor, but of the *veracity* of Mr. Campbell, when he is informed, that after a careful examination of every passage in the epistles, (the books of the New Testament translated by Doctor Macknight, ) there is not found *one* instance of a translation of either of the Greek words contained in the foregoing quotation, by the word *immersion*, nor one instance in which the Greek verb

BAPTIZO, or any of its variations, is translated by the word *immerse*.

"The only ground which the Bishop seems to have had for the above assertion, so far as it relates to the translation by Doctor Macknight. of the words BAPTISMOS and BAPTISMA, by the word *immersion*, is his commentary upon I Cor. 15: 29. Both the translation and the commentary are here given, that the reader may see upon what slender grounds Mi. Campbell can make a round assertion, when it suits his purpose. The translation reads thus: "Otherwise what shall they do who are baptized (UPER TON NEKRON, supply ANASTASEOS, ) for the resurrection of the dead, if the dead rise not at all? and why are they baptized (UPER TON NEKRON, ) for the resurrection of the dead?" The commentary upon this verse is as follows:—"I told you, verse 22, That by Christ all shall be made alive: and ver. 25, 26, That he must reign till death, the last enemy, is destroyed by the resurrection, *otherwise what shall they do* to repair their loss, who are *immersed in sufferings* for testifying *the resurrection of the dead*, if *the dead rise not at all*? And what inducement can they have *to suffer death* for believing *the resurrection of the dead*?" Further remarks upon this part of the Bishop's assertion, or plea in justification of his conduct, are deemed unnecessary. A discerning public cannot but see that here is a clear development of a part of that system of deception which he has, by means of his *new version*, practised upon the public. "

Veracity! aye, veracity! What a beautiful word!—The want of it, what a frailty! But the contrary, what a vice in any man, and most of all in him who handles the word of God, who is truth, light, and love! With how much apparent pleasure do some spirits attempt to filch away the character, moral and religious, from those whose sentiments differ from their own. If so good a man as Mr. Jennings could so delight in such foul imputations, alas for those who by him were taught Christian good manners!

But what is the matter? We said in note 4th, new version, that Doctors Campbell and Macknight have occasionally translated *baptismos*, &c., *immersion*. Mr. Jennings says this is not veracious—. not true as respects Dr. Macknight. But yet he, discovering his error, or, perhaps, cooling down a little, finds, before he gets to the end of the paragraph, one place where Doctor Macknight, when he comes to explain, in his commentary, the word BAPTIZO, renders it *immersion*, and in fact, quotes from Dr. Macknight, the phrase, the identical phrase, which might have put him to the blush—"What shall they do who are *immersed in sufferings*, for testifying the resurrection

of the dead." Now Mr. Jennings, foreseeing the tendency which this quotation would have to expose his imputation of the want of veracity, prefaces it with the words "*slender ground.*" "Now if a person have *slender ground* for an assertion, he has ground; and unless an assertion be groundless, it is not false. Well, we will give him credit for this contrition, for this repentance, slight as it is. But, gentle reader, the careful perusal which our author says he gave Macknight, and from which he would have you judge of our veracity, is, indeed, but slender ground for your faith in his assertions. "The *only ground?* he says, "which the Bishop (with him a term of contempt, ) seems to have had for the above assertion, so far as it relates to the translation, of the words BAPTISMOS and BAPTISMA, by Dr. Macknight, is his commentary upon 1st Corinthians, xv. 29." To say nothing of the extracts given in note 4th, new version, I will give a new quotation, which shows what sort of careful examination of every passage in the epistles, this gentleman bestowed, on which he imputes so great a fault to me. Will the reader take Macknight's translation, vol. 5, page 181, (Boston edition, in six volumes octavo, ) and read Hebrews ix, 10, both *translation and comment.* I will print it, *literatim et punctuatim*, as it stands in the copy before me—

"Only *with* meats, and drinks, and diverse (*baptismoij*) *immersions\** and ordinances *concerning the flesh*, imposed *until* the time of the reformation." And in his comment, which is always a paraphrase or more liberal translation, he thus speaks, "*Which nothing but meats, and drinks, and diverse immersions and ordinances* respecting the purifying of *the body*, impose." &c.

Now, courteous reader, this is the gentleman who impugns my veracity, and who positively affirms that "there is not to be found owe instance of a translation of either of the Greek words contained in the foregoing quotation, by the word *immersion*—nor *one* instance in which the Greek verb BAPTO, or any of its variations, is translated by the word *immerse.*" "!! Comment is wholly unnecessary.

But in the first, second, and now in the third edition of the new version, the following note is found, taken from Dr. Macknight's explanation of the word *baptism*, as the antitype of the water which

---

\*Doctor Macknight puts in *Italics* the words he prefers to those found in the common version.

---

saved Noah and drowned the world. We thought it better, in the first edition, as we could only give a few extracts, to give those which most fully signify the views of the translators. In tracing the type and the antitype the greatest accuracy is necessary, and here we find Doctor Macknight giving his view of BAPTISMOS in the most full and unequivocal style. As all who read. this have not access to the note, we shall extract a part of it—

"Adam is called the type of Christ, who, on that account, is called *the second Adam*. Thus also the water of baptism is here called *the antitype to the water of the food*, because the flood was a *type* or an *emblem* of baptism in the three following particulars: —First, As by building the ark and entering into it, Noah showed a strong faith in the promise of God, concerning his preservation by the very water which was to destroy the antediluvians for their sins; so, by giving ourselves to be buried in the water of baptism, we show a like faith in God's promise.; that, though we die and are buried, he will save us from death, the punishment of sin, by raising us from the dead at the last day. Secondly, As the preserving of Noah alive, during the nine months he was in the flood, is an emblem of the preservation of the souls of believers, while in the state of the dead; so the preservation of believers alive, while buried in the water of baptism, is a prefiguration of the same event. Thirdly, As the water of the deluge destroyed the wicked antediluvians, but preserved Noah, by bearing up the ark in which he was shut up, till the waters were assuaged, and he went out of it to live again on the earth; so baptism may be said to destroy the wicked, and to save the righteous, as it prefigures both these events: the death of the sinner it prefigures by the burying of the baptized person in the water; and the salvation of the righteous, by raising the baptized person out of the water to live a new life. These things considered, may not our Lord's words to Nicodemus, *Except a man be born again of water*, be an allusion to the history of the deluge, and a confirmation of its typical meaning. For Noah's coming forth from the water to live again on the earth, after having been full nine months in the water, might fitly be called his being *born of water*. Consequently, as baptism is *the antitype*, or thing signified by the deluge, a person's coming out of the water of baptism, may have been called, by our Lord, his being *born of water*."

Mr. Jennings, as a matter of course, took no notice of this. With these documents before him, the reader will judge what sort of spirits they are with whom we have to wrestle, in rescuing the people from the deceptions which are, through a false zeal, attempted to be practised upon them. If so

good a man as Mr. Jennings did act thus in the plainest matters of fact, what opinion must we form of those who, because of their Presbyterian blood and lineage, are induced to defend the sect and the system, as his nephew of Pittsburg lately boasted?

But we will not, on this subject, further defend ourselves from such wanton and imbecile attacks. The reader, if to be convinced at all, must perceive the grossness of slander, and the recklessness of truth, by which sectarianism defends itself, and assails those who oppose its proselyting career.

EDITOR.

## **Remarks on Rev. Dr. Cleland on Campbellism.**

### ***NO. 1.***

SIX essays, headed "CAMPBELLISM," signed, "C." dated from August 1st to September 5th, inclusive, have appeared in the "*Western Luminary*," published from Lexington, Ky. by *Thomas T. Skillman*, and have been *politely* forwarded to us, neither by the author nor the publisher, but by a friend in Kentucky. It is a favor which we gratefully acknowledge (as we do not take the *Luminary*) to be presented with so much *light* on "*Campbellism*" by so respectable and so learned a Presbyterian Rabbi, who, to atone for the inability of Dr. Jennings, Dr. Ralston, Messrs. M'Calla, and all other writers of his brotherhood, whose failures, in the judgment of Dr. C. required this free-will offering at this important crisis, has vouchsafed to us six essays on this most interesting theme.

My correspondent informs me that the "C" affixed to these essays, means Dr. Cleland, a very valorous champion of the Kentucky church militant, whose scars in the battles of orthodoxy would have honored any knight in the most chivalrous days of the crusades against the infidels. In the conclusion of his last essay which reached me (No. 6. ) he says—

"In a word, if I may express my own conviction, every attempt to show

that "regeneration," "born of the Spirit," "born of God." and the like, denote either baptism itself, in any mode, or some immediate effect of baptism, has a direct tendency to expose the simple but sublime religion of Jesus Christ to the derision of its enemies; and ought to be as strenuously exploded as the unscriptural and unintelligible dogmas of transubstantiation and consubstantiation. "

He ought (to have reached us) placed the word *terms* before "regeneration," "born of the Spirit," &c. and have read it thus: — 'To show that the *term* "regeneration," and the *terms* "born of the Spirit,"\* &c. Then he would have come into our territory; but as it is, he is as far from us, as we are from transubstantiation or consubstantiation.

But we quote the last passage for another purpose. He is averse to expose Christianity to the derision of its enemies, and dislikes the views which he ascribes to us, because he conceives them to have that tendency. Well, now, so far we are agreed, that Christianity should not be by any of its friends exposed to the derision of its enemies; and here I would beg the indulgence of Doctor Cleland while I propound it to his serious consideration, whether arguing as we do that the term *regeneration* and the term *baptism* are at least once used by an Apostle as equipollent representatives of the same thing, hazards so much the derision of the enemies of Christianity as the practice of making holy water by the consecrating prayer of Doctor Cleland,. who prays over a bason, that so many drops of the water, and no more than what cleaves to the ends of his fingers, shall be sanctified to the spiritual benefit of the infant,, whose repentance, faith, and conversion are all found by proxy in the flesh of a Presbyterian ancestry? A grave question, Doctor, deserves a grave answer! As you are very sensitive on this point, I beg you to consider well who most subjects Christianity to the derision of its enemies—you who say that a few drops of sanctified water from the fingers of a person on whose head the hands of the priesthood have been laid, dropped on the eyebrows, forehead, or scalp of an infant, born not of the Spirit, but of the flesh; without faith, repentance, knowledge, speech, or volition, except as these are found in the person of a father or a mother, avails to the changing of its state, not of its character, to Us introduction into the covenant and church of Jesus' Christ!!

I pray you, Doctor, to remember how much stress you lay upon the aphorism, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," in your strictures on baptism for remission: and then see



how your few drops, without knowledge, faith, repentance, speech, or consciousness, can avail to the change of an infant born of the flesh, from the visible kingdom of Satan into the visible kingdom of God! When you have shown how this dogma differs from transubstantiation or consubstantiation, then you may fear for the tendency of our views in subjecting the gospel to the de-

---

*\*For a full exposition of the sophism attempted here, we refer our readers to the "Extra Defended," p. 23—28, - in which we are supported by Dr. Stuart of Andover, Moros, Ernesti, Horne, and Michaelis.*

---

risation of its enemies! But till then weep not for us, but for yourself and your brethren, who believe in the translating efficacy of two drops of sanctified water!

But to the numbers on "Campbellism." I have made the last first, for two reasons: —first, because I have not read the five first; and, in the second place, because the last ought to have been both first and last.

The last, or No. 6, begins and ends with an attempt to show how some of the scriptures on which we rely for the proper meaning of Christian immersion, may be so explained as to show that remission of sins depends on repentance, and is connected with repentance alone. Now, lest the reader should think we put a wrong construction on the words of this very erudite Rabbi, we shall let him speak for himself. On Acts ii. 38. he remarks in the following words: —

"The first question here is, With what does remission of sins stand connected' With repentance, with baptism, or with both united' The proper answer shall be given by Peter himself: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come," &c. Acts iii. 19. Here is no mention of baptism in this exhortation of Peter, -which would have been an unpardonable omission, if remission of sins and baptism were inseparable. It is therefore plain, the union of repentance and baptism was not an indispensable condition for the remission of sin. Peter's expression in the first passage, to make it consistent with this and other scriptures, must mean, 'Repent—for the remission of sins, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ.' By this simple collocation of the words, not forbidden by just criticism, nor candid interpretation, it will be seen that remission of sins is in *consequence* of repentance, and baptism is urged *as a suitable mode of a testifying* that repentance, because an instituted rite of entering into a new visible relation

to Jesus Christ, the true Messiah. "

When Peter said, "Repent and be baptized for remission," he meant to leave out baptism, as not at all connected with remission, and intended only to say, *Repent for the remission of your sins*, and "be baptized as a suitable mode of testifying repentance," and not remission!

In Acts iii. 19. we are taught, says he, the meaning of Acts ii. 38. for Peter says, "Repent and be converted for remission." But the Doctor says not one word upon the imperative "*Be converted*," but "Repent that your sins may be blotted out." "Here," he exclaims, "is no mention of baptism!" No, nor of faith, nor of grace, nor of the blood of Christ; and because not mentioned in this verse, we are to learn that remission of sins is without grace, faith, or the blood of Christ!!!

Now, after all the meditations, readings, and watchings of all his predecessors, from W. L. M'Calla in 1823, to August, 1832—after all the debates which Dr. Cleland has read and heard, this is his learned defence of "*Repent for the remission of sins*" From Acts ii. 38. he expunges the words "*Be baptized*," and from Acts iii. 19. expunges the words "*Be converted*," from the connexion in which Peter placed them; and because baptism is not mentioned in every verse, from Pentecost to the year 90, and from Jerusalem to Patmos, therefore it ought not to be taken into the account!

A word to Doctor Cleland, *inter nos*. Doctor, to test your logic, please remember that if Acts iii. 19. explains Acts ii. 38. then Acts ii. 38. explains chap. iii. 19.; or, what is equivalent, both must mean, when explained, the same thing. Now how do you dispose of the *two interpretations*—viz. "*Be baptized*" and "*Be converted*?" Apply your own rule, and how reads this last interpretation—Repent for the remission of sins and be converted "as a suitable mode of testifying repentance?" This is your own logic returned to your own bosom.

Again—(pardon my presumption in speaking so plainly to a Presbyterian Doctor!)—again, I say, to use your own logic, if, as you assert, it would have been an unpardonable omission in Peter to leave out the command, "Be baptized," in his second discourse, Acts iii. 19. if connected with remission: I ask you, on your candor, Doctor, was it not an unpardonable omission in Peter's first discourse to leave out the command, "Be converted," if conversion was necessarily connected with remission? Thus you see that your logic equally excludes *baptism* and *conversion* from any connexion with remission, and contemplates them both as mere. nodes of testifying

repentance!

But we can make your logic still more illustrious. The command to believe and repent are not one and the same thing in your theology; nor do the words *faith* and *repentance* mean the same thing in any dictionary in the world. This single remark, and we proceed. Paul preached to the Jailor, and when asked by the Jailor what he should do to be saved, Paul said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shall be saved." Now how unpardonable in Paul to omit the command, "*Repent*," if, according to you, remission depends alone, or is consequent upon repentance alone. Paul, on *your* premises, makes no account of repentance, conversion, grace, the blood of Jesus, or baptism in the affair of salvation, if his not mentioning them on one occasion to one who inquired what he should do to be saved, is to be regarded as fair argument and rational proof. By this time, Doctor, I think you will excuse me for pushing you no farther with your own logic!

Thus the Doctor over acts his part, and sets all the Apostles at variance with one another, and the same Apostle at variance with himself, in his attempts to expunge the command, "Be baptized," from the place in which Peter placed it when first he opened the reign of Jesus and announced the glad tidings.

I will treat my readers now and then to a few samples of Doctor Cleland's logic and theology. The Presbyterian Doctors are becoming much more alarmed than formerly; because, in defiance of all their talents and address, the ancient gospel is shining into their congregations, and some of their most intelligent members are removing out of Babylon and submitting to Jesus as the only Lawgiver and King in his kingdom.

The Baptist Doctors are generally taking a nap after the fatigues of their numerous campaigns, it is kind in the Presbyterian Doctors to keep sentinel at this crisis, especially as *the heresy* is now upon their borders, if not actually within their camp.

I will, *Deovolente*, show that Dr. Cleland is just as much at fault on the four remaining passages commented on in this No. 6, as in the passage now examined. We thank the Doctor for his efforts, as they will prove to the most intractable of our readers, that, with all the superior pretensions of our Presbyterian Doctors, they are nothing more puissant in the volumes of revelation than our Baptist Doctors.

If the Editor of the Luminary will publish my replies, I will publish all

Dr. Cleland's essays in the Harbinger. I request the Postmaster at Lexington, Ky. to forward one copy of the Harbinger, containing my replies to Dr. Cleland, as I do not know his address.

EDITOR.

## Remarks on Rev. Dr. Cleland on Campbellism.

### *No. 2.*

THE same 6th number yet lies before me; and here it must lie till its merits are fairly and fully tested. The Doctor attempts to meet us on the Scriptures, and in this number takes up some of the passages on which we rely. We have, in our previous number, examined some of his interpretations; and as this is now before our readers, we shall proceed.

We shall again introduce the Doctor, and let him speak for himself. On the term *regeneration* his views are as follows: —

"The term "regeneration" is used by the inspired and ecclesiastical writers, to express *any great change*, whether mental or corporal, physical or supernatural, where any resemblance is discovered between that change and a birth: and as baptism is a *sign* of entering out of the world into the church, and out of a sinful into a holy state, it became customary to express that great change by regeneration, born again, &c. It is plain then, that to be "born of water" is to be baptized, by which we quit a former mode of existence and enter upon a new one, i. e. into a new state of *relative* existence, or enjoyment of external privileges, and consequently of corresponding obligations: whereas to be "born of the Spirit" is an effect of some operation of the Spirit of God in the mind distinct from and superior to. the baptismal rite. In a word, by being "born of water" we become externally and visibly related to the Christian dispensation, we "enter" into the visible church, or kingdom of God. So that as without the external rite of baptism, the outward and visible *sign* of regeneration, no one can "enter" the visible kingdom of the Messiah; so, also, without the thing signified, even regeneration by the Holy Spirit, no man can become a true subject of his

kingdom, or be admitted into it; as belonging "to the church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven. "

The discriminating reader will, no doubt, perceive that Dr. Cleland and we are agreed in several important matters: —

1. That the *term* (oh! that the reader would remark and remember the TERM) *regeneration* is used by *inspired* and *ecclesiastical* writers to express ANY great change; and as baptism is a *sign of entering into ike church, and into a holy state*, it became customary to express that great change by regeneration, born again, &c. *It is plain, then, that to be born of water* is to be baptized. Now this is so far our controversy with Dr. Jennings. We have Dr. Cleland with us against his Presbyterian brother Dr. Jennings.

Cleland says that "the phrases *to be born again* and *to be regenerated* are equivalent;" and that, "it is plain that to be born again is to be baptized;" hence *regeneration* and *immersion* are two TEEMS representing the same thing. We are much gratified to see a Doctor so learned and pious as Dr. Cleland, give his testimony in favor of the true meaning of the term, however he may talk about his theory. To settle the meaning of Bible terms is more than half our business in this generation. If any Presbyterian should ever happen to read this page, I would ask him one question, viz. —Whether two Doctors of the same church, moved and enlightened by the same spirit, taught and accomplished in the same school, can both be credible authority in a question of criticism, when they expressly contradict each other on the import of a word of cardinal import, and in the application of the whole passage in which that word occurs? Dr. Jennings not only says, but undertakes to prove, p. 225, *that there is no allusion to baptism* in the phrase "*being born of water,*" or in the phrase "*washing of regeneration.*" "And Dr. Cleland says, "It is plain, then, that *to be born of water, is to be baptized!*"

To return to the extract: —The reader will also observe that Dr. Cleland agrees with us in two other important items: —

2. That without baptism no one can enter the visible kingdom of the Messiah.

3. That by baptism "we quit a former mode of existence, and enter upon a new one." The unbaptized or unregenerate are, then, out of the visible kingdom of the Messiah, and have not entered upon this new mode of existence.

I will not pause to debate with the Doctor the principles on which he

justifies himself in living out of the visible kingdom of the Messiah, and in not entering upon this new mode of existence, as he yet refuses to be baptized. He has never, on his own showing, come into the visible kingdom of the Messiah; for he never *came* to be baptized. And certainly if his father had carried him, while an infant, into a Turkish Mosque, and had circumcised him according to the Mahometan custom, he would not, on that account alone, claim the privilege of being a Mahometan, nor think it reasonable that he should be condemned to such a profession, because his father had him circumcised. But I will not now debate this question, but proceed to the subject before us.

The Doctor very discreetly says, "There must be a resemblance between a change and a birth, before we can denominate that change *a being* torn." Now it devolves upon him to show what resemblance there is between any operation *upon the mind* of an adult, or *upon the face* of an infant, and a birth; before he can call the throwing of two drops upon the face *a being born of water*, or any operation upon the mind *a being born of the Spirit*. But on these difficulties I will not now press him too hard.

Baptism brings a man, he says, into the visible kingdom. Is there any spiritual blessing in belonging to the visible kingdom? If there be, what is it? If there be not, why baptize any person? It is easier for me to ask these questions than for the Doctor to answer them. I confess it. But his views make them necessary and pertinent. The Doctor felt these difficulties; and therefore he says—

"Without the rite of baptism, or the external administration of baptismal water, we are not initiated—do not visibly and legally "enter" the kingdom of God here below; yet the absence of this rite will not, of itself, preclude the man who is "born of the Spirit," from the kingdom of God above. "

He docs not help the matter much here; for he says, "The absence of this rite" is no detriment in the way of admission into the heavenly kingdom. Of course, then, all the blessings of his baptism are worth nothing to the baptized; and unless they are some interest to the baptizer, they are good for nothing. What a cypher Dr. Cleland's baptism! It has nothing to do with salvation, neither here nor hereafter. It secures no spiritual blessing in this life; has no connexion with the remission of sins here; and the absence of it will not preclude admission into heaven. It is necessary to legal admission into the church below; but in this visible church there is neither pardon of *sin*, nor adoption into the family of God, necessarily connected with it.

Certainly his definitions and comments have respect to the sprinkling of infants, and not to the immersion of one begotten by the Spirit! On Titus iii. 5. he says—

"According to his mercy he saved us, by *the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.*" By a careful examination of every passage in the New Testament, in which the term *regeneration* is used, or words of similar import, it will be found that this text and John iii. 5. are the only ones in which there can be supposed any direct allusion to baptism. And after a candid examination, had we nothing else to guide us but the *abstract* view of these texts, they might well be deemed *ambiguous*; but if so, we could not allow them to be at all *decisive*. There are other texts which are sufficiently plain and explicit on the subject; and therefore, according to all just rules of criticism, *what is ambiguous* ought ever to be interpreted by *what is not ambiguous.* "

Yes, Doctor; and you know as well as I, that the word *regeneration* occurs only in this passage, and in another, which we both agree has reference to another subject. Why, then, blindfold your reader by saying, "every other passage in which the term *regeneration* is used!" The *ambiguity* complained of in Titus iii. 5. is wholly of your own creation; and even when you have done your utmost, 'it is only *ambiguous* whether you have even made the *term* ambiguous in this instance. There is not another text in the book, less *ambiguous*, by which you can decide its meaning here. To say that the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit are one and the same thing, is a mere begging of the question in dispute. This passage you admit *may*, after all, mean both baptism and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and as you have to concede this, its evidence is directly against you in this discussion.

On 1 Peter iii. 21. he says—

"Another text adduced for the same purpose, is 1 Peter iii, 21: "The like figure, whereunto even baptism doth also now save us," &c. With this text right under his eye, Mr. Campbell makes the Apostle Peter speak what he never intended, and utter a meaning which his own words will not justify. He says, "Peter averred that immersion *saved* us, purifying the conscience through the resurrection of Jesus." Again, "Peter taught all the saints in Pontus, &c. that the water of baptism saved them, as the water of the deluge saved Noah in the Ark; and that in immersion a person was purged from all his former sins." Such a perversion as this—such a libel on an inspired

Apostle, appears almost akin to the sin against the Holy Spirit. By such an invention as this, every hypocrite, from Judas and Simon Magus, down to the present day, are taught "that in immersion they are purged from all their former sins. "——

Now, candid reader, mark the apparent wrath and the glaring slander couched in these terms, "Almost akin to the sin against the Holy Spirit!" What an ebullition of wrath! But observe the slander: We say, "Peter taught every *saint* in Pontus," &c. and "by such an invention as this," says Dr. Cleland, "we teach that every *hypocrite*, from Judas and Simon Magus down to the present day, are [is] taught that in immersion their former sins are purged." Is "not this slander of the first degree—to say, that because we teach that the sincere believers have remission of their former sins in immersion, therefore we teach that all *hypocrites*, like Judas, &c. are purged from their sins in immersion? In this way, and in this way only, Dr. Cleland can dispose of our argument from 1 Peter iii. 21.

I will now treat the reader to Dr. Cleland's gloss on this passage: — "Christ is the true Ark. Being convinced of sin and danger, and moved with fear, into this Ark do men enter by faith, and are saved. Upon a profession of their faith in the "resurrection of Jesus Christ," as he was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification, they are admitted into the Christian church by baptism. This baptismal water forms, as it were, the *sign* of their safety; and is *subsequent* to their entrance into the spiritual Ark, as the waters of the deluge were *subsequent* to Noah's entrance into the temporal Ark. And as the water could not save him *without* the ark, nor bring him into it; so neither does the mere outward administration of baptism save any one without a saving interest in Christ, nor can it possibly avail to effect a spiritual union to him, nor procure a saving interest in him. "

The pith of this gloss is in one sentence exposed. "He says, water could not save him without the ark." And who says it could? But, take notice, reader, the ark could not have saved him without the water! So reads the gloss.

Baptismal water is the *sign* of the safety of infants. Illustrious sign, without any thing *signified!* A sophism, to which Paidobaptists are prone, is conspicuously set before us here. The allusion is not to "baptismal water;" but to *immersion* in water. "The like figure, baptism," (and not "baptismal water, ") "now saves us," says Peter. But Dr. Cleland says, "baptismal water!" This attempt to correct the diction of the Spirit is not *almost* any sin



in Dr. Cleland!

A treatise on *signs* would be of some use to such Doctors as my friend Cleland. The Confession and Catechism say, "Baptism is a *sign of* engrafting into Christ, and of the remission of sins;" but where is the thing signified in the case of infants? Does it signify that they were before baptism, at baptism, or after baptism, engrafted into Christ and washed from their sins? Dr. Cleland will have to write six essays on the solution of the question, *Whether at, before, or after the sign, the thing signified is to be expected.*

By the potency of signs, without meaning or any thing signified, he despatches Acts xxii. 16. "Be baptized and wash away thy sins, Paul;" "Be baptized, Paul, as a sign or token that your sins are washed away"!! There are probably but three sorts of signs as respects time: These are commemorative, prophetic, and concomitant signs. The first are memorials, and may be often repeated; such as the passover and the Lord's supper. Concomitant signs cannot be repeated, but must accompany the thing signified. Prophetic signs may be often repeated, and exist long before the thing signified, as the various sacrifices of the Jewish and Patriarchal Institutions. A *sign* may be also a *seal* viewed in two aspects. It may be a *seal* of the past, and a concomitant *sign*, as was circumcision to Abraham, a *seal* of what he before possessed, and a *sign* of his actual separation to God. This is tons the plain doctrine of *signs*; and if we make baptism a *sign* only, it can be neither commemorative nor prophetic, but must be concomitant. If, then, Paul's baptism was only a *sign* the thing signified was the actual and personal remission of his sins; of which his immersion was a concomitant sign. It was neither commemorative of a previous remission, nor prophetic of a future remission.

Mr. Cleland mistakes, or grossly misrepresents our views. I will, for his benefit, state them once more to him, with all brevity, and, I hope, with all perspicuity. We regard the blood of Jesus Christ, as the procuring cause of the remission of sins; faith in God's testimony as the principle of our enjoyment of remission; and immersion as the means divinely appointed for our actual enjoyment of this first and greatest of present blessings. Immersion, nor faith, procures remission. The blood of Jesus, through the favor of God, procures; faith apprehends; and baptism takes hold of the boon of Heaven, or is the means of our enjoyment. "What God has joined, let no man separate." "He that believes, and is baptized, shall be saved."

EDITOR.