

MOBLEY-LEWIS DEBATE.

It was our good fortune to attend a public discussion between Bro. Wm. E. Mobley, of Elkton, and the Rev. T. D. Lewis, of the M. E. Church, Russellville, which was held at Allensville, Ky., beginning Feb. 10th, and continued four days. It will be remembered, that these gentlemen had one at the same place last November, discussing two propositions—viz., one involving the action of baptism,—the other the subjects of baptism—both parties agreeing to postpone the other two until the 10th of Feb.

There were present quite a number of preaching brethren of both sides, besides a large concourse of people from different parts of the State and elsewhere. It was expected that the same moderators who presided at the last, would also at this, but God had otherwise ordered, for since the last he had called Bro. C. M. Day from his earthly labors of love and work of faith, to the enjoyment of eternal life and a home in heaven. Bro. A. L. Johnson was chosen by Bro. Mobley in his place, and in the absence of the Rev. T. C. Peters, Rev. J. W. Emerson was moderator for Mr. Lewis.

Elder Dickens, president moderator.

First proposition: "The New Testament Scriptures teach that the baptism in water of a believing penitent is a condition of pardon." Bro. Mobley affirms; Bro. Lewis denies. In the beginning of his speech, Bro. Mobley very feelingly and appropriately alluded to the death of Bro. Day, whose labors had so long been identified with this people—and none knew him but to love him. Bro. M. then claimed the privilege of using his half hour, or so much thereof as may be necessary, in making an explanation of a statement made by him in the last debate, to which Mr. L. could not reply, but attempted one subsequently in a published letter. Mr. L. said that there were quite a number of manuscripts which translated the word *baptizo*, to sprinkle. He (M.) ventured the assertion, indeed positively affirmed that there is not in existence a Mss., that so translates the word *baptizo*, and called on Mr. L. to produce one, or the evidence that there is such. In this letter (here Bro. M. read the letter of Mr. L.) he appeals to Dr. Baker, of Russellville, a learned Baptist scholar and critic, who gives several manuscripts, which have in Rev. xix: 13, the word *bebammenon*, from which two or three ancient translators, have rendered the word, to sprinkle. Will my friend L. never learn the difference between an ancient manuscript of the New Testament and a translation. The Divine Spirit, dictated while inspired men wrote—hence the Mss. is the expressed will of the Spirit—other persons copied from these. Hence a copyist does not translate, but transfers; he has no right to change a single word or letter. Here Bro. M. referred to a similar statement made by Mr. Campbell in his debate with Mr. Rice. With a great deal of triumph Mr. Rice produced three versions—the Syriac, the Ethiopic, and Vulgate, which translated *bebammenon*, to sprinkle, to which Mr. Campbell replied: "The case alleged as an objection (and it is the only single objection, which, in all ages, can be brought against my third argument) is this, that the word *bebammenon*, a passive participle of *bapto*, not of *baptizo*, in the common Testament rendered "dipped," as it ought to be, but in the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Vulgate is rendered "sprinkled," * * *

"Origen, who flourished early in the second century, quotes this passage and its context, from verse 11-16, and for *bebammenon* reads *errantismenon*, a participle passive from *rantizo*, which signifies 'to sprinkle.' Now the probability is, that Origen quoted from another reading, or a more ancient copy; and if the Syriac copy alluded to was before Origen's time, it would corroborate that conclusion. The fact also, that Jerome, the real author of the Vulgate, has it, he having been the translator of Origen's Greek works into Latin, the more confirms a different reading.

Unless, then, it can be proved that they had the present reading before them, it is wholly idle urge this solitary verse, as an exception to the universal practice of the whole Christian world, in all time."

About 40 years pass away, when the celebrated Tischendorf discovers, in a monastery of Mt. Sinai, one of the most ancient manuscripts now in existence, in which is found, in Rev. xix: 13, the word *rantizo*, or one derived from it.

Remarkable prophecy this of Mr. C., and how truly has it been fulfilled!

Well may the pedobaptist world stand amazed and wonder, what next? (Time out.)

To this Mr. L. expressed great surprise, and that if he had misrepresented Mr. M., he was ready and willing to rectify, but to open anew the old discussion, he was not now prepared; and that if Mr. M. was not satisfied, why he would satisfy him at any time in the future that the gentleman might designate. Such, in brief, was the reply of Mr. L. to the Mss. controversy. Having still 15 minutes he led off in the proposition. He would call attention to the meaning of the word "condition," as defined by Webster, viz., "terms of a contract, stipulation, that which must exist, as the ground or necessary adjunct of something else,"—illustrates from a rebellious soldier, land title, etc. If then baptism is a condition of salvation, it follows that no man can be pardoned without baptism. God does not compromise—men might. "Heaven and earth may pass away, but my words shall not."

All protestant, orthodox denominations are a unit on the fundamental principles of religion, but differ on very small matters, the geering, government of the church, etc., but not so with Mr. M's church. They stand alone. If we are right, they are wrong, and if they are right, we are wrong. They come to you with another gospel. Reads from *Christian Baptist*, page 23: "The worshiping establishments now in operation throughout Christendom, increased and cemented by their voluminous confessions of faith, and their ecclesiastical constitutions, are not the churches of Jesus Christ, but the legitimate daughters of that Mother of Harlots, the church of Rome."

They ridicule the idea of experimental religion, but Mr. Campbell got religion—good old-fashioned religion—and that too on *dry ground*.

Bro. M.—Don't deny that we differ from the so-called orthodox denominations—willing to be—but am more willing to work that we may all be *one* in "the faith once delivered to the saints." But why did Mr. L. make this division—an appeal to the prejudices of the people, but to enlist their sympathies? Prejudice! I despise it! we appeal not to it, not to your affections or hearts, but to your intellect, your head, your judgment. The question before us is one of fact, to be settled by fair argument, appealing to the word of God. Then to the law and to the testimony let us go. The proposition is not whether a man *can* be saved without baptism, or involving the possibilities of God's power, what he can or can not do, or what has become of the pious of all ages, infants, idiots and heathen, but, is Christian baptism a condition of pardon?

My first argument, in proof of this proposition, is drawn from the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, recorded in Acts ix: 22, and 26th chapter. Here we have a man full of prejudice, but true to the convictions of his conscience—verily thought he was right, and was very zealous in all this.

Being on his way to Damascus, was stricken to the earth and heard the voice of the Lord!

Now we read in 1st Tim. i: 16, that Paul says, he was a "pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him (Christ) to life everlasting."

Then when this voice replied that "I am Jesus,"—Paul believed. Hence he writes, that "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Next he is a penitent, and prays to God, and with all this, he

has not come to pardon yet; he does not yet know the will of the Lord. See Acts xxii: 14. If he is pardoned, Paul does not know it, neither does Ananias, for A. must come to him and tell him *what to do*, verse 16. "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Therefore we conclude that baptism is a condition of pardon.

My second argument, is founded on 1st Peter iii: 21. 1st, God spoke to Noah. 2nd, He believed God. 3d, He obeyed God. Noah's salvation a type of ours—he was saved by water, the type—we by baptism, the antitype. Noah was translated out of the old, antediluvian world into the new,—so we, out of the old world of sin into the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ—the one into the state of safety, the other into a state of pardon.

But how does baptism now save us? By the resurrection of Christ from the dead. It gives efficacy to faith, repentance and baptism. See 1st Cor. xiii: 14; Luke xxiv: 46-47; Rom. vi: 3-4; Col. ii: 11-12. Will Mr. L. please tell us, if we are saved before baptism, how does baptism *now* save us, according to Peter?

Mr. L.—Now is it possible that the whole Christian world has been in error and darkness, until the great luminary of the nineteenth century, Mr. Campbell, arose to enlighten it? Mr. M. says that one may get to heaven without baptism, then how is baptism a condition? Strange logic! But to Mr. M's argument in the case of Paul. This case is recorded in three different chapters in the Acts. True, in two places baptism is mentioned and omitted in one. Is n't this a singular and significant fact! Why this omission if baptism was so essential? Now when Ananias came to him, he said, "Bro. Saul, the Lord hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Acts ix: 17. Can a sinner be filled with the Holy Ghost, and yet be unconverted? Nonsense! Why the Lord said to A., "behold, he prayeth." He got religion on the way, and hence is a proper subject of baptism.

Mr. Campbell, in his debate with McCalla, page 135, says, "a man's sins may be *actually* pardoned before baptism, but *formally* washed away in baptism. How could this be, Mr. M.? You and Mr. C. for it! Paul, in Rom. v: 1, says, "we are justified by faith," and Acts xxvi: 17-18, that the Lord sent him, "to open the eyes of the people, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are *sanctified by faith* that is in me." This is Paul's commission, no baptism here, in harmony with what he wrote to the Corinthians, he "sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," (1st Cor. i: 17), and even thanked God that he had baptized none of them. No! I don't wonder at it when God didn't send him for that purpose. Here then is your model! let us follow it, Mr. M.

But we'll hear Mr. Campbell again. *Christian Baptist*, page 454, says, "I do earnestly contend that God, through the blood of Christ, forgives our sins through *immersion*—through the *very act*, and in the *very instant*."

Mr. Brooks says, faith, repentance and baptism, all are conditions. All sorts of men, preaching all sorts of doctrine! Now will you deny, or say that no man can get to heaven without baptism? Why, Mr. M. talks very prettily about experimental religion, depravity, being born again, and conversion; but Mr. Campbell says, being born again, conversion and baptism mean the same thing.

Bro. Mobley.—Mr. L. says, the world is against us, therefore we are wrong. So was the world against Christ, against Martin Luther.

Paul thanked God that he had "baptized none of you" (Corinthians). Why? "Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." And if Paul was not sent to baptize, why did he baptize at all?

The gentleman seems very fond of reading from Mr. Campbell, but never without either misunderstanding or misrepresenting him. He has nowhere said that a man could not be saved without immersion.

In the same article from which Mr. L. read, Mr. C. says, "But we object to our objectors, the injustice they do us in representing us as ascribing to immersion the efficacy of Christ's blood; seeing we declare that it is through faith in his blood that we receive remission in the act of immersion."

(Here Bro. M. read from Doctrinal Tracts, page 248, and asked Mr. L., if he endorsed that?)

In reply to Rom. v: 1, said, there are some seven different causes assigned to justification, and about the same to salvation, hence to ascribe to these *faith* alone, would necessarily exclude all others; and a religion that does not recognize these, certainly does not harmonize the Scriptures. When we are said to be saved by the blood of Christ, it looks to that as the procuring cause, if by faith, and knowledge, it is man's province to examine God's testimony, and so believe, if by grace, then it's God's love, if by, save yourself, then man's work. Here is harmony, order, wisdom.

Mr. Lewis—said, Luther's reformation quite a different one from Mr. Campbell's. While the one began in the dark ages, with the key-note of justification by faith, the other in the full blaze of the 19th century, an age of progress, science and knowledge, with the key-note of baptismal regeneration, a stride back to the dark ages of ignorance and superstition, back to ritualism and to Rome.

According to Mr. C. and Mr. M., if one can be saved without baptism, then I desire to know how it is a condition? I deny that Mr. Wesley wrote the tract from which Mr. M. quoted. In reference to 1st Peter iii: 21, Dr. Jeter says, "the passage is dark and obscure, vague and uncertain as to its meaning, hence, the conclusion that Mr. M. draws from it, must necessarily be so too. (And yet Mr. L. attempts an explanation), viz, Noah's salvation was not from sin, therefore the figure does not apply. I think it in some way means a transition state, not spiritual, a mark of distinction, an external line, a profession of a new life, types without any relevancy to the question.

Bro. Mobley.—In regard to the reformation of the 16th and 19th century, Mr. L.'s argument is just simply this, because Luther's began in the dark ages, is therefore right, and Mr. C.'s in an enlightened age, is therefore wrong, ergo, baptism is not for the remission of sins. The gentleman's reasoning would also stop all progress in arts, sciences, literature, etc.

In regard to Wesley's tracts, Bro. M. read from the preface, showing that the Methodist church, in general Conference assembled, endorsed them, and that too, before the division into North and South.

My next argument will be founded on John iii: 5, and here I would remark, that all commentators, annotators and critics of any note, and even the Methodist Discipline, say that this Scripture evidently refers to baptism. That the phrase, "kingdom of God," means the "church," no intelligent, thinking man will deny, and, "being born of the Spirit," simply the belief of the truth. James says, "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth." Peter says, "Being born (or begotten) again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." The Pentecostians, "when they heard this," and this must precede being "born of water."

This language of the Savior, it is very evident, was not intended to have a present, but a future application, to be applied at the very instant the Messiah's kingdom commenced, and to be continued through all time. Now the Lord said, "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." Peter, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins;" 3,000 heard and obeyed and thus entered into the kingdom of God or the church.

And since "born of the water and of the Spirit," "He that believes and is baptized," and "repent and be baptized," are equivalent expressions, each placing the individual in the same state or condition, it follows that John iii: 5 teaches baptism to a penitent believer is for the remission of sins.

My next argument, Rom. vi: 3-4. From this Scripture we make three arguments, one on each of the expressions "baptized into Christ," "baptized into his death," and "baptized into death."

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." Rom. viii: 1. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2nd Cor. v: 17. Again, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Now it follows, since being in Christ there is no condemnation, sins pardoned, and we are baptized into Christ, that therefore baptism is for the remission of sins.

"Baptized into his death," that is, into the benefits of Christ's death. Christ shed his blood in death. Paul says, "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." In baptism we come in contact, or derive benefit from Christ's blood, which is for the remission of sins, therefore baptism is for the remission of sins.

"Baptized into death," "He that is dead is freed from sin," "but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." That form of doctrine is baptism, in imitation of Christ's death and burial, and as we are to be like his death in baptism, so in his resurrection, to walk in newness of life, it follows that baptism is for the remission of sins.

Our next argument, made from Titus iii: 5. "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit."

Now in regard to the expression *renewing of the Holy Spirit*, it is generally conceded that it is identical with the expression "*begotten by the Spirit*, i. e., an effect produced by the Spirit. It commences in the enlightenment of the mind, and results in an earnest faith in Jesus Christ.

But what is the meaning of *washing of regeneration*? That it refers to baptism but few will deny, and there is no other washing connected with the new institution, except with water. Now it is evident that the word "saved" refers to a salvation then past and completed, the salvation which depends on the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and is the first which happens after it. But what is this but the remission of sins? But this salvation does not depend alone on the renewing of the Holy Spirit, which is one thing, but also the washing of regeneration, which is another. Hence baptism is essential to the remission of sins.

My next argument will be made from the commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." That the salvation spoken of here, is the first which consists in the remission of sins, is evident from the fact, that it comes after the preaching of the gospel to every creature. Again, it is evident, that this salvation is conditional and the conditions are named in the passage. These are *belief* and *baptism*. Now the Savior promises salvation to him who complies with these conditions, and while this salvation may depend on more conditions than are mentioned in the text, it can never depend on less, but baptism is one of these, therefore baptism is for the remission of sins, or one of the conditions of pardon.

Mr. Lewis.—Mr. Campbell says, baptism is the *only act* in which remission takes place, and so said Walter Scott. Mr. Brents' "through immersion we come to the blood of Christ," and Mr. Campbell says again, "the blood of Christ is transferred to the water" and as a man does the baptizing, therefore man administers the remission of sins. If this is not back to formalism, and Romanism, then I fail to comprehend its meaning.

Once more in regard to Noah, while I don't exactly know what Peter means, one thing I do know—that Noah was not saved by getting into the water.

In reply to John iii: 5, Mr. L. said, this was under the Jewish dispensation, the kingdom had not been set up, then how was this a condition of Nicodemus' pardon? The Savior never required baptism but faith, verse 15, "Whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Hence in this way Nicodemus became a disciple. And Jesus said, "he that believeth not shall be damned," it follows that he that believes shall be saved; therefore baptism is not a condition of salvation. Now in regard to Rom. vi: 3-4, it is all figurative, indicative of the cleansing efficacy of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ, our Savior, for in 1st Cor. xii, Paul says, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," and Titus iii: 5, "according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, even the renewing of the Holy Spirit." So says Dr. Jeter. Hence baptism is an outward sign of an inward grace. Now if the Spirit does this, it is not done by the water, therefore baptism is not for the remission of sins.

The argument on the commission, as made by Mr. M., is very defective, for it is very clear, that since it is unbelief that damns a man, so belief saves him. This is the general principle, which God in all ages has prescribed for man's salvation.

"He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

"He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," and many other such plain declarations, all going to prove the principle of salvation by faith without baptism.

This is the faith that saves us, and is quite different from Mr. Campbell's, who says, in *Christian Baptist*, page 529, "Do you believe these sacred historic facts? If you do believe them, or are assured of their truth, you have historic faith."

Bro. Mobley.—There are really but few things in the last speech, that may be dignified with the title "argument," and consequently shall claim but little notice. I have, for some time, been pressing the gentleman to tell me what baptism is? At last it comes, will you hear it all ye ends of the earth! "An outward sign of an inward grace." I am curious to know where you got that from? Please to name the book, chapter and verse. Oh! the Methodist Discipline, well, well, that will do! we pass!

He don't deny what the Scriptures say, but then they don't mean it! This is a sweeper!

Again. Mr. L. goes to Mr. Campbell for light and instruction, and he finds merely historic faith. John xx: 31 says, "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name."

Of this faith Mr. Campbell says, in the same article from which Mr. L. quoted, "it is the same which Paul and the apostles had, and proclaimed. Arise and be immersed like Paul, and withhold not obedience; and your historic faith and obedience will stand the test of heaven."

I call upon the schoolmen, one and all, to show or prove any other.

My last argument I draw from Acts ii: 38. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Spirit." This is so plain that comment is unnecessary, but for the perversions that are made upon it. If we had not another passage in the Bible upon the subject, we should insist that this alone forever fixes the nature of baptism by the establishment of an inseparable connection between it and remission of sins. It makes remission depend on baptism in precisely the same sense in which it makes it depend on repentance. Now what that relation is may be determined by the little particle "*eis*," translated

in the text "for." Does the word mean "because" of, as contended for by the so-called orthodox world—excepting the more learned among them—then it follows if they are baptized because of the remission of sins, then they are to repent because of the same thing, which is simply an absurdity.

Now we take the position that *eis* in this passage, as in all other similar ones, means *in order to*, that is, expressing the end or object for which something is done.

"This is my body which is given for you: this do (*eis*) *in order to* my being remembered."

"This is my blood which is shed (*eis*) *in order to* remission of sins." John came "preaching the baptism of repentance (*eis*) *in order to* remission of sins." "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted (*eis*) *in order to* the blotting out of your sins." Those and many others might be produced to establish the similarity of expressions, in the use of the word *eis*—*in order to*.

Now in answer to the question, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter, speaking by inspiration, and for the first time, under the authority of the commission, commands two things to be done and only two: *repent and be baptized*. These two things are related to remission of sins precisely in the same sense. If then they are to repent *in order to* remission of sins, then they are to be baptized *in order to* remission of sins. But they are commanded to repent and be baptized. Therefore baptism, together with faith and repentance, is a condition of pardon.

Mr. L.—Mr. M. says, baptism is a condition of pardon, but Mr. Campbell says, it is the "only act," immersion is the all with him and his followers. The truth of the matter is, that your whole church is a contradiction, you contradict one another, believe anything, everything, nothing, but be all right on immersion, and that will be sufficient. But here is a beautiful specimen of their doctrine, some 7 or 8 different laws of pardon, one for the Patriarch, one for the Jew, one under John, one under the personal ministry of Christ, one after Pentecost, one for a backslider, one for a fellow on a lone island of the sea, and one for the poor paidobaptist whose conscience will not suffer him to be baptized. How dishonorable to the invisible God! Who wants such a system of religion as that! Rome has better ground for transubstantiation, than they have for theirs. "This is my body, this is my blood," etc.

The gentleman has made a tolerably fair argument on Acts ii: 38, the Gibraltar of Campbellism. But Paul says, "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God." "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." "But the gospel didn't profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." "Whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Thus we have endeavored, fairly and without partiality, to give the main arguments of the two debaters. Of course it will not be expected of me, to use the language of the speakers, or at all times to be as strong and forcible as they, for oftentimes, both speakers being so impressed with the subject in which they were engaged, would rise to a power and eloquence that my pen fails to portray.

Everything was conducted in the best manner possible, and everybody well pleased.

J. G. HESTER.

The Romish Church must be credited with inflexible adherence to the Scriptural law of divorce, and in commendable regard for the sanctity of the marriage relation. While Protestants do not exalt marriage to a sacrament, they do recognize it as a religious as well as a civil contract; but they are not so rigid in guarding and enforcing its obligations as Romanists. The grounds for divorce which are coming to be widely sanctioned among us are clearly unscriptural, and if the Pope's children need an encyclical letter on the sanctity of the marriage relation, much more is there need of a strong Protestant deliverance on the subject. —*N. Y. Baptist Weekly*.

BLOODY SACRIFICES.

In the letter to the Hebrews it is written that, "almost all things are by the law purged with blood," and that, "without the shedding of blood is no remission." (Heb. ix: 22.) This is a fact in the divine revelation—a fact which cannot be denied without denying the truth of the gospel. That God hath set Jesus forth "to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," and that "Jesus Christ died for our sins," must be believed in order to be saved.

It is upon the Scriptural allusions to this subject that the philosophists of the old school of theologians based their speculative "doctrine of the atonement," with its Calvinian and Arminian phases. The public mind has long since wearied of this speculation (as, indeed, it has wearied of speculative theology in general), and is now in danger of running into an opposite extreme and losing sight of the facts of the divine revelation. The exhortations of religious teachers contain only general and indefinite allusions to the death of Jesus and the blood of the covenant. One might listen to a great deal of the preaching now-a-days, and yet only reach the conclusion that "the death of Christ for our sins" means no more than that he died as a martyr to the principles which he had inculcated. There is a strong tendency to a rationalistic view that will discard all faith. Extremes usually follow each other. Yet as there were always some who did not accept either of the speculative theories of the atonement, so now there are some who will not hastily rush into the opposite extreme of rationalism—there will be some who will continue to believe the facts of the Sacred History.

Speculation (or conjecture, or hypothesis, if the reader has any choice of these terms) will continue as long as the constitution of the human mind continues to be what it is now. The evil is not in such an exercise of man's mind, but in the uses he makes of his speculative opinions. Creed making consists in formulating such opinions into "articles of religion," which must be accepted by the candidate for admission to fellowship in a church. The right of believers to think on such subjects and interchange views upon them is not to be questioned. But the fellowship of Christians should be based only upon the belief of the gospel and obedience to the Lord's command.

In any attempt to answer the question why there is no remission without shedding of blood we are at once driven into the region of conjecture. God has revealed the fact and demands belief. Some of the statements of the revelation, if they were not actually designed to serve as a basis for conjecture, certainly awaken our curiosity and our reflections. But no matter how plausible our conjectures may seem to our own minds, they must ever be distinguished from the facts of the divine revelation.

In what follows the reader will find some facts of the Scriptures which are not often considered in this connection. We may also find a moiety of conjecture, which, however, he will readily recognize and assign to its proper place.

1st. Physiologists, in their doctrines, follow the food which man eats through the various processes of mastication, deglutition, chymification, chyfication, and absorption into the blood, treating of it, meanwhile, as foreign substance within the body, and not as a part of the body. The digested food, still regarded as inanimate substance, when absorbed into the blood, is floated by it, first into the lungs, where it is acted upon by the atmosphere drawn into the lungs, and thence into all parts of the body where, in millions of "capillary vessels," it is deposited and becomes bone, muscle, nerve fiber, as needed.

Three thousand years before scientists had read in the book of nature the vitalization of food in the processes of circulation of the blood and respiration, Moses wrote them into the volume of God's inspiration: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the

ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." (Gen. ii: 7.) On the nature and use of the blood Moses wrote: "For it is the life of all flesh, the blood of it is for the life thereof." The Spirit in him knew, but Moses could not have known when he wrote this sentences, how literally true it is that the atmosphere in the lungs is the "breath of life," and that the blood of an animal is "for the life thereof."

2. The vitality in the blood is given as the reason for a strict law prohibiting the eating of blood. "Only be sure that thou eat not the blood, for the blood is the life; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh." (See Lev. xvii: 11-14, and Deut. xii: 15, 16, and 23, 24.) The same prohibition is given in the law of Christ. When the apostles in Jerusalem answered the question concerning the circumcision of the Gentiles, "peeled to them from Antioch, they included among the "necessary things," that the Gentiles "should abstain from blood and from things strangled." (Acts xv: 28, 29) In strangling an animal the blood is stopped in all the tissues of the body so that one cannot eat the flesh of a strangled animal without eating the blood. If Gentile Christians in America do not frequently violate this law of God it is because our habits do not lead us into violation rather than from our familiarity with the law.

3. Offerings involving the shedding of blood were numerous under the old covenant. In the first chapter of Leviticus is the law ordaining the burnt-offerings of slain animals,—bullocks, sheep and goats, turtle doves and young pigeons. In each case the law is explicit as to what shall be done with the blood. In the third chapter is the law under which the same animals were to be offered as peace offerings, including the same explicit directions with regard to the blood of the slain animals. And by reading the book of Leviticus throughout it will be seen, as already quoted, that "almost all things are by the law purged with blood."

4. Those sacrifices were imperfect and only types of the perfect sacrifice made by our Lord himself. The evidence of this is full in the viiith, ixth, and xth chapters of Hebrews. Note the connection of each of the following quotations:

The priests of the old covenant "serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."

"The Holy Spirit this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience."

"It was therefore necessary that the pattern of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these."

"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never, with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect."

"And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins."

5. Since those sacrificial offerings were but examples, "shadows," or "figures," of the offering made "once for all," and "could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience" that is, "could not take away sins," this inquiry arises: What became of the transgressions of the first covenant?

In Heb. x: 3, we learn that, "in these sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year." This was because "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." That this "remembrance again of sins every year," was not an afterthought of new covenant writers, but was in the mind of God throughout the old covenant generations, is clearly shown by Jeremiah and Daniel. God declared it as a distinguishing characteristic of the new covenant, predicted and promised nine hundred years