

THE STUMBLINGSTONE.

"BEHOLD I LAY IN SION A STUMBLING-STONE AND ROCK OF OFFENCE."--Romans IX., 33.

VOL. 9.

TOLEDO, OHIO, AUGUST, 1883.

NO. 6.

Entered at the Post Office at Toledo, O., as second-class matter.

THE STUMBLINGSTONE, published monthly at Toledo, Ohio, by Lyman H. Johnson. Address, Drawer 103.

Donations for the cause may be sent to the above address.

We put no price on the paper, but send it to all subscribers who send us their names according to postal laws. We estimate the cost at 25 cents per copy for one year. But this is paid by voluntary donations, so that all who want the paper can have it, whether they pay or not. The truth of God is not bought or sold. Send for all you want. State the number, write the address plainly; give Post-office, County and State.

We have revised our list of names, and set them all up in type for the mailing machine. If any find their names or address incorrect, or the number of papers you can distribute insufficient, please send corrections. Write name and address plainly, and tell just how many papers you can find readers for. If any fail to receive any month's issue, please let us know.

No paper can depend on human patronage and be a true mouthpiece for God.

Our office is still in North Toledo, but we are moved two and half miles west of city street cars, from Milburn Wagon works or from West Toledo. Our address will remain unchanged.

It is possible the paper may be delayed a little, owing to removing the office, but hope soon to make up lost time.

We change the date to each address on the paper when a letter or money is received. By this all may know we receive them.

Hierarchical Nihilism Tested.

Ecclesiastical Popes and Lords in Guilty Terror and Alarm.

The *Free Methodist* of June 18, has a long article by C. E. Harroun, Jr., headed *Nihilism*, (*Nothing-ism*) in which he compares those who reject man-made churches and stand alone by faith in Jesus to the Nihilists and Communists who would destroy all earthly governments and promote anarchy and ruin.

This is a desperate charge, and brings the direct issue before the people between sect organizations and God's organism the body of Christ.

C. E. Harroun says:

"The same diabolical (devilish) spirit which is cursing the civil society of both Europe and America has also breathed its fumes upon the church."

This is a sample of Free Methodist sweetness who so bitterly condemn our sourness. I accept the issue thus stated. Just what the Nihilists of Europe are to legitimate civil government, I am and all of my faith have usurped the place of Christ and lord it over God's heritage.

I will state the difference between us and the political Nihilists. They are opposed to all just government and authority in civil affairs; we are opposed only to lords over conscience, to political rulers in spiritual affairs, man's earthly governments substituted for Christ's spiritual government which has no authority but truth and right over conscience. We oppose popery and antichrist, all self-constituted or man-appointed church authority, since in truth only Christ is lord of each individual conscience by his truth and righteousness.

We believe in civil governments, and teach obedience to them, to kings and rulers in the kingdoms of this world even when unjust and oppressive, and condemn all acts of disloyalty and insubordination whatever, except it be for conscience, and then we should patiently suffer and never resist. Our teaching is just the opposite of Nihilism under earthly governments which God has ordained. It is only the basest calumny to associate us with such out-laws. Furthermore we are not opposed to God-ordained and constituted church government. The whole drift of C. E. Harroun's article insinuating our insubordination to any authority which God has expressly sanctioned in his church is a slanderous falsehood uttered through culpable ignorance, if not maliciously.

All the members of Christ's body are in subjection to each other for reproof, correction and instruction under Christ the head, and all of God's elders and ministers recognized as such, are obeyed in all they teach and command which is seen to be in accordance with Christ the head.

It is only by culpable ignorance of our writings that he could assume that we are opposed to any just church authority. We teach that when Jesus Christ was an elder, or apostle, or pastor, the sheep all know him. John 10: 2-5. So Jesus says, and we believe his elders lay no burdens on the sheep grievous to be borne. Their words are only the words of Christ, so understood by all, and hence joyfully obeyed. Wherever Christ has true disciples, he has some true shepherds, or at least himself has promised to be with them.

We believe in the church organization described in 1 Cor. 12, in Eph 4, and in the Acts of the apostles, and elsewhere in the New Testament. But we do not believe in any such organization as constitutes every existing sect.

We don't believe what we don't find in Scripture, that men, whether christian men or otherwise, can by agreement organize or make a church of Christ as every existing sect pretends.

We read in Scripture that Jesus called men to be his special witnesses, twelve in number, besides many others to be his apostles and ministers, pastors, evangelists, elders, etc. We believe he calls all his ministers and elders to-day just as he did then, except the

twelve special eye witnesses of his works and teachings which have no successors, and are not needed now.

When Judas fell, and Peter and the others appointed Matthias to take his place, they acted on their own responsibility as men, without any command from Christ, and we have the record of their act what they did, and it was in accordance with the facts, for Matthias was a witness from the beginning, of Christ's words and acts, and this had the authority of their indorsement. Just the same as if I, and brethren with me, should indorse another brother whom we know as a true witness with us of any important facts, or a true minister of spiritual things. This is all right. Our indorsement of a brother will have weight with all the church who know us and have confidence in us.

They supposed the number twelve must be made good by appointing Matthias with their number. But they claimed no divine command for so doing, any more than for any other act which they supposed to be reasonable. We have no account further of Matthias, nor do we have any other such an instance of any appointment by men of witnesses to facts, much less any appointment to the ministry of God. To take this instance of man's appointment of an associate witness and fellow-laborer in the gospel, as authority for an institution of a religious government by man to bring the whole church into subjection to would-be lords and heads of a political jurisdiction like civil courts is a monstrous outrage and perversion of Scripture.

1. "Acts 1: 21-22. Here Peter and the disciples determined that none should be ordained to the apostleship except he had been continually with them from the beginning. They even went further. They even decided by selection that it should be out of a certain two. No chance of a self-appointment here! Then having fixed on the two, one of which should be selected, they proceeded to cast lots, and the lot fell on Matthias and he was numbered with the eleven apostles. So the apostle whom the Lord did not ordain while in the flesh, those whom he did ordain, ordained him. Thus the twelve apostles were all ordained."

ANSWER. "No chance for self-appointment nor the Lord's either, but the apostles themselves by virtue of their ordination, ordained another." So says this advocate of human hierarchy.

His reasoning is precisely that of Rome for the apostolic succession. I would ask if he has had holy hands laid on him in regular succession from St. Peter? I question his ecclesiastical pedigree. What absurdity for a pretended Protestant to teach the papal dogma that apostles and ministers make the bishop, and so of course his successor down the line of rulers by divine right. It was this doctrine of human ordination together with other Jewish customs and sacraments which built the Roman papacy. So young F. M. aspirants build the daughter of the old harlot.

But there is nothing in this scripture that authorizes ecclesiastical establishments or ecclesiastical rings by men. There is no account of Jesus ordaining any such spiritual lords, nor permitting them to ordain successors. Jesus never performed an ordination ceremony nor did the apostles ordain Matthias. This is all pure guess work to build a damnable hierarchy. The apostles were chosen, just as every minister and elder now is chosen, directly by Jesus Christ with no human authority between. It don't say they ordained Matthias at all. But it does say that he was already equal to them as a witness and a disciple of Jesus having been with them from the beginning. And their choice of Matthias from other witnesses to make the number twelve good, was a mere act of the disciples themselves, frail men before they had received the Holy Ghost, and only just before Peter had forsaken Jesus totally, and every one of them had forsaken him and fled. This act has no more authority for us to make a bishop than when they made the mistake only just before of denying their master. They were totally ignorant of Christ's church, that it was anything more than Judaism; for eight years after the Holy Ghost came they would not have gone to eat with a Gentile, except for a special vision of a sheet let down from heaven.

Because Peter and the rest thought it best to make the Jewish sacred number twelve good is no more authority for us than the circumcision and Judaism they all continued to practice. Because John Wesley built a fence around his cow pasture is just as weighty an argument for a church organization by man as that any act of Peter or the other apostles before the Spirit came.

The apostles had no more right to make bishops or elders of laws for God's church than pope Pius, or cardinal McClosky, or P. T. Barnum. There is but one law-giver. And we are to follow the apostles only as we see that they followed Christ, just as we would follow any other godly men.

"CALL NO MAN MASTER," is our master's command. The apostles themselves claimed no power to create any authority in religious matters.

"If I or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than ye have received, let him be accursed." They had no more right to step in between the believer and Jesus Christ than I have, nor the devil has. The apostles were not popes, nor did they claim to be. They were brethren having no more authority than any other saint of God to-day, except only as we see that they had more truth and the Spirit of truth. Jesus has cut us off from calling them or any other man our master. "Call no man master." And he is an infamous tool of anti-christ who would make Peter or any accident of

Peter's mistakes, or good deeds, the basis of his or any other man's lordship in place of Jesus Christ the only head of every believer.

Just as fast as the apostles showed a knowledge of Christ's dispensation they are our authority and no further. They did confess their ignorance many years after Pentecost of the distinction between Judaism and Christianity until the Holy Ghost revealed that distinction and broke down the partition wall between the outward Judaism and the spiritual organism of Christ which stands by faith.

I believe the record in Acts 10, 11, 15, and 21 chapters, also Hebrews, etc., declaring their ignorance and final knowledge by special revelations of the end of the typical institutions of Moses and of the earthly organism. The apostles are authority in whatever they commanded or declared to be from God, but what they practiced under Judaism pertaining to the outward church is no authority to us.

Because eleven men choose a twelfth to accompany them is no proof that they have made him a bishop, or that they are organized like every sect with its bishops, chairmen, secretary, etc. If eleven neighbors should choose a twelfth to herd their cattle or do their threshing would that prove any organization with its officers? If eleven men should camp in the woods and should invite a twelfth to camp with them does that prove a society organized with its presidents and vice-presidents? If I should see eleven hogs or sheep running together and a twelfth should be added to their number with their consent would that prove that man had organized them into a society with officers duly appointed?

Oh! what logic sectarianism employs to build its priest-craft!

APPOINTMENT OF DEACONS.

2. "The seven deacons were selected by the multitude of the disciples, but they were solemnly set apart by the laying on of hands of the apostles. So it is evident that the simple choice of the seven by the disciples was not sufficient." (Acts 4: 5-6.)

ANSWER. The church existed before deacons, hence these were no part of the church organization. They were simply men appointed in trust of funds for the poor and needy, as a temporary necessity. If several of us should ask a brother or two to take care of our money and see that it is given to proper persons, would that prove that all Christians must have deacons to take care of their money? or that there must be a society with deacons made by man? What argument to fasten man's traditions on believers!

They prayed for these deacons and layed hands on them. Yes, and they likewise layed hands on the sick and prayed for them too, and on every body that had need of special blessings and gifts. Does that prove that ecclesiastical authority was thus conferred? What a stretch of words to prove priest-craft!

Laying on of hands was simply a Jewish custom in connection with prayer for blessings on any body. It conferred no authority but merely signified the faith and good will of those who layed on their hands, and had efficacy only as their faith had power with God to bless the sick or any body on whom hands were laid. It was all right, and is proper now for any brother to pray for another brother and lay hands on him, and if he has faith with God there is power in it to bless the person on whom hands are laid. That is all there is of it. Nothing more can be proved from Scripture. But that it conferred any official authority on any body can be proved from Scripture to be a lie.

It is nothing but papal superstition that the laying on of hands confers any sacerdotal dignity. It was only an act of faith by which God conferred blessings, whether upon the sick or upon deacons and elders who needed his grace, just precisely as now blessings are conferred in answer to prayer by one brother upon another brother.

SUBJECTION OF PETER TO THE CHURCH.

3. "The record of Acts xi, 1-18 shows that even Peter was not exempt from an official scrutiny of his ministerial conduct. Peter, far from manifesting anything like a spirit of insubordination, calmly rehearsed the whole matter of his going to the house of Cornelius and preaching the gospel to him and his house. When the apostles and brethren heard his statement they officially approved of his course." (See verse 18.)

ANSWER. What a plea is this from Peter's submission to rebukes and reproofs of brethren, to use in proof that we are stubborn because we won't kiss the toe of sectarian popes, and man created church lords! A child can see the subtlety of this reasoning.

But this instance proves just the opposite to what the writer intends. Peter submitted to the reproofs of those who were least in Christ's church. He did not resent the ignorant brethren who attempted to correct what they supposed to be his error. I want to know what bishop, chairman, or preacher of Free Methodism would allow thus a private member, or any saint of God to arise in any meeting at which they preside with sacerdotal dignity to call in question their acts? What one of them from B. T. Roberts down to lord Ed. Matthews would not say to any one who would dare to reprove church sin in their meetings. "YOU SIT DOWN,--WE DO THE PREACHING,--CONFINED YOURSELVES TO TESTIMONIES,--TELL HOW YOU FEEL,--WE WANT NO EXHORTATIONS HERE!" The lord gods of Free Methodism would no more submit to any reproofs from

saints, especially not of their craft, than the pope of Rome would allow a subordinate to set him right. But Peter does illustrate the humility which is in every saint of God. Not one who is in Christ, however gifted, but welcomes reproof from the least of Christ's little ones, and throws the door of every meeting wide open for just such reproof, as no F. M. nor any other sectarian lord dares to do. The padlock of silence or subordination is put upon every saint of God in all meetings presided over by these petty contemptible vicegerents of God Almighty who sit in his seat in the F. M. and every sect. No man can dispute this without falsehood as all well know. Hence the whole of the above scripture applies only to them and to none who have come out of sects.

Because Peter was right was his only ground of authority. So in all church government. Therefore in Christ's church if the least brother thinks the elders are wrong they are free to reprove and correct them, or demand of them an explanation for their course. But every sect cuts off this liberty, and walls in the ecclesiastics with all their corruption so that no faithful reproof can reach them.

PAUL AND BARNABAS ORDAINED.

4. "In Acts xiii., we learn that God had special work for Paul and Barnabas to perform. But they were not only called to this work by the Holy Ghost, but the Holy Ghost said to the prophets and teachers in the church at Antioch, 'Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.' (Verse 2.) This they proceeded to do by fasting and prayer and the laying on of hands. 'And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands upon them, they sent them away.' (Verse 3.) In this account we are clearly taught that the Holy Ghost does not call persons to special work in which the general interest of the church is involved, and ignore the authority of the church over those who are to represent her doctrines and spirit. It was necessary for the church to send even those whom the Holy Ghost had called."

Answer. The Holy Ghost speaking through Paul and Barnabas said to the church set apart these men to go to the Gentiles. These men felt the call of God and made it known to the church. It is not likely that the church found it out before Paul and Barnabas did, but learned of their call through them.

To set apart means to consecrate or dedicate by prayer. The prayers of the other brethren had efficacy with God. It is the duty of brethren to pray with and for each other. The prayer of consecration to a particular work or duty the whole church can unite in. The faith in God of brethren for his blessing and consecration of other brethren has virtue in it. Special gifts and blessings were conferred then, as now also, through the faith of saints.

The laying on of hands was simply an act of faith. It is only superstition which regards the virtue as flowing through the hands of apostles or elders. It was their faith in God which contained all the virtue there was, and prayer was the channel through which blessings and gifts flowed from God to those who were thus consecrated.

I cite Paul's words Gal. 1 and 2 chapters that no authority was conferred on him by the laying on of hands. He says: "Paul an apostle not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." I believe Paul tells the truth, and therefore I believe all those who teach that his ordination at Antioch gave him any apostolic authority are liars, because it contradicts all his express declarations in Gal. 1 and 2 chapters. Also all the declarations of God's Word that God's ministers are not sent of men nor by men, but by the Holy Ghost, and the fact that they were all free to obey God and not men in their work proves that men-commissioned ministers and all who "heap to themselves teachers" are contrary to God's order.

What a wresting of the words: "They sent them away," to construe that it means a church commission! When they had got through with them and they with the church, of course they were sent away or in other words dismissed.

When a preacher dismisses or sends his congregation away, it don't mean that they are commissioned to go to preach. When after a season of prayer and communion I send a dear brother away with my blessings, it don't mean that I make a bishop of him. When I get through with a man who has called on me and he with me of course I send him away, not that I make a bishop of him, but that I let him go where he wishes to go. If I see a burglar in my house and I send him away by showing a revolver, that don't mean that I make a bishop of him or give him ecclesiastical powers, but merely that I let him go, that is all. What rascality of priestcraft to wrest these words: "They sent them away," to support an ecclesiastical commission, and to prove that a minister must be sent of man besides being sent of God which makes the Word of God a lie. It is true one brother may sometimes go on an errand for another brother or for the church to bear a message from them. I may persuade a brother to go with me, or to go alone on a gospel work, but this does not prove that any man nor body of men can ever divinely commission any body to preach the gospel or assign them their field of operations.

Paul persuaded Timothy to abide still at Ephesus. 1 Tim. 1: 3. He could not command Timothy nor any other saint to stay or go. But he persuaded Timothy. This shows that no authority was exercised by apostles beyond persuasions and suggestions. Each saint was free to obey God in regard to where, when and what to preach or labor for God. There is not a shadow of any instance in Scripture of the authority exercised by all sectarian bodies; the man of sin, to dictate what another's gospel work shall be. Paul left Titus in Crete to finish the work begun there. Just the same as I leave a brother to finish meetings I have begun with him. I have begun to build a house with another workman, and leave him to finish the job. This language does not prove that any authority was conferred by Paul on Titus any more than when one workman leaves another to finish what they have begun together.

It is only wresting Scripture in every case that in shadow of ecclesiasticalism or popery can be justified.

JORDAINED ELDERS IN EVERY CHURCH.

5. "Acts xiv. 23, tells us that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in every church; i. e., in the churches that they raised up at Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, Pamphilia, Perga, Attalia, etc. See verses 21-25."

Answer. Yes, they ordained elders just as Paul and Barnabas were ordained which as we have seen conferred no ecclesiastical powers, but consisted only in prayers of consecration and blessing for those whom the Holy Ghost had already made overseers of God's church. Acts 20: 28 God says the Holy Ghost made the elders and all the officers of his church. See also 1 Cor. 12: 28, Eph. 4: 11, etc. I believe God, and hence I believe those to be false teachers who represent them to be in any part a creation of human authority.

How fitting and needful that the apostles should specially pray for and consecrate by blessing all whom God had called to the oversight of his flock. Just so now we ought to set apart by prayer and blessing every servant of God who proves himself to be such that they may be confirmed and fitted for their work. There is no damnable hierarchy or priest-craft in this text.

THE COUNCIL AT JERUSALEM.

6. "In Acts xv. we learn that certain teachers went down from Judea to Antioch of Pisidia and taught that in order to be saved it was necessary to be circumcised after the manner of Moses. Paul and Barnabas contended against them. But these self-commissioned teachers persisted in their work. Finally it was determined that Paul and Barnabas and certain others of them should go up to Jerusalem and have the matter settled on the authority of the apostles and elders. Here is a strong case. Paul and Barnabas, the church at Antioch, and the apostles and elders at Jerusalem each and all recognize the jurisdiction of the apostles and elders concerning such teaching and teachers."

"Notice the answer they return to Antioch about the matter: 'For as much as we have heard that certain which went (they were not sent) out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the law, to whom we gave no such commandment,' etc. The whole proceeding grows out of recognized authority. Neither is there a single hint that the proceeding was not approved of God."

Answer. This was no annual conference nor established hierarchy like every sect organization of the day. It was simply saints in one locality consulting saints of another locality about perplexing questions of duty. If one brother asks another's advice or judgment on a question of duty it does not prove that he bows his conscience to any human pope or lord. By no means. This voluntary consultation at Jerusalem was no more like the lordships of all human organizations in religion, than when one brother asks another brother's help in a question of duty. The brethren at Jerusalem did not cite Paul or the Judaizers to appear before them; as in all cases of Ecclesiastical trial.

But two parties of Christians in one part of the country agree to refer their differences to a general gathering of saints in another part of the country. It is right for brethren in any trouble to consult other brethren, and those who have the Holy Spirit can easily detect the wrong and show what is right. This was all that was done, just what Christians always should do in such an extremity.

It was the only instance of a general council in the New Testament. There never was such an occasion for it. It was needful for the whole church to declare the truth concerning the partition wall between Judaism and Christianity as abolished.

To construe a voluntary conference and council of saints on a particular question as a justification for an established ecclesiastical tribunal and popery to lord it over conscience like Rome and all her daughters, is the most dishonest and satanic wresting of scripture that ever was resorted to by false prophets.

CONCLUSION.

7. "Many other items might be cited, but these will suffice to vindicate the church in requiring all who preach the gospel and administer the sacraments of the church to pass a careful examination in doctrines, also touching their spirit and practice as well as their usefulness, and grant or withhold authority to do the same as it may deem for the best interests of the church and righteousness. They who are unwilling to pass such examination need straightening up either in head or heart. Let all the people say amen."

Answer. The conclusion which the writer draws from the above scripture that a preacher must be in subjection to a parliamentary political body and popedom, in respect to his right to preach the gospel, has precisely the same foundation as the claim of any Roman pontiff. It is the most monstrous lie that ever perverted the word of God. The Bible teaches that every minister God sends his people is independent of them, and that the salvation or damnation of the Israel of God turns on their reception or rejection of his ministers. "Thou shalt say unto them thus saith the Lord, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear." Ezekiel 2. He who makes God's ministers subject to the will of his people is a liar, and the worst of false prophets.

P. S. While penning the above article I have received the Aug. 1 *Free Methodist* and find another long article from a writer named, S. V. McVey.

Praise God, he is compelling sect builders to defend their craft as never before and thereby expose their sandy foundations.

This writer says first, the Scriptures teach that we may be a member of the invisible church, and not of the visible, and hence be deceived.

I answer, that this is a lie, or else Jesus tells a lie when he says it is a "City set on a hill which cannot be hid,—Light of the world,—Living epistles known and read of all men." Says Paul also. How astonishing any one pretending to believe the Bible should so contradict God's word! Jesus has no invisible church on earth. There is not a text of scripture that teaches that any saint is invisible.

Again, if Christ has a visible church he is the door to that and all who are in him are in it, hence the palpable

lie that any may be in Christ invisibly, and out of his visible church.

The case of Paul is cited when he first came to Jerusalem; the disciples being afraid of him is said to prove he was not a church-member. What nonsense.

"Does it prove that a man is not a member of Christ's church, because brethren who never saw him before but heard evil of him are afraid of him? Does our being afraid of one whom we don't know prove he is not a church-member?"

Nothing is said about any organization at Jerusalem or anywhere else, that men have to join after joining Christ, but only disciples themselves. Paul sought to join the disciples and not any organism they had made. So says Scripture, and he did join them as soon as they knew he was converted, just as I join every gathering of saints wherever I go except I am shut out by damnable sect doors which none can enter except sect members. God's saints join all believers impartially, but no sect members can, because they have other doors, other bonds, other heads and other foundations besides Christ.

He cites a number of texts where the word church is used, in order to prove church organization. But in no instance does it mean man's organism, but Christ's body. Man can no more organize Christ's body than he can make Jesus Christ. Saints are his body, and he builds his own church. No instance in Scripture where man made any church. All guessing that he did has just the same authority as that man can make his God.

The text is quoted "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." The church to which the Lord adds members man cannot add them, unless we make those who receive members into societies equal with God. The Bible method of joining the church is by entering Christ the door. No man can open that door. The pretense is blasphemy. All other doors are positively cut off, John 10: 1-9. Therefore any church which we join by man's arrangements and doors besides simply joining Christ is of necessity, the devil's church, because Christ is not the door of it.

"Whatever (in the church) is not of God, is necessarily of the devil." *Martin Luther*.

Finally, he says, that the scripture on church discipline, requiring to turn out bad members, proves a church organization by man.

I reply the contrary is the truth. There is no church organization made by man that will allow all bad members to be turned out.

Every sect yokes the good with the bad and makes discipline impossible. There is not one but knows that man's organization prevents discipline.

In Christ's church where there are no human or earthly bonds we can easily withdraw and separate from all bad members and thus obey God in 2 Cor. 6: 14-18, which is impossible in any denomination.

O, the subtlety and depth of Satan in all pleadings for bad sect organizations was never equalled for falseness by the cunning craftiness of lawyers and pettifoggers pleading in the corrupt courts of this world.

Fanaticism in "The Good Tidings."

In the Aug. 2, of the *Good Tidings* for 1883, are two articles which show the wildest fanaticism. I know whereof I speak from my own knowledge and acquaintance with multitudes of instances in history, and my own observation for the past fifteen years.

The worst peril of pilgrims is fanaticism, and when I see it cropping out I shall always expose it since it is Satan's chief means of destroying the truth from the earth.

I mean two articles, the first is headed "From Physical to Divine Conditions," the second is headed "The Cause of Sickness."

The idea is the same in both articles that the baptism of the Spirit in its highest perfection changes our physical nature into the divine or glorified state as it will be in the resurrection. The second article makes sickness a sin, and teaches the opposite of God's word, that sickness and affliction are a curse and not a blessing, and belong not to the best saints but to those who have the least faith and spirituality. It would attribute sickness and death to the devil and not to God, thus making it necessary to propitiate the devil's favor and not God's; for if God cannot inflict suffering and death, he cannot give happiness or life. So it simply substitutes the devil for God.

In John Wesley's time there were precisely the same fanatics sprung up to distract the church of God, who got so holy that they were never going to die, but would be translated like Enoch and Elijah.

There was another brood of these deluded victims of Satan in York State fifty years ago who were so entirely sanctified in body that all natural passions were entirely removed and in their religious gatherings they did not need to wear any clothing; and their conduct was so shameful that they were broken up and driven out of town by mob violence. Such an instance occurred in my native town in York State.

The "Oneida Community" was made up of precisely this sort of fanatics who have lived with property and wives in common without marriage.

Such is the natural and legitimate fruit of all that teaching of sanctification which changes our physical conditions, and gives us glorified bodies while here in the flesh. It is all a lie of the devil, and is dangerous to honest souls who are brought under its power. I know this from sad observation and experience with such fanatics in years past. It is nothing else but a spiritualistic delusion.

The only gospel sense in which our bodies are sanctified is that they are brought under the power and control of sanctified souls. We do not sin with our bodies simply because they are dead and in subjection to our renewed minds and hearts. But the essential nature of the flesh is not changed, nor the curse of sin removed

before literal death and resurrection." Our bodies will sicken, suffer and die literally. And no saint on earth is ever so sanctified but what he will suffer, and be liable to sickness and death; nor will he ever become so pure, but what fleshly passions will get the mastery of him if the devil can get him off his watch and guard, or out of the order and prudence of decency.

It is not safe for any saint to put himself or herself in the way of tempting any bodily appetite unnecessarily, for they will soon find the devil is not so far off as they had dreamed if they willfully expose themselves to his charms.

There is a sanctifying power which every child of God possesses that is proof against Satan so long as he is in God's order, and is faithful.

But "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." This is God's universal order. "Again I say unto you watch and pray lest ye enter into temptation."

No sickness or earthly calamity is from the devil, but is all from God, visited on our race in consequence of sin it is true. Sin and Satan are the cause of it only as they are the cause of a faithful father's punishing his wayward child. But it is the Great Father in every instance who administers the punishment, and all teaching that the devil does the punishing for sin is of the devil, and it is only the devil's teachers who teach that the devil administers punishment for sin. He loves sin too well to inflict any suffering for its practice. But he scruples not to tempt men to sin and the woe and wrath it insures.

God says "I kill and I make alive, I wound and I heal, neither is there any that can deliver out of my hands.—Vengeance is mine, I will repay saith the Lord.—Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If we be without chastisement we are bastards and not sons."

There can be no more false or fatal doctrine than that which throws God outside and makes Satan the author of suffering or life and death; nor the other equally false and fatal idea that any saints here have attained in part or entire any glorified physical condition so as to remove the possibility of temptation, peril, sickness, suffering or literal death.

What Denomination?

One who has not read this paper very much, asks what denomination we belong to?

I answer, the same that Jesus and apostles belonged to, and all the holy martyrs, the only denomination known in heaven or on earth named after Christ, Eph. 3: 15; and the only denomination in the Bible approved of God, variously called *Christians*, saints, righteous, believers, children of God, etc. If you can find any other religious denomination approved of God or not of the devil, I will immediately join that too, for I am determined to belong to everything in religion which God approves.

I await an answer from any body. I challenge any man living to show me one religious denomination besides the above alone that is not of the devil. I will give him my printing press and all my printing materials, because I shall have no further use for them, if other denominations besides the above are not all of the devil, or in other words are approved of God. If any other denomination besides saints sanctified by faith in Christ are of God or not of the devil, then it follows holiness is not essential, the one thing needful, but something besides salvation from sin will answer instead, and hence the Bible is no standard nor authority. Therefore I believe in no sect except the righteous, the only one approved by Scripture.

QUESTIONS ON ORDINANCES ANSWERED.

A Sister writes:

"Do I understand that you do not think that Jesus meant water when he told them to go and baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost?"

He certainly did not mean Jews only, for he said "All nations."

There are some texts I want to speak of, Acts 2: 38 and 19: 2, 3. Paul asks certain disciples he found at Ephesus "Unto what were ye baptized and they said unto John's baptism which we know was water. And they were baptized over again in the name of the Lord Jesus, and they were Ephesians. Also Acts 10th chapter where Peter baptized Cornelius after he had received the Holy Ghost.

Now, Brother, while I do not understand we are to be saved by works, either by baptism or any other work, yet if we love Jesus will we not keep his commands, as Peter says: "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience toward God?" Again, we read that we are to do all things "whatsoever he has commanded without murmurings and disputings,—that we all may so submit ourselves one to another in love that the work be not hindered,—that we can learn one of another, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God.

Answer. First, you ask me if I do not think Jesus meant water. Of what importance is what I think Jesus meant, or any other man thinks? Does Jesus say water?

To teach for doctrine what men think is to trample on the law of Christ who forbids our teaching the commandments of men, See Mark 7: 7, 8, etc. If Jesus says all men must be baptized literally in water, that settles it. There, then, can be no salvation without literal water baptism, and he is false who fellowships or receives as a brother one who has not been in literal water. Water then saves, and is the ground of unity, whoever fails to preach literal water besides Jesus is a false prophet. Literal water becomes the test, and is the dividing line between the saints and sinners as it is now made by some in Calhoun County, Mich. But I am bold to say that this is a doctrine of devils, and not of Christ.

On the other hand if Jesus don't say water in his command, then no body has a right to say it, then I am free to believe he does not mean water, but only a spiritual cleansing, precisely the same as when he says

he will give us water to drink which shall be within us a well of water; or when he says we must eat his flesh and drink his blood, John 6: 52, etc., over which his carnal disciples stumbled: or when he commanded to bear his cross which many, as conscientiously bear literally as others literally baptize; or when Nicodemus stumbled at the new birth, or Peter took a literal sword because Jesus had said: "He that hath no sword let him sell his garment and buy one." Oh, that men could understand his meaning when he spoke of that spiritual baptism or cleansing six times contrasted with John by water, by which men are truly saved!

But since Jesus did not command literal water, I am forbid to take what men think for his law. It is for Jesus and not for men to tell what Jesus meant in his command. And since he has told us six times over in Matt., Mark, Luke, John and Acts, and all scripture, that his baptism is of the Spirit and the word and in contrast with water the type and shadow, that is enough for me. Jesus does command the law of love and unity, and I have no confidence whatever in the pretense of any who divide his church by literal water or any other literal rite which he has not commanded, and when God says: "The end of the commandment is charity (or love) out of a pure heart and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned." 1 Tim. 1: 5. A good conscience is simply one which does not condemn us. If then this is the end of the law who shall condemn those who have the end of the law? If I have all the command is for, who shall shake the command over my head? No ground of unity was ever found in outward fleshly rites. Every damnable sect is made by such things. Seven sects exist alone on literal water baptism.

Glory to God, all types end in Christ and his baptism! He who denies the sufficiency of this, denies Christ.

2. You say it was for all nations and not for Jews only. I answer, yes, Christ's baptism or cleansing gospel is for all nations, while all types and shadows were for Jews only.

3. Peter in Acts 2: 38 commanded to baptize in the name of Jesus. Certainly, Peter was a Jew and kept the rites and ceremonies of Moses. Divers baptisms belonged to the old law. So says the apostle and all scripture, Hebrews 9: 10 "The old tabernacle—which stood in meats and drinks and divers baptisms (*washings*) and carnal ordinances until the time of reformation." etc. All the rites practiced before the death of Christ belonged to the old and not the new covenant. Hebrews 9: 17, for the new covenant was not yet in force. So says the word of God, and I believe it to be true. The time of reformation did not come till eight years after Pentecost when the door was opened to Gentiles, and at the Council, fifteen years after Pentecost Gentiles were declared free, but not Jews.

Baptisms all being in force before the reformation, of course all Jewish believers practiced them just as they did circumcision. In the case of Cornelius, Peter added water also, because nobody forbid it. But he tells us that it was a new light to him when he saw Cornelius baptized with the Holy Ghost. "Then remembered I the words of our Lord how he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." So he did not understand spiritual baptism until after he saw Cornelius baptized, and had baptized him with water in his ignorance. I believe Peter, and I believe all to be false or ignorant teachers who contradict Peter's account and make him authority on the outward rites of Moses when he confesses his own ignorance up to that time of the sufficiency of God's cleansing. "What God has cleansed call not thou common." It is only priest-craft which wants something for man to do, which makes Peter's ignorance a ground for calling a brother unclean whom God has cleansed. I am obliged to believe the inspired record of the fact that all the apostles and Jewish believers were under the law of types and shadows by Moses for thirty years after Pentecost, as saith the Scripture: Acts 10, 11, 15 and 21 chapters. Whoever denies this word of God is a false teacher or deceived by priest-craft. Gentiles only were freed from the law, until the epistle to the Hebrews exhorts them also to leave the law of Moses, thirty years after Pentecost.

4. Those disciples whom Paul found at Ephesus baptized under John's baptism were no other but Jews, for no Gentile ever had John's baptism. The door had not been opened to Gentiles under John's baptism. Why don't brethren read the Scriptures? It don't say they were baptized the second time with water, but it does say with the Holy Ghost. But I am willing to admit it may mean water, which is of no more authority than man's guessing. Being Jews it is possible they were baptized with water into Christ's name as at the Pentecost.

5. You say you don't mean that we are saved by works, like baptism, etc.

I answer, if you hold literal water to be Christ's command, you must hold that it is essential to salvation, and you cannot consistently receive any as brethren who are without immersion. Can one who breaks God's commands be your brother? Surely not. It matters not how full of the Holy Ghost a brother may be, you have got to reject him, and thereby deny the Holy Ghost, if you do not know that he is immersed in literal water, and if he does not teach the same! O, do you not see that by holding these carnal types and shadows you do of necessity deny the Spirit, and that salvation which is the end of all types and shadows?

"Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh but answering a good conscience." Oh, how that plain text is wrested to build a sect! The very words of Peter in that text, 1 Peter 3: 21, mean just the opposite, to guard against the false doctrine that literal water saves which puts away the filth of the flesh. It is not literal washing that saves, but that of which it is a type, the inward cleansing which alone can give us a good conscience? Read the text.

A GOOD CONSCIENCE.

What is a good conscience? It is a conscience that approves of what we do. An evil conscience is that which condemns us. It don't mean a conscience is good or bad because we have knowledge or are ignorant, but only that we conform or do not conform to what we believe to be right. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth."—He that esteemeth anything to be unclean to him it is unclean." One cannot judge another's conscience except where knowledge is the same. This is Bible. Those are false teachers who make water, or any outward act the answer or cause of a good conscience, except as one has knowledge of duty. When one has no knowledge of a duty it cannot make a good conscience to do it. How false are those who teach that water baptism or any other act makes or answers a good conscience. It is no outward thing at all, but only a heart to do all we know to be right. Such a heart water cannot make but only the Spirit's baptism, or as Peter says not that which puts away the filth of the flesh, but which cleanses the inside; or gives a good conscience. Our conscience is always good when we do all we believe Jesus commands, whether any other person sees as we do or not. Oh, what fools and blind to put sin on the outside instead of the inside! He is clean whom God has cleansed, and fails to do nothing but a pure heart approves. The whole effort of ritualists is to put the cleansing outside and not inside where God puts it, in the approval of one's own conscience. It is only in matters of righteousness we can judge one another, and never in those things which all cannot see alike, for such things were all abolished with Moses' law. Nearly the whole pilgrim church to-day believes in the spiritual cleansing only, and shall we judge their conscience to be evil, when it don't condemn them?

Oh, this popery and antichrist which lords it over those consciences which are cleansed by the Spirit and feel no condemnation before God; to bring them under bondage to fleshly laws which would outrage their sense of fidelity to Christ, is only another daughter of the Old Harlot Rome! A good conscience comes from God by the Holy Spirit and by faith, and not from fleshly rites which they know Jesus never commanded.

O, how killing to spiritual life is this attempt to bring Christ's freemen under bondage, and thereby distract and divide the church. I am glad that this work is confined to sect Babaylon, and does not affect pilgrims seriously outside of Calhoun Co., Mich.

I know that if one individual alone should declare the sufficiency of Christ it would clear the whole work in Michigan of this church trouble; while on the other hand if I for the sake of harmony with that one person, should submit to water baptism, feet-washing, and the Passover, described in Luke 22, a wail of grief and sorrow would go up from all the truest saints from Nova Scotia to Texas, and from Florida to Oregon, from the upper lakes to the Gulf, and from the Carolinas to California.

Ten thousand at least would stumble over my defection from the gospel, be confused, go back into Babylon, or else go forward and drop me as a renegade from the Bible faith! Worst of all, God would drop me as he did Judas Iscariot, for my far worse betrayal of Jesus by wresting his words to teach a carnal priesthood which denies his priesthood, MADE NOT AFTER THE LAW OF A CARNAL COMMANDMENT. Heb. 7: 16.

No, I say to the water sect in Michigan and all other localities, go on with your water god and christ, Jesus is my only priest and Savior in whom I live by faith, the substance of all types and shadows, judged no more by dead works but by the eternal law of righteousness, which makes no distinction between one child of God and another.

IS IT WATER OR RIGHTEOUSNESS THAT MAKES THE CHRISTIAN?

This is the simple question to which those drive us, who teach water to be the law of Christ. The subtlety of the devil in thus making Jesus author of carnal types and a priesthood besides himself which he came to fulfill and abolish, turns the church back from the substance to shadows from faith to sight, from the Spirit to the flesh, from Christ and righteousness to a literal type and shadow of the same. Oh, what blasphemy to charge Jesus with contradicting the whole Bible teaching of faith and salvation as the end of the typical law, by turning us back from the glorious substance! When we have Christ within us by faith, the end of the law, sanctified and saved from all sin, what fools and blind to turn back to shadows! "O, foolish Galatians having begun in the Spirit are ye made perfect in the flesh?—I would they were even cut off which trouble you,—Let them be accursed." Thus saith the Lord Almighty, by his apostle Paul in Galatians, 1 and 3 chapters.

You say it is only for conscience, to keep his commands, yet you cannot find his words without man's additions commanding it, but he does command not to divide his church. Who is responsible then, for the division?

You know that it is not water that makes the saint. That every one is made a christian by the Holy Ghost, and water is added afterwards, if at all. You know that thousands of the truest saints filled with the Holy Ghost never had literal water, and to condemn their conscience or to say that they are incomplete without a priest to baptize them besides Christ, is to trample Jesus and his work in the dust. Dare you do it? Peter could not withstand God that he saw in Cornelius, although in ignorance, he added water before he remembered what Jesus had said of his baptism: Acts 11: 16, yet some now can withstand God in his children made complete in Christ, and deny the work of righteousness by the Holy Spirit which they can see! There is no escaping this presumption and wickedness if you maintain that Jesus commanded literal water. It con-

tradicts all the Spirit's work in the faithful who have not had water. And what is the test? What is it that makes a Christian? Is it literal water, or is it "love out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned," which we see in a brother's life which God says is the end of the commandment? 1 Tim. 1: 5, etc. If a man has got salvation he has got all that types and shadows were designed for.

Christ's Figurative Language:

Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but unto others in parables, that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand."

God's plan of sifting out the carnally minded, and separating them from his spiritual children is too deep for the carnal mind to understand. The words of Christ in all his teaching of spiritual things are typical, by parables and figures of speech which none but the spiritually minded can understand. The carnal mind interpreting all his words literally are blinded by them. It is God's design that it should be so. Moral blindness is the most terrible judgment he visits upon the guilty in this life.

I will here give a few instances and show how men stumble at words, stumble at the stone God has purposely laid for the disobedient to stumble over, the stone which the builders have always rejected. 2 Pet. 2: 6-8.

John 6: Many were following Jesus for the loaves and fishes, Jesus told them the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world. They said: "Evermore give us this bread." Jesus said: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger: and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."

"The Jews murmured at him because he said I am the bread." They took his words literally as most of his professed disciples do now, and did not understand that he meant to cut them off for their carnality and disobedience of heart.

He continued: "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Worse and worse! They should not only never hunger if they came to him, the bread of heaven, but they could not come except the Father draw them! This surely stumbled them!

Yet Jesus continues his inexplicable words: "Your fathers did eat manna and are dead.—If any man eat of this bread he shall live, and the bread I shall give is my flesh."

"The Jews therefore strove among themselves saying How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" They were utterly confounded. Jesus made himself greater than their fathers, who were dead, while by eating his flesh, they might live forever. How could this be? They could not understand him any more than carnal minds can to-day, who have made seven different sects trying to baptize as they suppose he commanded. Jesus repeated the same, blind words in stronger terms over and over again.

Many therefore of his disciples said it is a hard saying who can hear it, and from that time went back and walked no more with him.

Although Jesus said: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life." Yet these carnal disciples would understand him as speaking literally of the flesh, so they left him to perish in their sins. Precisely as many now interpret Christ's words about eating his body, understanding only the literal body and the literal bread, being blinded by their carnal minds to saving truth. So also about literal baptisms and literal crosses.

Jesus said to his disciples on eating the Passover, Luke 22: 19: "This is my body." So thousands understand Jesus to mean that the bread of the Passover becomes the literal body of our Lord when the priest prays over it. Luther contends against Zwingle for this idea, while the latter held it to be his body only in a spiritual or typical sense. This was the first sad split of Protestantism, all because Luther held to the superstition of carnal Rome in this literal sense of Christ's words.

Jesus said to the woman at the well of Samaria, "Whoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst.—The woman said give me this water that I thirst not neither come hither to draw." This woman, just like the majority of sectarians, understood him literally and wanted the water to save her the trouble of drawing. But when he told her of the well of water within, and proved his prophetic power, she believed with a more true spiritual understanding.

Next came his disciples and asked him to eat the meat they had brought. He said: "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." They wanted to know if any man had brought him meat. Just as all ritualists now who flunk only of the literal eating and literal baptisms.

Then they saw the Samaritans coming, and Jesus said: "Say ye not there four months then cometh the harvest?—Lift up your eyes and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest." If modern Christians had heard those words they would have been for buying McCormick's reaper as church property, and would build a sect on wheat harvesting. It is a wonder they don't think of this, the way they generally treat Christ's words.

Matt. 16: 18, Jesus says to Peter: "Thou art Peter, on this rock will I build my church." These words have been taken by carnal Rome as authority for Peter's being the literal rock on which their church is built.

And next verse, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth," etc., have been taken literally as the basis of hierarchical power and authority by Rome and her carnal church progeny.

And the 24th verse Jesus said: "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross

and follow me." This is one of six or more direct and plain commands of Jesus to take a cross and bear it if we would be his disciples. He bore the literal cross, and there is six times as much authority from Jesus to bear a literal cross as there is for either feet-washing, baptism or any fleshly supper. Catholics keep this ordinance. Why don't Protestants who enjoin other rites? No reason whatever, except the whims and caprices of Protestant priestcraft who make unjust distinctions between Christ's supposed ordinances.

At another time Jesus said: "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees." His disciples understood him to mean the literal leaven of bread, because they had brought no bread, and nothing but unleavened bread was allowed by the law during Passover. Just as all carnal minds, they could not see beyond legal rites and ceremonies in his command. So Jesus rebuked them sharply because they saw not his spiritual meaning.

Again, Jesus said: "Destroy this temple and I will build it again in three days." This the Jews understood of the literal temple and accordingly accused him before Pilate of speaking against their temple.

Again, Jesus tells Nicodemus of the New Birth, and he though a master in Israel understands only a literal birth. And when he said we must be born of water and of the Spirit the same masters in Israel, to-day, understand literal water, just as Nicodemus understood a literal regeneration.

Jesus said to the mother of Zebedee's children that they could have the honor of his kingdom if they could drink the cup he should drink of and be baptized with the baptism he should be baptized with. They said they could!—Just like multitudes of greater fools to-day, who understand only a ritual cup and a ritual baptism, and know nothing of his cup of suffering and baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost.

Again, Jesus says that when we pray we are not to be as hypocrites, but to enter our closets and shut the door and pray in secret. Many also take this as literally cutting off all social or public prayer which would make his words conflict with his own example, and with other scripture.

Again, when Jesus speaks of death and life as the penalty and reward of sin and repentance there are those who understand only a literal death and life of the flesh, and are blind to spiritual states.

Over against these figurative or comparative forms of speech we can easily distinguish the literal commands of Christ.

When he tells us to take no thought for the body what we shall eat or have for our clothing,—or to sell that we have and give alms, to lay not up treasures on earth, I don't find any disposed to build a sect on the literal construction of these words.

When Jesus tells us his new commandment in contrast with the law of Moses, the law of brotherly love and unity by which all men are known as his disciples, I don't find any sect built on this only distinguishing command. Where Jesus commands righteousness carnal minds make no hobby of that. His direct teaching to seek first his kingdom and righteousness is unheeded,—to be one as he and the Father are one is trampled under foot, to do God's will in earth as it is done in heaven, men care not; but with infinite hypocrisy they will tear his bleeding body to pieces in their zeal for a literal water understanding of his great commission to make disciples of all nations, because of the words baptizing them, and they know of no other sense in which nations can be purified or washed except by the putting away the filth of the literal flesh with the zeal of the Pharisees who make clean the outside of the cup and platter.

So at another time when Jesus was at the table with the twelve, and they began to ask one another who should be greatest, Jesus takes a towel and acts the part of a servant in those days whose business it was to wash the master's feet. Luke tells us all about it, except the feet-washing. He tells about the strife among the disciples and that Jesus rebuked their pride, told them none should be lords in his kingdom, but as he set the example and became a servant, so they should be servants to one another. John tells how Jesus acted the servant by feet-washing, which part Luke did not tell because that was not the lesson nor the design of his words to institute a rite, but to teach humility between brethren.

But now this lesson is trampled and perverted by those who scruple not to lord it over God's heritage, tyrannize over conscience, put a brother down because he sees not as they do, and rend the body of Christ with contention for carnal forms, while with hypocritical pretense of extraordinary love and zeal for Jesus, they bare their feet and limbs in a promiscuous assembly to do penance over a wash tub in mock humility which would put the blush on the most superstitious and blind devotee of Rome!

The poor Catholic that eats no meat on Friday, confesses to a priest, puts pebbles in his shoes and wears a crucifix, shows more sense and understanding of Scripture. Oh, that men would get the scales off from their spiritual eyes!

The Locality of Sin, or Ground of Judgment.

The central error and lie of Satan by which he causes all divisions among God's children is in placing sin and holiness in outward things instead of the heart and motive of the sinner or saint.

The Quaker makes holiness to consist in certain cuts of garment, of forms of words, stillness, absence of our wills, going by impressions, and leadings not of ourselves. To them all is sin which is contrary to these outward tests.

Ritualists make sanctity to consist in literal water, literal bread and wine, various literal observances, and distinctions of days and other outward things, and sin to consist in non-conformity in these respects.

Some teach sin to consist in eating pork, or using certain kinds of vegetation, minerals, medicines, etc. The whole sectarian world teach completeness in Christ's

church to depend on joining a society men have organized, and hence practically make it sin to stay outside of such societies.

In this way all divisions are caused among saints of God, and hence all confusion and cause of spiritual death to the church and infidelity through the world. The truth over against this vital error is that sin and holiness depend on no outward thing whatever, but only on the state of the heart toward God.

Where there is a heart and a will to do God's will, there can be no sin, nor anything but true holiness. This is the whole difference between the saint and sinner. The only importance of any outward act or condition of a man is the proof it may give that his heart is right or wrong. He who makes any outward thing whatever a sin or a virtue except only as there is proof of a wrong heart, is a false teacher. To locate sin or sacredness in outward things, and not in the manifest motives of the heart, is to act the Pharisee and the false prophet. Prove to us that a man love God and hates unrighteousness, and that proves that he has and keeps all obligatory commandments. No law is against him. Whoever condemns him for not observing any command or outward thing whatever which others suppose to be obligatory, condemn not him but Christ, and are the manifest enemies of God.

It is the gospel of Satan always, and never the gospel of Christ which locates sin in any outward thing whatever: All the gospel has to do is with the hearts of men, and with those things only which test the heart and prove it good or bad by universal conscience.

THE NO-SECT SECT.

This is now the contradictory epithet with which those are reproached who repudiate all other religious names, and faiths, and churches except the dispensed Jesus alone.

A no-sin-sinner, a no-liquor-drunkard, a no-stealing-thief, a no-fraud-imposter, an honest liar, a kind hearted murderer, a moral villain, a concordant contradiction is the hardest language which our sanctified Free Methodist tongues can bend or twist against us.

Well, we are told that two negatives destroy one another. If, therefore, they tell the truth when they say we are a no-sect-sect, then it logically follows that we are no sect at all. A no-sect-sect can be no sect at all, if words mean what they say. If we are no sect, then we cannot be a sect at the same time. But it is impossible to tell what modern sanctified tongues mean, unless as a rule you just reverse all they say, and understand them by the opposite meaning from their words. The exception to this rule is when their risings get too much the better of their sanctification to use hyperbole of speech, then they are apt to speak what they mean in words which admit of no doubt.

Jesus Christ is not the head of a sect, but of all God's people on earth. Every sect is a separation from the one body of God's people on earth and in heaven. The whole wicked world is a sect or schism of the family of God, the righteous; and a multitude of divisions exist in the world and belong to the world, and sin is the separating cause of every division. Christ's followers are a separation from the world only by separation from sin and sinners. It is sin in every case that causes division. Whoever advocates or pleads for division except from sin, pleads for sin, and is of the devil. To divide the family of Christ is to cause sin and to practice the same.

If all on earth should join sects and denominations except one man, and he should abide alone in Christ, that man would be the only true visible church of Christ, and would be no sect; all others besides would be visibly sectarian. Whoever accuses those who refuse all divisions, and abide in Christ alone of being a sect are just as wicked liars as those who say that Jesus is not the Son of God, or as those who say that a horse is sound when they know it is not, or who promise to pay what they never intend to pay. Those who lie about the church of Christ or God's plan of salvation are a much worse liars than any who are frauds in money matters, as the kingdom of Christ is more important than worldly property.

Notes on Letters.

A brother from Newcastle writes: "There is more wickedness than righteousness in the sects you so strongly oppose. But I cannot learn from Scripture or any other source that it is necessarily wrong for Christians to unite or organize to aid each other in carrying on the work of the Lord."

Answer: If men are Christians, that is in Christ, they are already organized and united, and ought to act accordingly. If being in Christ don't unite them then their faith is vain, and all attempt to unite by human bonds and organizations is hypocrisy. Christians ought to act as such, and be united by virtue of being in Christ.

To get up other bonds besides Christ only proves they have no faith. We don't need to organize the earthly family where natural love exists. How much less the family of Christ! For Christians therefore to make special bonds of union divides them from all other Christians, hence makes a sect, and treats Jesus with contempt and tramples on that law of love which condemns partiality and respect of persons. I may choose to work with one brother rather than another, or one locality than another, but to form bonds of love and unity besides Christ, so as to leave any saints outside is to divide the body of Christ, and is a greater sin than any sect contains besides.

Camp-meetings and Other Appointments.

Wednesday, August 29, there will be a camp-meeting in the name of Jesus only, less than a half mile West of Dunlap Station, Morris Co., Kansas, to hold one week. If Providence permits I expect to be present.

Dunlap is on the Missouri Pacific R. R. between Junction City and Emporia. Let all who can come with tents if possible, but come any way, to the above and all the free meetings to stay through.

Also, if it please God, I expect to hold a tent or camp-meeting at Guthrie Center, Guthrie Co., Iowa, commencing Sept. 12, Wednesday, and holding one week.

Also a camp-meeting or cave meeting at Cave-in-Rock, Hardin Co. Ill. Wednesday Oct. 3d, to hold one week.