

Samuel Rutherford, whose Letters have melted so many hearts, was a bitter and unjust controversialist, exhibiting "such assumption of personal infallibility, such fierceness of contradiction, such unmeasured vituperation, such extreme narrowness of sectarian orthodoxy, and such suspicion of all who differed from him, as are alike wonderful and sorrowful." Representative Nonconformists. Rev. A. B. Grosart. Page 202.

The Countess of Huntingdon trafficked in human beings. Whitfield kept slaves. J. C. Philpot not only maintained that the deity of Jesus Christ was generated, but absolutely reviled, in most uncourteous language, those who ventured to oppose his idea. James Wells preached and *printed* his terrible sermon, "The Faith of Bahab Defended." Protestants, in their mistaken zeal, have persecuted Roman Catholics. Episcopalians persecuted the Puritans. The Puritan Fathers in America persecuted Baptists and Quakers. Sir Thomas Browne approved of the burning of witches. None were more bitter against the Baptists than holy Richard Baxter. Wesley lied about Toplady, whom he supposed to have died. Toplady wrote a book against Wesley, whom he styled an Old Fox Tarred and Feathered. C. H. Spurgeon aided and abetted certain persons who, in 1866, turned against their honoured Pastor, George Murrell of St. Neot's. (See W. Palmer's Letter to Mr. C. H. S.)

With such facts in view, it is not hard to understand the meaning of the words, "that every one (each Christian) may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Surely the above actions, though those of eminent Christians, were "bad things;" but it is nowhere recorded that they were confessed *as such* by those that committed them, either to God or to men.

Can we think that these holy men were permitted after death, to mingle with the "sweet societies" of the world of light without any solemn presentation of their persons and commendation of their characters or condemnation of their mistakes or transgressions, to themselves and others? Something would surely be lacking in Christ's moral government of His people were nothing of this kind to take place.

Lastly, the moral and spiritual influence of this, in its bearing on our lives and conduct now, appears in Rom. xiv. 10—12 and 2 Cor. v. 9—11. The terrors of a supposed far-distant General Judgment affect even Christians but little. The Millenarian idea of the judgment of the saints after the Resurrection and prior to the Lord's reign on earth is vague, remote, and inoperative for all practical purposes. But life is uncertain; death is at hand; Christ observes all our actions, and

we shall know His thoughts about them as soon as the soul quits its tenement of clay. This is a fact so near as to be solemn and momentous. May God impress the significance on every Christian heart.\*

## II. THE JUDGMENT OF THE QUICK.

NOTE 4.—(2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5), namely, those that are alive at the Second Advent of Christ.

Matt. xxv. 31—46. This evidently describes a judgment which will take place on the earth after the Lord has returned in glory. No mention is made of the dead. All who compose the then existing nations will be arraigned before [the] "throne of His glory" as "the Son of Man," and the relation of men to Him will then be determined by their previous conduct to His followers. This condemnation of the wicked will be penal and final.

Acts xvii. 31, "Inasmuch as He hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world (or the inhabited earth, Greek) in righteousness by the Man whom He hath ordained." (REV. VER.) This also refers to the judgment of the nations as appears (1) From the fact that the Judge, as in Matt. xxv. 31—46, will be Jesus in the character of the [risen] Son of Man. (2) Those who are to be judged are not the whole of Adam's race, or "the dead, small and great," but "the inhabitable earth," namely, all the inhabitants of the earth at this period. The word is *oikoumenē*, which never means the whole of the generations of humanity, and does not include the dead.

This is the Judgment which is so often foretold in the Old Testament, and which the godly in the past dispensation eagerly anticipated. Psa. xcv. 13, and xcvi. 9, "The Lord cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall He judge the world (namely, the Gentiles nations) and the [Jewish] people with equity."

---

\*Young Christians should remember that the Judgment-seat of Christ, like "the throne of grace," or the "altar" that we are said to "have," (Heb. iv. 16 and xiii. 10) is a figurative expression for a spiritual fact. No *literal* throne is intended, before which suppliants bow. No *literal* judgment Seat is meant before which the holy dead must stand on entering Paradise. The doctrine is that Christ Himself, in His gracious authority, will commend all that has been truly holy in our lives—however men may have censured us; and that He will pronounce His own estimate on what has been displeasing to Him, though all the world has applauded it.

## III.—THE LAST JUDGMENT.

All evangelical Christians agree that the vast and involved proceedings of Time will be brought to a final termination by the arraignment of the human race before "the great white throne," after the Lord's return and the Resurrection, (Rev. xx. 11, 12) on the "day of judgment."

On this subject there is, however, diversity of opinion.

The phrase "the general or universal judgment," does not occur in the Bible, nor is the idea scriptural. For

1. Those who will then be judged will not be persons who are living at the Lord's return. Theirs (if ungodly) will be the judgment of "the quick" (see page 119) which is distinguished from that of "the dead." (Acts x. 42; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5.) Here it is the *dead*—namely, those that have died—that will "stand before God."

2. Infants who died before arriving at rational and moral accountability, and, therefore, could not have committed personal transgressions, will not form part of this great assembly, since all that compose it will be "judged according to *their works*." "Small and great" (verse 12) does not mean, of all ages, but refers to "all sorts and conditions of men."

3. None of God's elect and redeemed people will then be arraigned. The language of Rev. xx. 12, 15, though difficult, seems to indicate that those only whose names are not in the Lamb's book of life will be summoned, and that to these the investigation will be confined.

With these reservations, what is written in ordinary treatises on the subject may be read with profit; and it is not our object to repeat accessible matter.

This judgment will, however, be universal in the sense of including men of all times and nations, whether the knowledge of Divine things had been vouchsafed them or not. The writer has elsewhere protested against the popular but most erroneous misuse of Rom. ii. 12—16; so often quoted to prove that heathens will be *saved* if they follow the light of nature. It is, however, evident that Paul's subject here is not salvation, but Retribution. He is discussing the final condition of those that "have sinned" and "shall perish." These he divides into two classes—those who have no written revelation of God's will and those that possess one, and shows that the judgment of God will be equitable in both cases.—MANUAL OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, page 274.

Though not summoned to appear before the throne, saved sinners will be present and aid in the final assize, (1 Cor. vi. 2) not as subordinate judges, for "the Father hath committed

all judgment unto the Son, (John v. 22), but as having had a personal knowledge of the sins of their ungodly neighbours, and as approving of the equity which "the Lord the righteous Judge" will display. (Rom. ii. 2—6)

It is also hinted—perhaps somewhat obscurely—that before sinners are consigned to their eternal destiny, the Judge will openly commend His people in the presence of their enemies—presenting them with "crowns," or tokens of His approval, (2 Tim. iv. 8; 1 Pet. v. 4; Heb. xi. 26); and then and thus shall every (Christian) man receive "his own reward," (1 Cor. iii. 8) and "every (Christian) man have *his* praise"—the praise that is due to him—"from God." (1 Cor. iv. 5)\*

The results of all evangelical labours will then be publicly declared, (1 Thess. ii. 19), and all the subjects of God's moral government be accurately and fully informed of the true character, bearing, and influence of all the events that occurred in the world's history.

Then the private commendations pronounced on each saint after his death at the Judgment-seat of Christ will be *publicly* corroborated and confirmed. It will be demonstrated that "the gates," or counsels "of hell" have "not prevailed against" the church, (Matt. xvi. 18); that Satan's machinations have all been foiled; that God's plans have all succeeded, and that the hosts of the redeemed who exultingly surround the Judge, are numerically and exactly identical with those whose names were written in the "book of life" before the foundation of the world.

## IV.—THE JUDGMENT OF ANGELS.

Part of the proceedings of the final assize will be the judgment of angels, (Jude 6.) Whether this will precede or follow the judgment of men is not stated—the former is probable. The saints will assist at the judgment of angels in the same way as at the judgment of unsaved sinners, (1 Cor. vi. 3.) Fallen angels have a fore-knowledge of their future doom, and

\*1 Cor. iv. 5. Literally, "And then the praise shall be to each from God." Timorous commentators are afraid of this verse, and seek to show that *epainos*, correctly here—as in every other place in the New Testament—translated "praise," has another meaning. "Praise" is, however, the proper rendering. To each Christian man at the Judgment day, the (or *his* due) praise shall be from God. This strongly corroborates the idea that saved sinners will not be present to be judged or acquitted, but to be commended according to their deserts.

know that Christ will be their Judge, (Matt. viii. 29.) Their final destination after the Day of Judgment will be "the lake of fire," prepared for the punishment both of their chief, Satan or the Devil, and the fallen spirits who have acted in concert with him, (Rev. xx. 10.) Thither, also, doomed and damned men will be conveyed, (Matt. xxv. 41.)\* Satan's influence over intelligent creatures will then terminate for ever.

☞ THE AUTHOR'S REMINDER. ☞

The reader is besought to remember that many of the views expressed on pages 114 to 122 are not those of ordinary Strict and Particular Baptists, and, therefore, have not their sanction and authority.

THE ETERNAL CONDITION OF THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE UNGODLY.

NOTE 4.—Our Article asserts that both the blessedness of the righteous in Heaven and the misery of the wicked in Hell, will be eternal.

The former is never denied, and demands no confirmation. The latter is disputed by four classes of opponents.

(1.) Some MATERIALISTS who do not believe in the Resurrection from the dead, contend that Death is the final termination of human existence.

(2.) UNIVERSALISTS hold that, in accordance with an unrevealed method of mercy, all mankind—some even including the Devil and his angels—will finally be reconciled to God and saved. No direct texts are urged in support of this view; though a great number have to be toned down or explained away.

(3.) Those who entertain the LARGER HOPE—namely, that to the Heathen and others who have had no opportunity in this life of examining the claims of the Gospel, and of accepting or rejecting its offers of mercy, a second probation will be granted after death. There is, it is urged, at least a possibility that the terrors of the unseen world will produce a reformation which was not effected here. This the absence of material enticements to sin may favour, and the penitence and prayers of godless disembodied spirits lead to their pardon and renovation.

\*Young Bible students are cautioned not to confuse texts bearing on the above subjects with those that refer to God's parental or providential judgment of them in this life. For instance, 1 Pet. iv. 17; Eccles. iii. 17.

To this, it suffices to reply that the Bible says nothing about a posthumous salvation, and that Death is invariably spoken of as the termination of the happiness of the ungodly. What men are when they die, they will continue to be in their future condition. Death perpetuates character. Eccles. xi. 3,\* Rev. xxii. 11.

(4.) Eternal Punishment is denied by those who hold

ANNIHILATION, OR CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

This is the doctrine that men—considered in their whole personality of body and soul—are mortal, and must, but for Divine interposition, eventually cease to be. Some, namely believers, they admit, will exist for ever, not on account of their original constitution, but through their union to Christ, from whom they have obtained deathless and eternal being. These, and these only they contend, will never die, the condition of endless life being Faith in the Saviour† and the acceptance from Him of the gift of immortality.

They, however, hold that the souls of the ungodly will survive death; that their bodies will be raised again; that they will be arraigned in their whole persons before the great white throne, to be judged; that they will be punished by the torture of literal fire for a longer or shorter period; that, finally, their bodies, being destructible, will be exterminated by the element which has caused their suffering, and their souls, being mortal, will simultaneously perish; and that thus the final end of the

\*This verse is adduced because it is that which Strict and Particular Baptists generally advance in proof of the above position. By way of accommodation it is certainly striking, but its primary and proper meaning is evidently different from the sense in which it is quoted above. On the force of Rev. xxii. 11, there is, however, no room for doubt. See Barnes' Notes.

†This is surely Arminianism carried to its farthest extreme. A mortal being—according to this scheme—has it in his power to do something called "believing" by which he will be elevated in the scale of being from mortality to immortality. All is contingent on his will. He may, if he chooses, grasp eternal life in the energy of mortal life: or he may "judge himself unworthy of eternal life," (Acts xiii. 46) and remain on the plain of terminable existence. The doctrines of grace as taught by the Strict and Particular Baptists are the best answer to, and the surest preservative against the errors above refuted.

ungodly will be ANNIHILATION or ABSOLUTE TERMINATION OF EXISTENCE.

This is submitted as a fair statement of the Annihilation scheme.

As our readers may be called upon to refute this theory, we briefly indicate the method of reply.

#### ANNIHILATION REFUTED.

I. We assert that HUMAN SOULS, AS SUCH, ARE IMMORTAL.

Observe that we are not now concerned with the souls of saints, as saints, or of sinners, as sinners; but with the souls of both saints and sinners, considered as men and women.

If the omnipotence of God is granted, we must admit that He *could* have called creatures into existence, who, but for some special intervention of His power, would never cease to exist. The souls of men, we affirm, are precisely such beings.

We do not endeavour to prove this by mere reasoning. This has been attempted by learned men. Their arguments have, perhaps, enforced the assent of the mind; but they have invariably failed to obtain the practical consent of the heart. Even Samuel Drow's marvellous "Essay on the Immateriality and Immortality of the Human Soul, Founded solely on Physical and Rational Principles," is adapted to convince persons of a metaphysical turn of mind only. Butler's grand chapter on the probability that we shall live after death, (ANALOGY, Book I., Chap. 1,) is of little practical value except to persons of culture. So, arguments based upon the soul's vast capacities—its boundless desires—its universal recognition of some kind of Deity—the prevalence of religious worship—its shame at sin—its apprehensions of a future existence—and the intuitions of immortality of which all men are conscious, and which many of the more enlightened and virtuous heathen avowed—can have force only with the educated, and are useless to honest enquirers, if plain and uneducated persons.

We do not base our proof upon the immateriality of the soul, or upon the fact that it will survive the catastrophe of death. We concede that it may be immaterial without being immortal, and that it may exist apart from the body, without its necessarily living for ever.

We avoid such injudicious expressions as that the human soul is "essentially," "naturally," or "necessarily," immortal\*

\*What a creature may be constituted by its Creator, and what a being *essentially is*, are two widely different things. God Almighty alone is essentially anything whatever, and all creatures are just what He chose to make them. We

—namely, that it *must*, independently of all exterior causes or considerations, continue to live for ever. One Being only is essentially immortal. God is naturally self-existent, and, by a necessity of His being, cannot cease to exist. The risen Saviour is the "only one having" absolute "immortality" (*athanasia*.) God is independent of all His creatures, and in no ways subject to laws, forces, or agencies without Himself. Angels, saints, Satan, demons and damned men exist or live through His sustaining power; and would collapse into non-entity but for Him.

We base our belief solely on the testimony of the Word of God.

Again, we concede that the Scriptures in no place explicitly and distinctly assert the immortality of the human soul. This, however, does not stagger us, for the existence of the Supreme Being is likewise nowhere affirmed. The Bible takes this for granted, from its commencement to its conclusion: and, in like manner, it assumes throughout that it is the will of God that the immaterial nature of man should live for ever. Any scriptural demonstration of this fact *must*, therefore, be INFERENTIAL. We can only show that it is unquestionably implied in the passages we advance.

#### The First Adam.

The immortality of the human soul is involved in the inspired accounts (for there are two; Gen. i., ii. 3, and ii. 4—7,) of the creation of man.

That the lower animals were designed to die and to cease to be, after a limited period of existence, is all but universally admitted. That the Inspired Records attribute a speciality to man and his original constitution, none will deny. What this speciality is, now claims our attention.

It appears that Adam was not—like the lower animals—called into existence by one creative act, but by two. His bodily structure was first formed, "of the dust of the ground." It was then a perfect, but lifeless, organism. Subsequently, the Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Gen. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 45.

Again, we read that "God said, Let us make man in our

concede at once, therefore, that as man is not *essentially* mortal, so he is *not essentially immortal*; because if he *were essentially immortal* he could live in spite of God, and God could not put an end to his existence.—EVERLASTING LIFE AND EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT: G. W. Shepherd, 1888.

image, and after our likeness;”—so, “God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him.” As, therefore, a portrait or a statue is *in some respects*, the representation of its original, man was formed to be the “image” and “likeness” of God.

Thus the sought-for speciality of man as created is apparent. The principle which vivified his body was not created with it, but afterwards “breathed into” it by a distinct act of God, and it was, as other Scriptures teach, capable of existing apart from it—and, as he was created, there were points of correspondence between him and his Maker.

We enquire in what way he was the image of God. Not, assuredly, because his body was a representation of the Divine essence. “God is a spirit,” (John iv. 24,) and no material object can represent Him, (Isaiah xl. 18; xlv. 5.) Adam’s resemblance to God must have consisted in the properties of his immaterial nature. In other words, HIS SOUL—faintly and feebly, but to a point accurately—represented the incommunicable glories and attributes of his Creator. Nor has the Fall effaced this image. “Men are [still] made after the similitude of God,” James iii. 9.

Thus God is holy—man was created “upright,” (Ecc. vii. 29); God is omniscient—man possessed a mind of vast intelligence; God is a free agent (Job xxiii. 13; Dan. iv. 35)—man enjoyed full liberty to exercise his intellectual faculties; God can impart His thoughts and feelings to intelligent beings—man could hold fellowship with other intelligent beings, his “tongue” being his “glory,” (Psa. xxx. 12, *margin*); God is self-existent and eternal—man is immortal.

This last point we expressly limit to his soul. His body was liable to die. It would have required the special sustenance of the fruit of the tree of life to perpetuate it, had the time of his probation on earth been prolonged. His soul we are, however, not told could die. “To dust shalt thou return” could not refer to his whole person, or we must join with materialists and admit that he possessed no spiritual nature—in plain words, that he had no soul. The resemblance of Gen. i. 26 thus assuredly lies, in one respect, between the ETERNITY of God’s essence and the IMMORTALITY of man’s soul.

This is again implied in Luke iii. 36, where (supplying the word “son,” from verse 23) we read “which was the son of God:” and in Acts xxvii. 29, we are also told that “we are the offspring of God.” The ideas of “sonship” and “offspring” assuredly imply similitude to a parent; and if Adam’s spiritual nature resembled the essence of his God, as the

nature of a child does that of his parent—his immortality is indisputably included.

Our position is strengthened by Gen. ii. 7. God breathed into him “the breath of life.” “He became a living soul.” This breath, breathed into man, differed from the “spirit,” or animal life, possessed by the beasts of the field. It was distinct from his material frame. It did not depend on the body for its existence; and being derived immediately from God, there is firm ground for assuming that it was not created to die. Whether “a living soul” means an *ever-living* soul, the reader must determine. Certainly the term elsewhere has the force of “deathless.” (Psa. xlii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 10.) Its connection, however, must determine its force, and there is, at least, strong presumption that it here also has the meaning of continuing to exist for ever.

Moreover, there is not a Scripture which asserts or implies that mortality is inherent in the soul of man. Should an Annihilationist demand of the reader a text which states that it was created to exist for ever, it will suffice to ask him to produce one which asserts that it will not.\*

#### The Last Adam.

Christ, “the Son of Man” was “made in all things like unto His brethren,” (Heb. ii. 17.) This, of course, refers wholly to His created nature or humanity. His Deity could undergo no change. This similitude, while it included His body with its functions, assuredly extended to His soul.

Now, it is only on the basis of a certain degree of similarity and congruity between the human and Divine natures which make up the complex person of the Lord, that it is possible to conceive of their union as the constituent parts of one Being. The particulars in which such resemblance may be supposed to exist, it would not be difficult to enumerate, and these *must* include immortality or an adaptation to existence without any natural limit. For *if* there is a limit to the duration of the human soul *as such*, the human soul of Christ must have possessed this limit; in plain words, it must have been mortal.

---

\*While it was expressly stated what the consequence of the first man’s sin would be in relation to his body, (Gen. iii. 3), its dire results in relation, both to *his* soul, and those of his posterity were reserved for future revelations. That the souls of sinners are—in a sense—dead through sin, is evident, (Eph. ii. 1), but it is equally evident that this does not involve cessation of volition and action.

His person, therefore, must have consisted of His Divine nature, which was essentially self-existent and eternal, in hypostatical union with a soul which was formed and designed to die. It is, however, surely inconceivable that Divine wisdom should have so framed the person of the Redeemer, as to unite in it two elements of unequal duration; elements, one of which must exist for ever, while the other would have arrived, in due course, at a natural period of extinction. Had not the human nature been adapted to endless being, it would never have been wrought into the structure of the Son of God.

Certainly sanctified reason recoils from the thought. God "made His *soul* an offering for sin," (Isa. liii. 10.) that He might save His people's "*souls*," (1 Pet. i. 9) from the "tribulation and anguish" which must otherwise come "upon every *soul* of man that doeth evil," (Rom. ii. 9.) That the offering of a *mortal soul* could secure the blessedness of eternal life, assuredly involves what is fatal to the creed of the Annihilationist. If it be granted that Christ was "made in all things like unto His brethren," their souls must have been immortal.

THE GROUND OF THE ERROR lies in confounding the terms "EXIST" and "LIVE." It is the will of God that men shall exist, or continue in being, for ever. "Life" or happy and glorious existence through the possession of a principle capable of fellowship with God, is a super-added gift conferred on all the chosen and ransomed people of the ever-living God.

II. While we maintain the immortality of the human soul, we deny that the bodies of the wicked will, after the Resurrection, be destroyed.

It is urged that the fire which will be the instrumentality of the torture of the wicked, and which will finally destroy their bodies, will be literal fire. This we deny. Its property is to torment a disembodied spirit, (Luke xvi. 24,) which material fire could not do. "Moreover, that hell-fire will not be literal and material is evident from the circumstances of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. On that solemn occasion the moral government of God found its fullest exemplification and manifestation. Whatever the dread word, 'damnation,' may express and involve was endured by the forsaken and broken-hearted Saviour when He 'was made a curse for us.' Terrors, indeed, took hold of Him, but there were no literal flames blazing around the cross; neither will physical fire form part of the punishment of the lost hereafter." (*John Hazelton.*)

Nor will the raised bodies of the wicked be exterminated by any other instrumentality. Death will cease to be operative

after the last Judgment, (Rev. xx. 14.) Note the REVISED VERSION: "And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, even the lake of fire." Death (together with Hades, which is represented as his escort) is personified. As in 1 Cor. xv. 26, it is declared that "Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed," so here, the evident meaning is that, "Death, considered as the power which separates the soul from the body, will exist no more." The wicked in Hell cannot die, in the sense of being exterminated.

The word "destroy" when used in relation to the future of the wicked, has been shown by competent scholars not to mean the extinction of their existence. "Everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," (2 Thess. i. 9,) evidently means punitive banishment from the "fulness of joy" and the "pleasures for evermore," associated with the presence of Jehovah, (Psa. xvi. 11.) If a definite act, terminating existence, were intended by the terms "destruction," the words "everlasting" and "presence of the Lord," would be not only redundant but meaningless. A process of punishment which will never end is obviously intended.

The "second death" does not indicate extinction of being. The expression occurs only in Rev. ii. 21; xx. 6; xx. 14; and xxi. 8. It is evidently used in a symbolic sense. Natural death is not ceasing to be, but a transition from one to another mode of existence. The "second death" is evidently an act of God's punitive vengeance by which sinners will be consigned to their final doom in a place, and amid surroundings, metaphorically described as "the Lake of fire, which is the second death," (Rev. xx. 14, REV. VER.)

III. We affirm that as the unsaved will, after the Resurrection, never be annihilated—so, THEY WILL BE PUNISHED IN THEIR WHOLE PERSONS FOR EVER AND EVER.

John iii. 36. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." This clearly implies the perpetuity of the existence of a godless man. He will not cease to be; but "life"—that is holy joy in God's presence, he will never "see" or partake of. So far, however, from the penal expression of God's wrath exterminating him, it will "abide on him," and, being unappeased, it will "abide on him for ever." As the ages roll on in unceasing succession, he will have the terrible consciousness of the frown of his Maker.

Matt. xxv. 16. "These shall go away into eternal (aionion) punishment: but the righteous into eternal

(aiōnion) life." Here the same word is used in both clauses to denote the duration of the punishment of the wicked and the felicity of the righteous. Each will be unending.

It is contended by some that the Scriptures teach eternal PUNISHMENT, not ETERNAL PUNISHING. The fire which causes the torment will, it is urged, burn for ever, but tormented sinners will cease to be, and their sufferings will therefore terminate with their existence.

We, however, reply that this is not the fair sense of the words employed to describe the dire future of sinners. A scourge is not a punishment; the pain it is adapted to inflict is. A prison is not a punishment; confinement in it is.

Thus Matt. xxv. 46, "everlasting punishment;" Mark iii. 29, "eternal damnation;" Mark ix. 43, "the fire that never shall be quenched;" and Jude 13, "the blackness of darkness for ever," and similar expressions, do not simply indicate that the agencies and instrumentalities, which will cause sufferings to the lost, will not be abolished, but that the lost themselves will endure the actual pain of soul and body which these will inflict, for ever and ever.

Events which happened in Time will be seen in their eternal significance, for even God cannot alter facts, and their results must abide, to the unending sorrow of sinners.

If these are truths "it were cruel kindness to keep them back from our fellow men." (*Spurgeon.*)

## The Constitution and Order of a Gospel Church.

### Article XVI.—The Constitution of a Church.

NOTE 1.—The term Church (which is derived from the Greek word *kuriakon*—belonging to the Lord, *kurios*) is the accepted and proper translation of the Greek word *ekklesiā*, "an Assembly called out."\*

It is used, in current English, in a variety of senses; but, in the New Testament, mainly in three. (1) For the whole number of the saved from the beginning to the end of time, (Eph. v. 25, 27; Col. i. 18.) (2) For all God's people on earth at one period, (1 Cor. x. 32; 1 Tim. iii. 15); and (3) For a local congregation as defined in this Article.

NOTE 2.—The people of God are a vital unity, through their union to their glorious Head, the Lord Jesus. Christians compose one family, (Eph. iii. 15) having the living God for their Father. Their faith rests, their hopes arise, their love centres in the one only Saviour. Their holiness they all ascribe to the "one Spirit" who (as the Church Catechism witnesses) "sanctifieth.....all the elect people of God." All profess allegiance to the same Lord, whose authority is paramount and final. All appeal to the same Bible as the only source of Divine truth, (Eph. iv. 1—6).

All heaven-born persons believe that it is their duty to render this *vital* unity a *visible* one (John xvii. 21—23; Eph. iv. 3); yet the ways in which this is done differ so widely, as

\*The derivation of the word is instructive as it comes from the verb, *ek-kaleo*, "I call out." It implies that Christians are called out of the world by and to the Lord. It is, however, accurately rendered *Church*, and readers should avoid the affectation of the Plymouth Brethren, who (to serve their purpose) frequently render it "assembly."

In Acts xix. 32, 39, 41, it is, however, rightly so translated. It occurs in Acts vii. 38, where it means, not "the church" in a religious sense, but the people who were called out of Egypt and gathered together "in the wilderness." "The church in thy house" meant either the believing and baptised persons in a locality who statedly met for worship at the residence of the person referred to, or such members of his household (*oikon*) as were Christians (Rom. xvi. 5; Phil. 2.)

to necessitate the most earnest and prayerful enquiries as to which method of Christian profession most nearly corresponds with the will of God as revealed in His word. To indicate this is our present object.

Episcopacy; Congregationalism or Independency; Presbyterianism, with its more recent modification, Methodism; Quakerism; and Brethrenism—are the accepted names of the five systems of religious association adopted by different Christians, by the maintenance of which they seek to give effect to their loyalty to Christ, and their obedience to His precepts. The Church order of the Strict and Particular Baptists is Congregational or Independent.

These views were first professed at the close of the sixteenth century—not long after the Protestant Reformation. Ere long a division took place on the question of Baptism. As opinions became defined, those Congregationalists who sprinkled infants became technically known as Independents—while those who practised the immersion of believers were styled “Ana-baptists”\* by their opponents—though they ordinarily called themselves Baptists. The title still applies to Christians who “maintain the congregational order of churches in violation” and practise the baptism by immersion of professed believers.

NOTE 3.—Our article states that a Church is a Body†—that is, “a number of persons united by *common ties*, which in this case are their common participation in “the salvation of God,” and their common adherence to the doctrines and ordinances of the New Testament. Hence the essence of Church mem-

\*“Ana-baptist,” literally, one who baptises over again. It is wrongly applied to Baptists, commonly so called, since they deny that Infant Sprinkling is Baptism at all, and insist that the immersion of professed believers only is Baptism. Our brethren of the modern “Keswick” school who, with Rev. F. B. Meyer, B.A., hold that believers should be re-immersed whenever favoured with new light (founding their views on Acts xix. 3—5) might accurately be styled “Anabaptists.”

†This word is more familiar to us in its French representative, *Corps* (a body.) Thus we speak of a Rifle *Corps*, of the *esprit de corps* or the animating spirit of a number of persons who are formed into one *body*; or of an *incorporated society*—an assemblage of persons who have combined for a specified purpose, and who unitedly compose a *corporation*, or a Company authorised by law to act as one individual—the personality of each being merged into the body of the whole.

bership is stated to be “fellowship in (the truths and practices of) the Gospel,” (Phil. i. 5.)

NOTE 4.—Each Church is INDEPENDENT, namely, it has no organic relation to any other body of men or of Christians. It is independent of the State, and does not regulate its movements or proceedings by the Laws of the Land, and has even sometimes to act in opposition to them. It is independent of other Churches, and neither defers to their opinions nor submits to their authority. Hence it is neither national nor parochial, but in submission to the will of Christ, as revealed in the New Testament, frames its own creed, adopts its own rules, and chooses its own officers, without interference or dictation of any kind from without.\*

NOTE 5.—A church is AN ORGANISED BODY—that is, it is constituted on a defined basis, acts on defined principles, and allots to all of its members their appropriate positions, privileges and duties, according to the word of God. In this its power is not legislative. It can originate no laws for its own guidance, but is bound to adhere to those “made and provided” in the Book to which it appeals as its sole and supreme authority. Hence it is purely an executive body—following, according to its light, the principles and precepts of Christ and His apostles.

\*In opposition to Episcopalians and Presbyterians, the early Independents held that “every particular society of visible professors, agreeing to walk together in the faith and order of the Gospel is a complete church, having full power within itself to elect and ordain all church officers, to exclude all offenders, and to do all other acts relating to the edification and well-being of the Church. They disavowed the power of all synods, presbyteries, convocations and assemblies of Divines over particular churches. *Advice* they were ready to receive, but the *exercise of jurisdiction* over them they totally renounced.”—Quoted from Calamy in “Bunhill Memorials,” page 30, by J. Andrews Jones, who adds, “This is religious liberty, the unalienable right of man, and any infringement thereof is arbitrary and despotic.”

Unions or Associations of churches for Scriptural purposes are, of course, permissible; though without much watchfulness, these have a tendency to exalt men of wealth and secular influence; to give prominence to *gifted* rather than to *gracious* ministers; to bring forward *popular* subjects, instead of such as are solemn, heart-searching, and condemnatory of worldliness and fashionable errors; and thus to repress and hinder the truth.

The government of a true Church is therefore **Congregational**—that is to say, every member has a voice in the management of its affairs. No business can be done; no members can be admitted or withdrawn from; no officers can be elected without the consensus of the entire Assembly, every one having an equal right to vote.

**Independency and Congregationalism** are not the same. A Church is *Independent* when it has no organic connection with any other religious body. It is *Congregational* when its affairs are regulated by the voice and vote of all the members.

Churches in which the Minister alone decides on the fitness of candidates for membership, and admits them on his own authority, (like those of William Huntington and George Abrahams) are **Independent**, but not **Congregational**—whereas an ideal Gospel Church, such as is portrayed in these notes, is both.

NOTE 6.—Church membership is **voluntary**. In deference to the Master's will, all Christians are free to join a particular Assembly or not, and its members are at liberty to use their discretion as to receiving or rejecting such as seek membership.

Church Membership **INVOLVES SURRENDER**. In joining a Church, persons "give themselves to the Lord and to each other"—willingly undertaking to give their convenience, their influence, their gifts, their time, and their money to the common good. Having used all lawful efforts by diligence in business (Rom. xii. 11) to provide "things honest in the sight of all men," (Rom. xii. 17) and duly to maintain those of their own house, (1 Tim. v. 8.) Church members are bound to serve each other "by person and by purse" in every possible way.

NOTE 7.—The object sought by our associated Church life is our common good, and especially the glory of God. Isolated Christians may serve Him, but it is only when banded together in the way which He ordains that we can fully do so. This motive should weigh on the conscience of every saved sinner. The people may be poor, obscure and uncultured; but if they compose a true Church, every Christian should connect himself with the congregation nearest the home in which Providence has placed him.

#### OUR CONDUCT TOWARDS CHURCHES NOT OF OUR "FAITH AND ORDER."

NOTE 8.—From this follows the obligation to own no religious community as a Church that is not Scripturally constituted as such. "Every heap of bricks is not a wall. Every group of

sheep is not a flock. Every multitude of soldiers is not a regiment—and all congregations of [even true and devoted] Christians are not Churches." (John Hazelton.) If their terms of admission are not scriptural; if they do not consist wholly of baptised believers; if there is no doctrinal basis, or if this be lax, insufficient, or unsound; if the presence of improper persons for Transient Communion at the Lord's Table is sanctioned; or if immoral persons, or such as hold error, are retained—other Churches (without denying the personal godliness of any of their members) are bound to repudiate them as bodies. Hence such should never be asked to dismiss their members to true and orderly Churches; nor should true and orderly Churches dismiss members to them.

If it is or is not Scriptural to call such irregular assemblies Churches, is a moot point. But whether we disown them as Churches, or recognise them as such and simply consider their creed unsound, or their practice unscriptural—on either ground we are compelled to decline *ecclesiastical* fellowship with them.\*

Harsh things are said against Strict and Particular Baptists for their refusing to receive members from irregularly constituted Churches and declining to transfer members to them; as if by so doing they denied the personal godliness of the individuals composing such Churches, and declined all *spiritual* fellowship with them.

Such allegations arise from failing to recognise the distinction (which we deem most important) between

#### CHRISTIAN COMMUNION AND CHURCH COMMUNION.

NOTE 9.—"Gospel fellowship on earth is two-fold; namely *Christian* fellowship and *Church* fellowship. We desire to have fellowship and communion with all that love Christ in sincerity. When someone, whether he belongs to the Church or not, pours out his heart in prayer to God, we feel a union of soul to him, and recognise that he is our brother. We possess the same spirit, and have fellowship with him in the feelings he

\*"I might call the members of a church, practising open communion, Christians, but I could not call them a Church duly organised, or a Church at all."—JOHN FOREMAN. "I do not say that I would unchristianise or unchurch (such). I should say that they are not walking orderly, but are pursuing a practice forbidden by the word of God."—SAMUEL MILNER. "Strictly speaking, I should not call it a Church."—GEORGE WRIGHT. Report of the Norwich Chapel Suit, 1860; Norton's Edition, page 97.

thus expresses. Those, however, who compose a Christian Church are said to be in *Church* fellowship. All Christian fellowship is not *Church* fellowship, but all *Church* fellowship is or should be *Christian* fellowship." (John Hazelton.)

"Such brethren may be amiable as Christian gentlemen; earnest as workers in the cause of morality. Their excellence we appreciate: their zeal we respect. Their anomalous and unscriptural position, however, precludes our recognising in any way their *ecclesiastical* standing." (From an Address in *The Gospel Herald* for July, 1875—the joint production of Israel Atkinson, of Brighton, William Crowther, J.P., of Gomersal, and the Editor, W. Jeyes Styles.)

## Article XVII. Pastors and Deacons. Page 9.

### EPISCOPALIANS,

Or Christians who hold that Churches should be governed by Bishops (*episkopoi*, overseers) contend that there are three Orders of Christian Ministers—Deacons, Priests, and Bishops. Deacons are probationary ministers, having authority to read prayers in public and to preach: but not to repeat the Absolution (either in Church or to the dying); to administer the Holy Communion; to marry; or to bury the dead.\*

The second Order is the PRIESTHOOD. It is urged by Evangelical Clergymen that the word Priest (being, as it is admitted, a contraction of Presbyter or Elder) is simply employed here

\*Whether the word Deacon (*diakonos*, minister or servant) is appropriate to such officials, and whether 1 Tim. iii. 8—13, at all answers to the character and functions of young men whose characters are undeveloped, whose principles are unproved, and who are ordinarily unmarried—the reader must determine.

The contention that verse 13, "They that have used the office of a Deacon well, purchase unto themselves a good degree," means that if a (Deacon or) half-ordained clergyman behaves properly, he is entitled to full ordination as a Priest, is disproved by the words themselves. Nothing is said about obtaining a *better*, higher, or more honourable position or degree—but a *good* one. "Gain (or acquire) to themselves a good standing;" (REVISED VERSION) "or step"—"not promotion to the higher office of a Presbyter," admits Rev. A. R. Fausset, A.M.—a worthy Clergyman. The evident meaning is that, though Deacons receive no pay, they obtain the honour of high estimation by their brethren, and joy and confidence in their own souls.

in the sense of a senior or experienced minister, and that no sacerdotal idea is involved. This, High Church clergymen with reason deny. "The Form and Manner of Ordering Priests," in the Book of Common Prayer, directs "the Bishop to lay his hand upon the head" of the minister who is ordained, and to say, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy Sacraments." A Priest is thus commissioned to *dispense* the Word of God, and His holy Sacraments, and to perform those ministerial acts which (as above) are forbidden to the inferior clergy.

The highest Order is that of the BISHOP, who is not only (as the word implies) the clerical *overseer* of the district placed under his jurisdiction, but has power to confirm Christians in the Faith; to confer authority upon Deacons, and to ordain Priests. He is also an Ordinary or established Judge of Ecclesiastical causes. All this he becomes by the ordination (if practicable) of an Archbishop who bids him (for the second time) "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc.

A glance at a Prayer Book will show the Scriptures relied on in the support of all this—but the reader will probably admire the candour of the late Professor Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College, Oxford, who, while contending that "the Episcopal Form of Church Government has sufficient grounds," concedes that "the *weakness* is the attempt to derive it from Scripture." ESSAYS AND REVIEWS, page 361.

### PRESBYTERIANS

Are Christians, who while they believe in but two orders of ministry, namely Pastors and Deacons, deny the Independency of the Churches and plead that they should in many matters be governed by an Assembly exterior to themselves. This Body is composed of Presbyters, or men (both ministers and laymen) who are venerable for their sanctity and experience (rather than their age) and who are elected by the Churches to represent them. Thus while each Congregation has some liberty or independence of action, the General Assembly exercises a jurisdiction over all.

### Strict and Particular Baptists

Hold that "a Church gathered and completely organised according to the mind of Christ, consists of officers and mem-

bers,\* and that the officers appointed to be chosen and set apart by the Church (so called and gathered) are Bishops (or Elders) and Deacons." BAPTIST CONFESSION OF FAITH. 1689.

#### THE CHRISTIAN BISHOP.†

NOTE 1.—The presiding minister of a Gospel Church is ordinarily in the New Testament styled its "Bishop" or "Elder"—the two terms denoting the same officer.

Thus Acts xx. 17, 28. To the "Elders" (or "Presbyters") of the Church at Ephesus, Paul said—"the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops (or overseers) REVISED VERSION.

In 1 Timothy iii. 1—13, Paul mentions Bishops and Deacons

\*The author demurs to the phrase "*officers and members*," as Office pre-supposes membership, and membership, with its privileges, duties and responsibilities does not cease when Office is assumed. Thus, before a Minister is recognised as a Pastor, his membership should be transferred, and he himself publicly received at the Lord's Table *as a member*, by a responsible person in the name of the whole Church. Nor does the office of Deacon interfere with a person's individual standing as a private member. This is no mere crotchet. While in the Established Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are Christians of a higher order than the rest, we plead for the common brotherhood of all alike. Bishops and Deacons are simply brethren who have the honour of *serv*ing the rest, (Matt. xxiii. 11.)

†The prefix "Reverend" has no Scriptural sanction.

The modern fashion introduced by C. H. Spurgeon, of addressing a Christian minister as "PASTOR"—though convenient to distinguish Open Baptist preachers from those who hold the Faith and Order of the New Testament—has also no Scriptural warrant. The word "pastor" occurs but once in the New Testament, (Eph. iv. 11) and is not employed as the designation of an individual.

The word Pastor or Shepherd in the Old Testament (see Jer. xxiii. 1, 2, and Ezek. xxxiv.) when applied to public officials, refers to secular governors, not to those who had the care of souls. Thus in Jer. ii. 8 and iii. 15, the pastors intended are "not ordained ministers according to the familiar application of the word in modern times, but.....temporal rulers (or) kings." CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS. Jeremiah, by A. W. Streane, M.A.

"Mr." (the ordinary title of courtesy) is the most appropriate style of address for Baptist Ministers.

—the word "Elder" not occurring. This would not have been omitted if there were in the Church three distinct Offices, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons.

Again in Titus i. 5—7, "Elders" are mentioned and subsequently referred to by the synonymous and interchangeable term of "Bishop."

1 Peter v. 1, 2. "The Elders I exhort.....tend the flock .....exercising the oversight," or, literally, "fulfilling the office of Bishops." See also Phil. i. 1.

Other titles are occasionally found—as Phil. ii. 25, Epaphroditus is styled "your Messenger or Apostle" (*apostolos*)—not as the Philippians' Messenger to Paul, but God's Messenger to them. The Pastors of the Asian churches are called "angels," or messengers, (*a(n)ggellos*), Rev. ii. 1. "Steward," or house-manager, Tit. i. 7. Christian ministers, as such, are never styled Priests. The assertion that sacerdotal ministry is implied in Rom. xv. 16 cannot be sustained. "Ministering (*hierourgeo*) the Gospel." *Hierourgeo* does not mean, officiating as a priest, but simply serving or ministering in holy things.\* This is the only passage to which appeal is made in defence of the official priesthood of Christian ministers.

NOTE 2.—Limited space forbids the discussing of the question of the plurality of Elders in one Church—namely, whether there may not be, in addition to the minister or preaching and presiding elder, spiritually gifted men *appointed* to visit the sick, instruct the young in the truth, &c., &c., under the title of Elders. It has been feared that this involves a serious modification of what has always been considered the Scriptural order of our Churches; but Philip Doddridge, Archibald Maclean, and C. H. Spurgeon favoured it, as has Charles Hill.

#### PASTORAL QUALIFICATIONS.

NOTE 3.—The Epistles to Timothy and Titus are what would now be styled **Open Letters**. Addressed primarily to indi-

\*Dictionaries or Lexicons to the Greek Testament are not to be wholly trusted, being often tinctured with the views of their compilers, who were mostly clergymen. Thus Bloomfield (whom Robinson follows) renders, "*hierourgounta to eua(n)g-gelion*, ministering as a priest [in respect to] the gospel." Rom. xv. 16. T. S. Green, however, gives as the meaning of *hierourgeo* "to minister in a Divine commission." J. H. Bass, "to discharge a sacred office;" and, S. G. Green (then of Rawdon College.) "to minister in holy things." Its derivation is *hieros*, sacred, and *ergon*, a work.

viduals, their ultimate design was the instruction of all whom they concerned.

When the hearts of a people were set on a minister, it devolved on the Apostles or their colleagues (who, like them, possessed at least some measure of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit) to ordain him by the imposition of hands. 1 Tim. i. 5.

The Apostles appear to have been endowed with such insight into character as to be able, in ordinary cases, to form an accurate estimate of those who professed to possess grace. This faculty was not granted in equal measure to their colleagues and immediate successors.\*

To inform two of these concerning the ministers on whom only they should "lay their hands," and to guide all Churches in the choice of Pastors to the end of time, was therefore the object designed in 1 Tim. iii. 2-7, and Titus i. 5-9.

These passages are often supposed to contain fuller instruction than they do. They are not complete portrayals of an ideal minister.

Nothing is said about Conversion to God; Faith in Christ; Spirituality of mind; Habitual prayerfulness; Knowledge of the truth; Studious habits; Concern for the purity of the Church and the salvation of sinners; or a measure of rhetorical and oratorical ability—all of which are essential for efficient pastoral work. Paul, however, rather presents the moral and social qualifications such a minister should possess.†

The reason is plain. A Bishop is *first* an Evangelist (see page 146), *then* a settled Minister. The qualifications of a preacher may be learned elsewhere; and Paul here assumes that Timothy, Titus, and the Christians he had in mind were able to "try the spirits," (1 John iv. 1) and to judge whether or not any man should be recognised as a *Minister*. At present he is dealing only with such *traits* of character and relative advantages, as preachers whom Churches contemplated choosing to the *pastorate*, should possess.

\*Acts viii. 13. Philip the Evangelist baptised Simon under the impression that he was a spiritual believer. Peter, however, was not deceived. Verse 23, "I SEE that thou art," etc. Yet even Paul was mistaken in Demas (Col. iv. 14 and 2 Tim. iv. 10) and Alexander (Acts xix. 33; 1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 14.)

†"Holy," in Titus i. 8, may seem to oppose this; but the word here stands, not for *hagios*, holy through the grace of Sanctification; but *hōstios*, holy according to the observation of others, *i.e.*, pious or religious.

1 Tim. iii. 2-7. It behoves the Bishop [of a Church]\* to be (verse 2.) 1. Irreproachable; 2. The husband of [but] one wife; 3. Sober, (or temperate in judgment, of an equable disposition); 4. Of sound mind, (or discreet); 5. Orderly (or decorous); 6. Hospitable; 7. [Naturally] apt to teach (born with the faculty of imparting knowledge); (Verse 3) 8. Not addicted to wine; 9. Not contentious (in spirit); † 10. But gentle; 11. Not quarrelsome (in conduct); 12. Not a lover of money (Verse 4); 13. One that governs his own family well [and] with all dignity (not harshness or austerity) and has his children in subjection; 14. Not a neophyte (or recently converted person.)

Moreover, it behoves him to have good testimony from (to be held in good repute by) those that are without.

Titus i. 5-9. As I gave thee charge.....ordain elders in every city. (Verse 6) If any man is 1. Unimpeachable; 2. The husband of [but] one wife; 3. Having faithful (or trustworthy) children, [who are] not under accusation of dissoluteness (not justly chargeable with dissipation), or in-subordinate (either to their parents, or perhaps—in a political sense—not overtly hostile to the powers that be).

VERSE 7. For it behoves the Bishop [of a Church]\* to be 4. Unimpeachable, as God's steward; 5. Not self-willed (or conceited); 6. Not passionate; 7. Not addicted to wine; 8. Not contentious (in spirit); 9. Not seeking gain by base means, (VERSE 8) but 10. Hospitable; 11. A lover of [what is] good; 12. Of sound mind (or discreet); 13. Just (or upright in relation to men); 14. Holy (or pious in relation to religious things—a consistent Christian); 15. Self-controlled (or temperate); 16. Holding to the faithful word which is according to the teaching" (holding fast the Christian doctrines which he had orally received from the Apostles and their colleagues.)

These, then, were the tests by which the qualifications of one who sought to be inducted to the office of the Bishop of a Church should be judged. They should engage the attention—

1. Of all Churches seeking a Pastor. If a Preacher is not a true Evangelist, or if any of these characteristics are conspicuously lacking in him, he is unfit to take the oversight of a Church, and to promote his election, were to offend the Lord. (See also page 140, 146.)

2. The directions should be studied by all who take part in

\*THE Bishop—an incidental proof that Paul contemplated each church as having but one. As we say, *The Queen, The Mayor*. (Compare Note, page 148.)

†"Not greedy of filthy lucre," or "not seeking gain by base means," (*aischrokerdēs*) is rightly omitted in the REV. VER.

the Settlement or Induction of a Minister. Satisfaction should be sought and obtained that these *traits* are to be found in his character,—or the service is a breach of God's order. It is true that none can now (in the full sense of the word) ordain, but one's presence implies sanction and sympathy, which should never be lightly accorded.

3. The passages demand the attention of all who desire the Pastoral Office. Unless *sure* that their character is here depicted, they should steadfastly refuse a position which they *know* they are not qualified to fill.

#### THE ELECTION OF MINISTERS.

NOTE 3.—It is held by Episcopalians that the right of appointing a Clergyman to the oversight of a Congregation lies with a person styled a Patron—namely, one who has the gift of a Benefice, or Ecclesiastical living.

He may be a wealthy layman : in which case the living is styled an Impropriation. His right is often valuable, and he can, if he chooses, part with it—the sale of Advowsons (as the right of patronage or presentation to a Church benefice is styled) being common.

The Patron may, however, be a high ecclesiastic, a Bishop or Archbishop, or the living may be in the gift of a Body, as a College, or the Dean and Chapter of a Cathedral.

In neither case, are the wishes or welfare of the congregation consulted. With the appointment they have nothing to do but to acquiesce.

In contrast to this, Plymouth Brethren deny that there is such an office as *the* Minister of a congregation. It is true that many of them virtually occupy this position ; and it is suspicious that the presiding preacher is generally a man of wealth and social position—often the owner of “the room” in which “the gathering” meets.

#### CHURCHES SHOULD ELECT THEIR OWN PASTORS.

This Strict and Particular Baptists assert—the burden of the proof, of course, lying with them. (Page 7.)

It is granted that we have no account in the New Testament, of a Church making formal choice of a Minister ; nor are we told in so many words, that it is their right and duty so to do. But :—

1. Granting that a Church should have a presiding Minister, such an officer must either be chosen and appointed by himself : but this would be contrary to delicacy and propriety. He should, indeed, “long eagerly for [the office of] A Bishop”

that is, his heart should be set upon his work ; but this is far different from thrusting himself on a particular Church. Or :—

2. He must be appointed by some man, or body of men outside the Church. But this would be a violation of the principles of Congregational Independency. The Apostles and their immediate successors indeed “ordained elders,” (Acts xiv. 23 ; 1 Tim. v. 22 ; Titus i. 5) thus conferring honour and gifts on the already chosen servants of the churches ; but they did not force Pastors upon them. Or :—

3. Pastors must be chosen by the united voice and vote of the churches. This we hold,

The Risen Saviour till the end of time will confer on all Christian Congregations the officers requisite for their well-being. This includes the gift of a Pastor and Teacher, (Eph. iv. 11.) Every Church has the right to accept the man whom Christ sends, without submission to the dictation or authority of any one besides.

#### PRINCIPLES OF PASTORAL ELECTION.

NOTE 4.—The principles exemplified in the choice of the first Deacons, (Acts vi. 3—6) should rule a Church when choosing a Pastor. They should “look out” a man of suitable moral, educational and spiritual qualifications,—one “who will care naturally—that is, truly, genuinely, sincerely, and not in a cold, formal and perfunctory way—for their state.” Phil. ii. 20. They should consult Paul's First Open Letter to Timothy (chapter iii. 1—7) and mark the qualifications he should possess. They should confidently expect that the Lord will send him, and pray accordingly. They should be “swift to hear, and slow to speak,” (James i. 19.) They should wait till unanimity prevails before expressing their united decision, (2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Phil. i. 27, and ii. 2.) Haste is folly. If the object of their attention is God's servant, he will gladly wait God's time.

#### ORDINATION.

NOTE 5.—The earlier Dissenting Churches attached more importance to the Induction\* (or *public* introduction to office) of Ministers than we—it is to be hoped with increasing light—

\*Induction—the act of giving a clergyman formal possession of the Church to which he has been appointed—was adopted by some Dissenters during the earlier decades of the nineteenth century, in place of the term Ordination to which many objected. It is to be wished that it were common among Strict and Particular Baptists.

have been led to do. The imposition of hands and other ceremonies were at one time practised, and the service was regarded as a veritable Ordination. We, however, rather believe that the extraordinary functions of the Apostles and their successors ceased with them, and that none have now power to ordain elders. Lacking the power, we have therefore abandoned the form, and regard an Induction Service as a friendly and fraternal recognition on the part of other ministers and churches, of the brother who has been duly elected previously by the people of his choice and charge.

Even now, the scripturalness of some popular proceedings may be questioned. If without the formal sanction of other ministers and brethren, the minister who has been chosen by a Church must not be recognised as having assumed the pastoral relation, there is an end of the independence of our Churches in one of their most important proceedings. A brother who has been set apart by a Church by fasting and prayer (Acts xiii. 3) as its minister, is as much ordained as, under existing circumstances, he can possibly be: nor can the presence and prayers of any that are without—however holy their characters and high their station, make his call to his office more solemn or valid.\*

#### MINISTERIAL REMUNERATION.

NOTE 6.—The New Testament distinctly sanctions and enjoins that a minister who devotes his whole time to God's work among his people should be entirely maintained by the offerings of his Church and congregation. An ox that trod out corn was not to be muzzled.....“even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live (not starve) of the gospel,” (1 Cor. x. 14.) There is nothing to prohibit a Church from naming an annual sum which, God permitting, they are prepared to promise. The squeamishness of Plymouth Brethren and others in this matter is sickening. Many of these furtively *receive* more than honest Baptist Ministers, in a manly and straightforward manner, *accept*.

Every Christian community is bound to maintain, according to its ability, the man who unreservedly devotes himself to its service, Gal. vi. 6, (where “communicate” means “to share with,” or, to impart a share): 1 Tim. v. 17, 18, (where “double honour”—*timé*—is used to signify remuneration for service.) Efficient Ministers are not only, like Deacons, (See Note on

\*John Hazelton, though he assisted at many such services, was never ordained or recognised himself.

1 Tim. iii. 13, page 136) to be treated with high respect, but they are to receive a competent reward or stipend. 1 Pet. v. 2. Not sordidly, or for the sake of money only—for their motive would *then* be “unworthy eagerness for disgraceful gain.” It is, however, implied that money is given and received, in a frank and uncovetous spirit. Ministers are simply warned against making *this* their primary consideration.

On the other hand, Ministers who are treated generously by their people, have distinctly no right to become Managers of money-making Societies, etc., for the sake of the remuneration paid for their services. Doubtless, as Ministers of the Gospel, they make good advertisements for the projects with which they are associated and earn their pay, but such men do inconceivable harm in the professing Church. 1 Tim. iv., vi. 5—10, where read, “supposing that godliness is a way of gain.” R.V. Verse 5, “They that WILL, or study to, be rich,” at any risk—whatever else they do. “For the love of money”—not simply a due estimate of its value as the circulating medium—is a root of all evil,” verse 10.

#### THE WORK OF AN EVANGELIST.

NOTE 7.—In the Church of the first age, there were several kinds of Ministers—namely, Apostles, to whom all the truths of the Gospel were made known by special and direct revelation, Eph. iii. 3; their colleagues, like Timothy and Titus, who were also, in measure, endowed with special gifts; and Evangelists, like Philip, Acts viii. 5—39, and xxi. 8, who appear to have largely resembled our own Itinerating Preachers. As their title imports, they were messengers of good tidings, or evangelical Ministers, but had not the stated care of Churches. Spiritual gifts were needed and bestowed for their work, Eph. iv. 11.

To this order of Ministers, Timothy belonged, though his special and peculiar gifts conferred on him power and authority which ordinary Evangelists did not possess, 1 Tim. iv. 14, vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 6, 14. Paul, therefore, while enforcing on him his higher duties—the laying on of hands, 1 Tim. v. 22, etc.—reminds him that he is still a “minister of Jesus Christ,” 1 Tim. iv. 6, and enjoins him to “do the work of an Evangelist,” 2 Tim. iv. 5.

What—according to the New Testament this work is—may be gathered from many scriptures.

Our Annotations on Articles XI. and XII., pages 59 to 90, contain much Scriptural information on the point, specially