



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

C
8348
600.15

Notes - Discourse - 1825

C 8348 .600, 15

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



THE GIFT OF
HAVERFORD COLLEGE LIBRARY
HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA

95
A DISCOURSE

ON

THE ORDINANCES,

AND

REPLY TO D. B. UPDEGRAFF,

BY

ISRAEL P. HOLE.

COLUMBIA, ILLINOIS:
WILLIAM H. BURNHAM & CO., PUBLISHERS.
1885.

PRICE, 15 CTS. Address Publishers.



A DISCOURSE,

DELIVERED IN OHIO YEARLY MEETING
OF FRIENDS, 9th Mo. 1st, 1885,

BY ISRAEL P. HOLE,

IN ANSWER TO ARGUMENTS BY D. B. UPDEGRAFF,
IN FAVOR OF THE ORDINANCES,

AND

*In Vindication of a Proposition Reported by the
Representatives, Which Was Before the
Meeting for Consideration.*

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
WM. G. HUBBARD & CO., PUBLISHERS.
1885.

C 8348.600.15

✓

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

GIFT OF

HAVERFORD COLLEGE LIBRARY

JUL 9 1935

DISCOURSE,

*Delivered in Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends, Ninth
Month, 1st, 1885,*

BY ISRAEL P. HOLE,



The following proposition was proposed by the representatives, and its adoption recommended by a majority of those voting, viz :

We feel called upon at this time to re-affirm the *scriptural views* always held by Friends upon the subjects of *Baptism* and the *Supper*.

We believe that the baptism which appertains to the present dispensation, is that of *Christ*, who baptizes His people with the *Holy Ghost*; and that the true communion is a spiritual partaking of the body and blood of Christ, *by faith*. Therefore, no one should be received, acknowledged or retained in the position of *Minster* or *Elder* among us, who continues to participate in, or advocate the necessity of the *outward* rite of baptism or the Supper. Monthly meetings shall be bound by this rule.

Dear Friends of Ohio Yearly Meeting :

The brief time that has been allowed to prepare an answer to the argument to which we listened with so much interest last evening, has

not been sufficient to give that system and definiteness to the present discussion which would be desirable. And while I entertain the hope that I shall not detain you very long, yet my discourse must be longer than it would have been if I had time to make it shorter.

MISSION OF THE FRIEND.

In everything which God orders, and in much that he permits, there is an end to be reached, an object to be attained. And, if I mistake not, one of the important ends to be attained in the mission of the Friend's Society, seems clearly to be, to teach the spirituality of the religion of Jesus Christ, as opposed to the ceremonies of the *law*, and the ritualism of the *church*. The religion of our Divine Master, is a religion of the heart and life, and the worship that is acceptable to him is the worship in spirit and in truth ; and without the necessity of outward forms and ceremonies or the intervention of rites and the offices of a priesthood.

Christ is the *High Priest* of the Gospel, who entered into the Holiest of Holies once for all, and offered his own body on the cross, a sin-offering for the people once for all ; and washes His devout followers in his own blood, by which they are cleansed from sin and incorporated into the family and fold of God. And he yet liveth to make intercession for us ; He stands

and pleads at the bar of God for all those who believe on him and call upon his name. Hence, all those forms, ceremonies, rites and ritualistic observances prescribed, either by Jews under the law or by Christians since Christ's advent, are not only not necessary, but really a hinderance to that spiritual religion of the heart and life, by the operation of which, man becomes a new creature in Christ Jesus; "Old things are passed away, and behold, all things are become new and all of God."

Man undirected by revelation, has ever manifested a religious nature, and must and will have some object to worship, as proved by the various forms of pagan worship, both in the past and present. And even where he has a conception, vague and imperfect though it be, of an uncreated spirit, yet he taxes his imagination in the production of a visible image or likeness of his ideal god; and falls down in worship before the idol his hands have made.

It was against the ritualism of the Christian church as well as the idol worship of the pagan and the ceremonies of the Jew, that in God's good providence, the Quaker was raised up; and through the teaching and practice of our beloved Society, for more than 200 years, the attachment of other branches of the Christian church to the outward rites of baptism and the Supper, has steadily declined, so that they are

no longer taught as God-ordained and essential to salvation, as they were two hundred years ago.

The illustrious Spurgeon has borne important testimony to the work of the Quaker in deepening the spiritual conception and practice of the church, not only in England, but upon the continent of Europe, and throughout the world. Many other shrewd observers and wise thinkers have borne similar testimony.

While other denominations of christians are losing their confidence in, and attachment for these rites, and casting about for a mode of escape from them, it is cause for profound regret and sorrow that there are some of the ministers of our Society, who seem to desire to be regarded leaders of thought, and who lay claim to high attainment in sanctity, who are ready to teach and practice, the propriety, if not necessity, of a return to those carnal ordinances, going back to the beggarly elements, which in effect must detract from the spirituality of the believer both in faith and practice.

Can it be that the mission of our branch of the Christian church is fulfilled in regard to these things? Has the *need* for the precept and practice of the Friend passed away? *Nay verily.* But in this age of affluence, in this land of liberty, when pride, passion, and a desire for display, have so strong a hold upon the hearts of the people, not excluding many of those who

claim to have passed from the death of sin into the life of God, there is a demand for a continuance, not only, but an intensifying of those teachings and practices, which we may not neglect and which we dare not disregard.

RIGHTS OF YEARLY MEETINGS.

Ohio Yearly Meeting is—in a sense—an independent body. May enunciate whatever views she entertains. May establish her own discipline, making her own declaration of faith and prescribing her modes of worship, and, in short, do and say what she pleases ; and there is no tribunal before which she may be called to account, in which her case may be adjudicated, and by whose sentence she may stand condemned. But these prerogatives are always and at all times to be exercised in view of the consequences which are sure, or likely, to follow. If Ohio Yearly Meeting enunciates doctrines, either officially, as a Yearly Meeting, or through her recognized ministers, without protest ; or upholds or allows practices not in harmony with the clearly enunciated doctrines, or well established practices of Friends, she takes the chances of being regarded unsound by the other Yearly Meetings of Friends and cut off from the privileges of the brotherhood of the church and the sisterhood of the Yearly Meetings.

BENEFITS OF CORRESPONDENCE.

The benefits arising from the fraternal relations existing between co-ordinate bodies of christians are varied and important. The bonds of union and fellowship which have existed between the Yearly Meetings of Friends, have been a source of mutual blessing and benefit to these meetings and the membership thereof, in ways and manners that I have neither time nor disposition to delineate at present. But, be it remembered, that these privileges, benefits and blessings can only be enjoyed—*nay more*—can only continue to exist, while there is a mutual good understanding, a mutual strong confidence in the fidelity of each.

SELF PRESERVATION.

Some master mind has given expression to the maxim, that "self preservation is the first law of nature." Acting upon this recognized, this instinctive law, every organization, whether social, civil, political or religious, is under imperative obligations to protect, not only its organic existence, but the rights, privileges and immunities of its membership. Every church is bound by the most sacred obligations to protect its members from the teaching of unsound doctrines, and the influence of erroneous practices, whether the teachers who promulgate

the one or practice the other, are their own members or the members of other organized bodies of christians. And the case is not altered when the objectionable teachers belong to other Yearly Meetings with which we are in correspondence. Home and home associations deserve and demand our first care, our strongest solicitude.

NEW YORK YEARLY MEETING.

If New York Yearly Meeting believes that certain ministers of our own Yearly Meeting, teach and practice doctrines and usages which have not been taught and practiced by consistent Friends in the past, and are not properly taught or practiced by friends in the present, then it is the privilege—*nay more*—it is the duty of New York Yearly Meeting to refuse to receive such minister or allow him to preach in their houses of worship; and this notwithstanding, he may come to them bearing credentials duly executed and signed by the Meeting to which he belongs. When the protection of my home stands opposed to the privileges which I have heretofore accorded to my neighbor, it becomes my duty to insist that he forego the exercise of these, heretofore, conceded privileges. And what is true of my home is equally true of the church, is equally true of New York Yearly Meeting. Friends of New York Yearly Meeting have been severely criticized for the action

taken at their late session with regard to one of our ministers. Their judgments were evidently convinced that the rejected minister was not sound in his teaching nor correct in his practice.

Believing these things to be true, New York Friends pursued the only course that could have been taken, consistent with their duties to their own membership. And ministers ought to learn the lesson, that if they choose to teach the things that are not sound, and practice the things that are not proper ; while, in a sense, they may have a right to do so, yet they thereby restrict the field of labor which otherwise they might occupy.

I want to set my seal to the action of New York Yearly Meeting, in the case referred to, as judicious and wise, and it ought to be a lesson to our Friends at home, not to liberate ministers to labor in other Yearly Meetings, who will, in all probability, teach them doctrines and usages which neither they nor their fathers have ever known.

DUTIES OF THE CHURCH.

The law of self-preservation goes much further than we have just claimed. It is the duty of all organized bodies, to protect themselves from internal as well as external foes.

A church, in its organic capacity, is as much and as thoroughly God ordained as a family, a social compact, a state, or a nation ; and as such,

has a measure of understanding, of wisdom, of *Divine light* and *Guidance*, above, beyond and superior to that which is possessed by any one of its members. The opposite doctrine must prove subversive of any and all organizations. The teaching to which some of us have listened more than once ; that when you have exercised due care, by consecration and faith, to put yourselves into the hands of the Lord, and take the Bible as your rule of doctrine and practice ; and then have an impression which you believe to be the mind of the Spirit, with regard to what you should say or do—if the church sanctions, well—if the church does not sanction, blaze away anyhow ; disregard the church, evil dently, because you have more *spiritual light* and *guidance* than the church.

Here, in this presence, and in view of my responsibility to the Church and to God, I want to brand this teaching as pernicious and subversive of all organization, and inimical to the best interests of the body at large, and of the membership in particular ; and is a delusion that stands condemned alike by history and revelation.

I thank God that no one man, no set of men, in the Church, has a monopoly of the Holy Spirit, or an exclusive mortgage upon divine guidance. But all the members of Christ's Church are ordained a royal priesthood, to

whom the Holy Spirit is sent by the loving Father, in answer to the prayer of the loving Lord, and to whom the gifts of the Spirit are distributed for the good of the Church and the conversion of the world. All are component parts of the same body, and members one of another. A minister, if properly such, must have a call of God, receive his commission from the Court of Heaven, and then be recognized by the Church, and as such become the *servant* of the Church, and not its autocratic master. The Church is thus bound to look to the teaching and practice of its ministers; it takes the responsibility of what it tolerates as well as what it orders; and hence it must follow that, if ministers continue to teach and practice what the Church has never recognized as necessary or proper, and continue to set up the claim of infallibility in guidance, it becomes the duty of the Church, after due effort to control and direct,—if these prove unavailing,—to recall its consent, and rescind its record of the ministry of such an unfaithful servant. And it seems very clear that such a minister who finds himself unable to teach and practice in accord with the doctrines and usages of the Church, should seek to avoid sowing the seeds of discord among brethren, by withdrawing from such association. The Church which, from blind devotion to its ministers, fails to see and assert its

rights, or meet its responsibilities and duties to protect its membership, assumes a fearful responsibility in thus disregarding a sacred trust.

OTHER YEARLY MEETINGS.

The distinct utterances of five Yearly Meetings on this continent, recently made upon the subject of the Ordinances, was denounced as the result of a concerted plan amongst them; and hence we were to infer that it was wrong, because concerted. First: To the best of my knowledge it was not the result of a concerted plan amongst these Yearly Meetings, but was a spontaneous utterance on the part of each one, in response to a pressing sense of need, and that the dereliction of duty upon the part of Ohio Yearly Meeting furnished both the cause and the occasion for these utterances. Second: If it was the result of a concerted plan on the part of these Yearly Meetings, it was not wrong on that account. The Yearly Meetings of Friends constitute a sisterhood, a family, and anything that affects one becomes a matter of interest and concern to all. If by concerted action difficulty could be avoided and danger averted, then concerted action would be right.

If concerted action had its origin in malevolence, or hatred, or persecution, or some other base passion or emotion, then it would

be wrong, but not otherwise. To the best of my memory there was no direct effort made to show that these utterances came from impure motives, but simply because they were concerted were they condemned. As well might you object to a mutual consultation between husband and wife as to the best course to pursue in the management of the family to secure harmony in the household, or the consultations between representatives of different States or communities as to their relations and common welfare. Such fallacious attempts at argument need only to be stated that they may be condemned as unworthy a good cause or a fair disputant.

REVOLUTIONARY—REBELS.

In the argument to which we listened last evening we were treated to a most astounding revelation, viz.: That the action of those six Yearly Meetings,—including Iowa, which has a strong utterance in its discipline upon the Ordinances,—was *revolutionary*; in other words, that they were rebels. This is a grave charge to make against any one, but when it is made against six Yearly Meetings, including a large majority of Friends in America, its gravity becomes intensified, and when it is remembered that the utterance came from one who does not fairly represent more than one thousand of the one hundred thousand Friends

of recognized standing in the world,—as I verily believe,—its gravity becomes appalling.

REBELS!!? Against whom? Against the one hundredth part of the Church—the most magnificent rebellion that the world ever saw. And the reason for the charge is to be found in the claim made that the clear and distinct teachings of the founders of our Society had never been understood by their followers; in other words, that for two hundred and forty years the Society of Friends have never known what the fathers taught—had really lacked the intelligence to understand their teachers. *And worse than that*: had occupied a plane of such low intellectual possibility as not to know what they themselves believed. *Nay, more*: that the one hundred thousand living members of the Church never knew either what the fathers taught or what they themselves believed, until the advent of my illustrious opponent, when lo, a bright light appeared, through whose brilliancy the pages of the fathers shone with a new lustre, and sparkled with a new meaning, and the dormant intellect of the Church was quickened into new vigor, and expanded into new possibilities of comprehension.

And yet, after years of effort on the part of this grand expositor and illuminator, to the eternal disgrace of the Church, and in evidence of the stolidity of its members, only one in one

hundred to-day either understands the fathers, or knows what he himself believes ; and hence are rebels against the doctrines and usages of the Church, as clearly laid down by the recognized writers of the Church and expounders of the faith and practice thereof. What a pity that in the good providence of God this light had not appeared two hundred years ago, so as to expound the writings of the fathers and raise the groveling comprehension of the Church, so that they might know what they themselves believed.

“ The ways of Providence are past finding out :
God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform.”

Seriously speaking, the author of this apparent argument, *but real fallacy*, has offered to more than nine-tenths of the living members of our branch of the Church a high-handed insult, by inferentially stigmatizing them as destitute of the ability either to understand the teaching of others or to know the deductions of their own understandings; and not satisfied with that, he goes back and offers a like insult to the generations of Friends who are in their graves. And then, by misrepresentations and garbled quotations, seeks to make the fathers say what they never intended to say, and, as a matter of fact, never did say. And all this under the assumed guidance of the Holy Spirit

who is to guide us into all truth, and out of and away from all error.

PROPOSITION—FIRST CLAUSE.

Let us next consider more specifically the proposition submitted by the representatives for adoption or rejection by this meeting. The first clause declares, that we feel called upon at this time to re-affirm the scriptural views always held by friends upon the subjects of *Baptism* and the *supper*.

We feel called upon at this *time*, because Ohio Yearly Meeting is under a cloud of suspicion. The impression is wide-spread through the church that some of our ministers are departing, both in theory and practice, from the doctrines and usages inculcated by the fathers of the church, and practiced by them, their associates and descendants in the Society for more than two hundred years; and it is with sorrow that many of us are compelled to admit that these suspicions are well founded; and the utterances to which we listened last evening in the discussion of this proposition, fully justify this distrust of our orthodoxy, to which I refer. If Ohio Yearly Meeting is ready and willing to make this re-affirmation, she will thereby lift the cloud of suspicion and set herself right on the record. If she refuses or neglects to make such declaration, the suspicion

is at once deepened into the belief that we are unsound in doctrine and erroneous in practice.

Ohio Yearly meeting cannot afford to sunder the fraternal bonds that bind her to the sisterhood of Yearly Meetings. Neither can she afford to remain in the fraternity and continue to demean herself in such a manner as not to merit the confidence of the other Yearly Meetings.

SECOND CLAUSE.

The second clause of the proposition affirms, that we believe that the baptism which appertains to the present dispensation is that of Christ, who baptizes his people with the Holy Ghost.

The baptism of the Holy Ghost has been recognized by Friends through all the years of our existence as a church, not because our writers and teachers so declared, but because the Holy Spirit says so in the book of revelation. Neither has any other form or kind of baptism by application of water been recognized or practiced except by innovators, and, perhaps, a few cases have been tolerated during the transition from a religion of external forms to that of the heart and life, and then, because of the spiritual weakness and ignorance of young converts to the faith, and these exceptions of themselves tend to establish the rule.

The opposite proportion cannot be maintained without setting aside the continuous testimony of history for over two hundred years, and the testimony of nearly all the living members of the church to-day.

All intelligent Friends do know that no form of water baptism has been regarded essential by Friends, but, on the contrary, that the practice of non-essential rites, many times works harm to those who practice them, by attaching undue importance to them, and thus clothing them with the attributes of saving grace. For these reasons water baptism has been disused and discouraged by Friends.

Hear the testimony of that accurate writer, John Allen, in his *State Churches*, where he says: "The society of Friends for about two hundred years, taking a spiritual view of our Lord's dispensation, have altogether refrained from the use of the outward ceremony of water baptism, believing the baptism of the Holy Ghost alone to be required and sufficient." And in another place he makes a similar statement as to the outward supper.

SCRIPTURE PROOF OF BAPTISM OF HOLY GHOST.

This proposition is clearly set forth in the sacred scriptures. John the Baptist testifies, as recorded by Matt. 3, 11: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but He that

cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And in Mark 1, 8: "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Luke 3, 16: "I indeed baptize you with water, but One mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And Again in John 1, 53: "Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." And the Lord said to his disciples just before his ascension, Acts 1, 5: "For John truly baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Paul declares to the church at Corinth, 1st. Cor. 12, 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." And again, Gal. 3, 27: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." And again, Eph. 4, 5: "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism."

The testimony thus recorded by the Holy Spirit by the mouths of the four evangelists and by Paul, is that Christ's baptism is that of the Holy Ghost and of fire, and that as cer-

tainly as there is but one Lord, and one saving faith, so there is but one baptism recognized by Christ as a part of his dispensation.

Through the ages then passed by, as well as at the time of Christ, there were many that were regarded lords. Paganisms are and have been polythistic. But Paul says to the Ephesian church and to us as well, that among all those which are called lords there is but one real, veritable Lord.

The same thing is embodied in Elijah's utterance to the people upon Mt. Carmel, when he said: "If the Lord be God follow him, but if Baal then follow him." There is one Lord and only one, and in like manner there is one faith. Faith rests upon belief, and belief rests upon evidence.

Men in all ages have had faith in a multitude of gods, in sacrifices, ordinances, self-righteousness, and things almost without number, as efficacious in securing the favor of God, or appeasing his wrath. And yet the Holy Spirit declares by the mouth of Paul, that there is but one saving or acceptable faith, and that is, by inference as clear as the noonday,—faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. And in like form, there is one baptism. It is a well-known fact that amongst the Jews, baptism of Gentile proselytes had become common, and that baptism was one of the ceremonies in the installation of Jewish

priests. And that the baptism of John, had obtained much notoriety, and that these and kindred baptisms were with water. And in view of these well-known facts he says that there is one baptism; and by necessary inference that there is *but* one baptism. But the brother claimed, last evening, that water baptism was not an ordinance of the Jews. If so, what did Jesus mean when he said to John, who forbade him, "suffer it to be so now for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness?" The righteousness of the law was an expression often used by the Master, meaning the requirements of the law, and he evidently meant to say that in order to fulfill the law he must meet its requirements.

ORDAINING PRIESTS UNDER THE LAW.

There were three distinct things to be done in ordaining a priest under the law, viz. : Baptism or washing, unction or anointing, and sacrifice.

Jesus was baptized by John, a prophet of the law. He received the unction in the descent of the Holy Spirit as he came up out of the water, and his body upon the cross, was the sacrifice; and thus ordained, he became the fulfillment and end of the law.

The scriptural testimony adduced, clearly shows that Christ's baptism was that of the Holy Ghost. And if Christ's baptism was with the Holy Ghost, and there is but one baptism

recognized as part and parcel of the gospel dispensation, as the apostle clearly declares, then it must follow that water-baptism is not that *one* baptism, and has no more part in the dispensation of the gospel than the gods of the Pagan, and the faiths of Idolatry.

I discover no such extenuating circumstances connected with this trinity of utterances by the apostle, as my apponent would fain have you believe.

FURTHER SCRIPTURE PROOF.

It would be competent to rest the vindication of this second clause of the proposition on this one argument alone; but the same conclusion is reached by many other lines of argument, all conveying the same conclusion.

Peter testifies in his first General Epistle, 3-21 : "The like figure, whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

The saving baptism to which the apostle refers is clearly not outward, but inward, in the heart, spiritual.

Paul puts a question to the Romans, 6-3, thus: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?"

And this, coupled with the utterance of the same apostle to the *Galatians* 3-27, (already quoted): "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," These can only be understood to apply to the baptism of the Holy Ghost; if otherwise, if these and a multitude of other passages of Holy Scripture refer to water baptism as an essential or important part of Christ's gospel, then is water baptism necessary to salvation, and all freedom of judgment is at an end with regard to it; but perfect freedom to choose or let alone, was the burden of the first half of the argument to which we listened last evening.

BAPTIZE IN THE COMMISSION.

It was also argued, that when Christ gave his disciples the charge to baptize those who believe, into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, that he must have meant water baptism, because man could not baptize with the Holy Ghost. In the figurative language of the East, man is often said to do, what he is simply instrumental in effecting.

Witness, James 5. 19-20. "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins."

No man can convert a sinner, save a soul, or hide sins any more than he can baptize with the Holy Ghost. Paul says, 1 Cor. 9-22, "I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means *save* some." But Paul was not the Savior.

The disciples could not disciple the world, but could be humble instruments in God's hand for the accomplishment of that work; and this is the evident meaning. The gospel truths were to be set before the people, so that by believing and repentance, the blood of cleansing might wash away their sins, and purify the heart and make it fit for the indwelling of the Spirit.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

The brother, whose argument I am reviewing, claimed that water baptism was a part of the dispensation of Christ, upon the ground that John's baptism was an integral part of that dispensation; claiming that the prophets of the Mosaic dispensation ended with John's advent; and quoting Matt. 11-13, "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John" as proof of his claim. The evident meaning of this Scripture is, that all the prophets and the law prophesied until John prophesied, or in other words, that the earlier prophets foretold of Christ's coming, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and that John prophesied of his personality

and mission as he was moved by the Holy Ghost. That John was a Jew and a prophet of the law is clearly set forth by Christ himself. Matt. 11-9. "But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet." More than any of the prophets, because he pointed out Christ to the people, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," Also Matt. 11-11. "He that is least in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." That is, the humblest of Christ's servants or apostles is greater than the baptist, as being a minister of a superior dispensation, and more enlightened in the mysteries of Divine truth. But to leave no doubt as to the place that John occupied, the Master further testifies, (Matt. 11-14,) "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come." Here reference is, evidently, made to the closing prophecy of the Old Testament, as found in the last two verses of the book of Malachi, especially the 5th verse, viz: "Behold, I will send you Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." Our Lord here unquestionably declares that John was the prophet predicted by Malachi, under the name of Elias (or Elijah) as coming in the Spirit and power of that prophet. So that John's place amongst the prophets of the law is clearly and definitely established by the testimony of

the Sacred Scriptures, chiefly by the express words of Jesus Himself.

I trust the brother will call a halt in his career of dogmatisms, lest unhappily he be found fighting against God.

John the baptist thus stands as the last of the prophets of the law, and as such, the forerunner of Christ, who is declared to be the end of the law ; the fulfillment of the law ; he to whom all the ceremonies of the law pointed, and in whom they were all fulfilled. In like manner, the law is said to be our schoolmaster (or pedagogue) to bring us to Christ. If Christ's dispensation commenced with John's baptism, then it should read, the law is our schoolmaster to bring us to John.

I cannot conceive that any fair-minded investigator of the truth can hesitate in the acceptance of the conclusion thus reached, that John and his baptism belonged to the old dispensation and not to the new.

CHRIST'S DISPENSATION.

But we are not left to this line of statement and argument alone, but are clearly taught, that Christ's dispensation was not fully inaugurated and established until that memorable occasion, when, without the gates of Jerusalem, our blessed Savior was suffering the physical torment of death on the cross, and the spiritual torment

caused by the sins of the world which he bore in his body on the cross, producing such a sense of condemnation that he cried out in agony of Spirit, "My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?" When as he drank the dregs of that cup of suffering which purchased redemption for you and me, He cried out, "IT IS FINISHED."

Then, and then only, was the law fulfilled. Then was the Paschal Lamb slain. Then was the sin offering made once for all. Then was the blood of sprinkling shed. Then was the dispensation of the Gospel of Christ fully inaugurated, fully established.

EXPEDIENT THAT I GO AWAY.

When Christ told his disciples that it is expedient for you that I go away, it must have been an utterance hard for them to understand, What! expedient for them, that their Lord and Master should go away, after he had been with them for three years going up and down in the land, teaching as never man taught, healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, opening the blind eyes, unstopping deaf ears, raising the dead, arresting, controlling or overturning the laws of nature, saying to the wild winds and mad waves, "peace be still," and they obeyed. Thus proving to them that he was Lord of all; that he was the Christ, and that without him was not any-

thing made that was made. It must have been an astounding revelation to those disciples who had left all to follow him, who had risked every thing—home, friends, consideration of men, position, prospects of worldly happiness, in their devotion to him, and then to be told that it was expedient for them that he go away ; expedient for them that they should be deserted by their Lord and King. The announcement must have filled them with profound sorrow.

And doubtless the reply of Peter to the question, ‘‘Will ye also go away ?’’ when he said, ‘‘To whom shall we go ? for thou hast the words of eternal life,’’ must have been in their minds as they thought of being deprived of the teaching of their blessed Master, at whose feet they loved to sit and hear his gracious words. It was expedient that he die upon the cross, for so it had been decreed in the counsels of the Infinite.

It was expedient that he finish the work he came to perform. It was expedient for them as it was for you and me, that his atonement should be made complete, that the sin Offering provided by infinite Wisdom, and infinite Mercy, should be offered once for all. By which God’s righteous law might be vindicated, and yet repentant sinners justified. Otherwise, the salvation of the disciples would not be possible, otherwise, the faithful of the ages before Christ

would be lost. Otherwise, those who should believe on the name of Jesus through the ages to come, would not find redemption by his blood.

Expedient that he go away that the dispensation of grace might be sealed with his blood, and that he might send the Holy Ghost, the Comforter who shall abide with the redeemed forever.

THIRD CLAUSE.

The third clause of the proposition declares that we believe the true communion is a spiritual partaking of the body and blood of Christ, by faith.

If the outward or material supper was instituted and ordained by Jesus Christ, we must find an account of that ordering in the account given in the gospels of the last supper of which he partook with his disciples. We read Matt. 26-26 to 28: And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and break it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body; and he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Mark 14-22 to 24, same as above except this, *They all drank of it.*

Luke 22-19, 20: And he took bread and gave thanks, and break it, and gave unto them

saying, This is my body which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also, the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

In 1st Cor. 11-24, 25: Paul speaks of the same passover supper in nearly the same language, but adds, "This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me." Be it remembered that there were sayings and doings at a regular Jewish feast. He was eating the passover with his disciples, and thus fulfilling all righteousness; and while it was one of the ceremonial observances of the law, it was no less the evening meal, and Jesus took this opportunity to impress his disciples with his true character, which they were slow to learn, as man has ever been slow to learn lessons of spiritual truth, and he says to them that this bread and wine of the passover is, typically, his own body and blood, and had been the types thereof since its first introduction on that memorable night before the children of Isreal left Egypt. That these were the types of his body and blood about to be offered on the cross as the consummation of the New Testament—as the ushering in of the new dispensation. How unlike the supper as administered by the church to-day. But let it be remembered that the passover was one of the ordinances of the law

which he took away, "Nailing it to his cross."

In understanding the scripture we must ever remember that the language of eastern nations is and has been largely figurative. Every figure of speech known to the Rhetorician finds abundant exemplification in the Bible.

If you take the utterances of this book literally, you will find it full of contradictions, unworthy of confidence, and much of it impossible of belief. In the teaching of Jesus we find many figures. At this last supper he blesses and breaks, and hands forth, as was his custom when eating with his disciples.

As he did when he fed the multitude in desert places, and as they partook of this natural food for the nourishment of their bodies, he used the figure to teach them, that, like as this natural food eaten, by digestion and assimilation, would nourish, strengthen and develop their bodies, so the spiritual partaking of his meritorious sacrifice, properly applied to the soul, would nourish, strengthen and develop the spiritual being, and impart to it his own life and nature.

This becomes more evidently his teaching when we consider his sayings as recorded by John 6-54: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.

"But many of his disciples said 'it is a hard

saying; who can hear it?" He explains to them in the 63rd verse, thus: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Which most clearly proves that the entire utterance, as it pertains to eating his flesh and drinking his blood, is a spiritual partaking for the purpose of nourishing the spirit; and by legitimate inference his disciples were enjoined, that as oft as they celebrated the feast of the passover to celebrate it in remembrance of him.

Nay more; we may properly infer that he intended to say to them, and to us, as often as ye break bread and drink wine for the sustenance of your bodies, let it be done in remembrance of my broken body and shed blood, by the partaking of which your souls may be nourished up to everlasting life.

We find the true communion promised, John 13-23: "If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." And again, Rev. 3-20: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." Gracious, loving promise of our loving Lord.

Friends have ever held and believed the doctrine of baptism and the supper, but they accept

that baptism which cleanses the soul from the guilt and malady of sin, and that supper of the soul which consists in spiritual communion with the great head of the church. If any one is cleansed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost and made whiter than snow, so as to reflect the image of the Master, he cannot be benefitted by the baptism with water. If he is not thus cleansed by the Holy Ghost, water baptism will be a mockery and result in a delusion. So that taking either horn of the dilemma, he will either receive no benefit or he will be deluded.

And in like manner, if any one enjoys the spiritual communion, he is complete in Christ, and does not need the outward. If he does not enjoy the spiritual, the outward is mockery, and he eats and drinks to his own condemnation. Hence he does *not* need the outward, or is condemned by partaking.

In Gurney's Observation, page 68, I find the following terse utterance: "It is the belief of Friends that we have been led out of the practice of the rites of baptism and the supper by the Spirit of truth. That we could not return to them without grieving our heavenly Monitor, and that in fact they are not in accordance with the entire spirituality of the gospel dispensation." They are similiar to those other Jewish rites of which the apostle wrote, thus—Acts 21-25: "As

touching the Gentiles, which believe we have written and concluded that they observe no such things,"—"For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burdens than these necessary things." Acts 15-28.

FOURTH CLAUSE.

The fourth clause of the proposition declares that no one should be received, acknowledged, or retained in the position of minister or elder among us, who continues to participate in, or advocate the necessity of the outward rite of baptism or the supper. This clause does not propose to regard what is past as an offence, for which satisfaction must be made to the church, but it does propose to regard those who persist in erroneous teaching and practice as offenders against the good order of the Society, and thus, not for the purpose of retaliation but protection.

I have already urged the propriety and necessity of the means to secure self-preservation. Those who come from other meetings as well as our own ministers and elders, who would use their sacred office to sow the seeds of discord among brethren, ought to be restrained, for their labor tends to scatter and destroy, and not to build up and perpetuate. And this restraint applied for the good of the body is not persecution, as claimed by the brother, but simply a safeguard and promoter of harmony.

No minister or elder has a right to teach doctrines or practice usages that are not sanctioned by the church.

Those who are set over the flock should not take such a course as to scatter the sheep, or estrange them one from another, and those who have not sufficient restraining grace, should be restrained by authority of the church, and when thus restrained for the good of the body, they are not persecuted. No one has a right to do as he pleases, unless he pleases to do right. The Spirit declares by the mouth of the wise King, Prov. 6-19: "That he that soweth discord among brethren, doth the Lord hate." And he whom the Lord hates ought to be restrained.

CHARGE OF HYPOCRISY.

Serious objection was made to this clause in the discourse to which we listened last evening, because it would tend to produce hypocrisy, because it did not propose to change the convictions, and desires but only the utterances and practices. That it was not declared wrong to believe in the outward rites of baptism and the supper, but to teach and practice them was made an offence. There was a resolute effort to make us believe that it was hypocritical to believe one thing and teach and practice another thing; and yet the author of this argument, in

his testimony in a recent trial in Canada, under the solemnity of an affirmation, declares that he has been doing this very thing for years; hear him:—“I wish distinctly to disclaim any responsibility of the society to which I belong, for my personal views in this matter with regard to baptism, because it is but just to my own Yearly Meeting, and to others, to say that I don’t believe that they would accept or endorse my views upon this particular thought; so that I want to stand upon my individual basis, and not in any way as a representative; because I don’t preach the views I have spoken; I don’t preach them at all, it was only in a matter of personal converse.” He now claims that this proposition offers a premium on hypocrisy, because it allows a man to believe a doctrine, and yet declares he shall not teach or practice it; and yet only a few months ago he declared over in Canada, that he had been doing that very thing for years. The conclusion is so obvious that I refrain from the utterance of it. Suppression is not dishonesty. If a man will believe what he ought not, and can be restrained from uttering it, then the restraint is good for others, and he is prevented from doing mischief, which would otherwise be done, and he is thus, less harmful than if unrestrained.

CLASS LEGISLATION.

It was further urged that this clause was objectionable, because it applied only to ministers and elders; allowing unlimited liberty to others, and on that account it was denounced as class legislation; and the impression sought to be established that it was wrong, because applied only to a class. I fully admit that it is class legislation, but is not wrong on that account. If it should require what is wrong of the class to which it refers, then it might be denounced, but not otherwise. Everything in the organic law of our society, which refers to ministers and elders; the recognition of their gifts; the organization of the select meeting, &c., &c., is class legislation, but not wrong.

We have another instance of class legislation, and that forbids to ministers and elders the luxury of using tobacco, while it does not forbid said luxury to other members, and yet, while this is purely class legislation, I have not learned that our ministers and elders feel especially aggrieved on account of that restraint. Even if a minister believes that tobacco would do him good, the law has no exceptions on account of belief; the decree is inexorable, he must submit, and nearly all the people say Amen! And do not regard him a hypocrite, either.

MINISTERS AND ELDERS TO BLAME.

This is class legislation because the class referred to are the offenders, who are introducing erroneous doctrines and practices, and thereby sowing the seeds of discord among brethren, and hence need restraint.

It is a fact now as formerly, that the leaders of the people cause them to err. The present attitude of the membership of Ohio Yearly Meeting, divided into factions upon the question of the ordinances, is the work of our ministers and elders ; and the members of our select body who have precipitated this condition of things upon us, are responsible to God and man for the consequences which may result. It is the dictate of self-preservation, and not a desire to persecute or retaliate that prompts the church to attempt to stay this reckless tide of innovation and overthrow, and restore that harmony of action and oneness of purpose, that ought, at all times, to characterize those who profess to be followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. Not only have our ministers and elders produced the present unhappy division of sentiment and distrust—both at home and abroad, but they have it in their power *to-day*, if they would, to heal the wounds they have inflicted, to restore the harmony they have destroyed, to cement the

bonds of fraternal union, which they have well nigh sundered. Will not a sense of duty to the church and to God, move them to set about restoring the breach, binding up the wounds, strengthening the bonds, and restoring harmony, so that our church may be,—to the hosts of Satan,—terrible as an army with banners.

ALL ARE FREE TO CHOOSE.

The fore part of the address to which we listened last evening, was a vigorous plea for perfect freedom to all the membership upon the subject of the ordinances.

Paul was quoted where he speaks on another subject: "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." And the brother labored to prove that every one should believe as he would, and act as he desires upon these subjects; and neither his belief nor his act should effect his standing in the church. He called attention to the fact that we have no law against the ordinances. Why does not our discipline forbid these outward rites? Simply because these were neither believed in, nor taught, nor practiced by friends of recognized standing; and it was clearly understood—both in and out of the society, that these rites were no part of Quakerism. But the claim was made that the early writers of the church advocated perfect freedom—both in belief and practice, on these

subjects. Here were scores of fathers and mothers in the church who had read and re-read the early writers, and had never found them advocating any such thing.

How is it that the brother finds confirmation of his new theory, when others, equally capable of understanding an author, and equally careful in their reading, and equally anxious to obtain the truth, have never found such things, but just the opposite. He quotes from these writers just what suits him, taking a part of a statement, which by itself seems to sanction his views, when the entire statement, which the author evidently intended should go together, would mean a very different thing.

In plain English: He proves his propositions by garbled quotations, and thereby seeks to make those writers say what they did not say, and teach what they never intended to teach. Allow me to introduce two specimens, a part of each of which he quotes to prove that these writers confirmed his theory of perfect freedom.

FIRST, FROM JOHN CROOK.

“We believe there is one baptism necessary unto salvation. Eph. 4-5: Christ, the substance, being come, the shadows flee away; *and yet, wherever any believe they are commanded now by the same spirit that commanded the believers to be baptized in the days past, either for the further-*

ance of the gospel, or trial of their faith, we judge them not, but this obedience is very rare to be found ; and we could heartily desire that all would consider seriously, whether literal sayings, observed only by outward reading, hearing by the ear, or inward impulses upon the heart by the Divine Power, are the motives unto obedience in this kind ; and if honesty and uprightness of heart may be heard, we believe and know the many dead souls everywhere, notwithstanding their baptisms will be so many witnesses against them by their groveling upon the earth, as so many slain and killed men by the letter, while the Spirit's quickenings have not been in the true baptism into death, for we find by daily experience that most men and women live like Pharaoh's lean kine, only to eat up the fat, and to envy those who are not so lean-souled as themselves."

And again I quote from Robert Barclay the conclusion of his argument on the thirteenth proposition of his Apology :

"If any at this day, from a true tenderness of spirit and with real conscience toward God, did practice this ceremony in the same way, method and manner, as did the primitive Christians recorded in Scripture, I should not doubt to affirm but that they might be indulged in it, and the Lord might regard them, and for a season appear to them, in the use of these things, as

many of us have known him to do to us in the time of our ignorance, providing always they did not seek to obtrude them upon others, nor judge such as found themselves delivered from them, or that they do not pertinaciously adhere to them. For we certainly know that the day is dawned in which God hath arisen and hath dismissed all these ceremonies and rites, and is only to be worshipped in Spirit, and that he appears to them who wait upon him, and that to seek God in these things is, with Mary at the sepulchre, to seek the living among the dead. For we know that he is arisen and revealed in Spirit, leading his children out of these rudiments that they may walk with him in his light."

I believe I have italicized just what the brother quoted, and am willing to leave it to any fair mind if he has done justice to the authors he quotes. The only way a writer can be made to say what he does not say, is by *unfair, dishonest* quotations; and while I would like to shield the brother's reputation, it becomes my duty to expose his *dishonesty*. He is not so *dull* as not to understand language when he reads it, nor so much of a novice as to be ignorant of the rules of criticism and fairness. By a kindred procedure you may prove, *by Scripture*, any absurd or monstrous proposition you may please to state.

NO RIGHT TO CHOOSE.

After having spent much effort to prove that we all are entitled to perfect freedom of belief and act, as pertains to these ceremonies, then he completely overturns his own structure by claiming that Christ and his apostles introduced and practiced water baptism as an initiatory rite, by which those converted to God should be received into the Church; that it was ordained and established for this express purpose, and that Jesus Christ commands so to use it. Now, if this proposition be true, the freedom of choice is at an end, and the former proposition fails entirely. What Christ commanded to be done as a perpetual ordinance of His Church may not be neglected. So that *both* of these propositions of the brother cannot stand, because they are antagonistic. The first I have shown to be false, by the clear and definite testimony of Friends, past and present; and the second I have shown to be false by the clear and definite testimony of Scripture. Hence, *neither* of them is true.

I have thus gone over the ground covered by the proposition under consideration, and given good and sufficient reasons why it should be adopted by this meeting; and have also dwelt somewhat at length upon the prominent points

of the argument adduced by the brother, and while I have spoken plainly, as is my duty to do, I have not, intentionally, spoken unkindly. I have no unkind feeling in my heart toward any one of those who differ from me upon these questions. *Nay, more:* I could not respect myself if there was room for malice in my heart. While I may and do disapprove and dislike many things which these brothers and sisters believe and do, yet I love you all, and pray that the Lord's choicest blessings may rest upon you all.

EXPLANATION.

The foregoing address was delivered *ex-tempore*, and, in response to numerous solicitations, has been written, as nearly as could be remembered, from five to ten days after its delivery, being somewhat guided by a few brief notes. I have not had access to D. B. U.'s address, except as I listened to its delivery.

ISRAEL P. HOLE.









C 8348.600.15

A discourse delivered in Ohio Yearl

Widener Library

003110940



3 2044 081 824 682