

Communications.

Ordination.

BRO. DUNTON TO BRO. WALLER.

Bro. Waller:

The MESSENGER of June 8th, containing your three-fold argument in favor of ordination by evangelists, is before me.

Your positions are: First, Choosing and ordaining are not the same. 2d. Evangelists are authorized to ordain. 3d. Fasting, prayer and the laying on of hands comprise the manner or mode.

We will notice each of your positions as we proceed. Your first item will be noticed in our direct Scriptural argument. Your main proofs for the authority of evangelists to ordain are contained in two texts. Paul to 1 Tim. v. 22. Lay hands suddenly on no man. Dr. Lee, in his theology art. ministry, sec. 2, page 519, expresses our views on this passage better than we can do it. He says: "This text does not require the laying on of hands as essential for any purpose, but only forbids, it to be done suddenly. And says further, that the text itself, nor the connection in which it stands, does not prove that it has any allusion to the setting apart of persons to the ministry. Now, this is a correct view. Yet you say that this must have reference to ordination. If your views of ordination are correct, it could not refer to it, since in that case, it could not be done suddenly. This Scripture has a general significance, and to give it a specific one, shows upon what slender grounds your proof stands, so far as this text is concerned. Your main reliance seems to rest upon Paul to Titus i. 5: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." The word ordain in this passage signifies to fix, settle, establish, and to set in order, is to reduce to system and method; this was done by the teaching of Titus, and not by the exercise of executive powers. We will refer to this text again, Acts vi. 3, 6, in this example the congregation did the choosing, and you say that the apostles did the ordaining; how do you know that, the record does not say so, one of your elements are missing here. True, they prayed and laid on hands; does ordain and ordained come from words which mean to fast, to pray, to lay on hands by an evangelist. Acts xiii. 1, in this example fasting, prayer, and the laying on of hands were done; but does the record say that it was an act of ordination; was not the sending away the separating act. Acts xiv. 23, in this example the ordaining is one thing, and the prayer with fasting is another. We will revert to this again as we proceed. In our reference to the practice of the inspired founders and advisers of the early churches, we referred to it as peculiar to those who were specially inspired. They laid on hands to impart gifts, and did things which we cannot do, hence it is a great leap of logic to infer from their practice, rules, that other ages should follow. We never said that their teaching was not binding on us, and it is not fair to represent us as saying so. It is also erroneous to deduce from our premises conclusions that make us say that congregations can ordain their officers in any manner they please, and can also make such laws for their own government as they please, and to substitute the word teaching for the word practice which we used, represents us as saying that which we did not say. I do not think that there is a sufficient analogy between baptism and ordination to warrant its introduction into this discussion, but we will not object.

Now, because we will not consent to infer the laying of hands, where it is neither expressed nor implied, and call it ordination, and where fasting, prayer and the laying on of hands are

expressed, and ordination is neither expressed nor implied, because we will not infer ordination, we are told that such lothness on our part is mere subterfuge. And to illustrate us, you say you will try our reasoning and see what it is worth. You then quote four texts of Scripture, each of which contain baptism of command, and in which the word *water* is not mentioned, therefore you make us say that it was Holy Ghost baptism, or fire, or oil, or something else; baptize is an anglicized Greek word, of a uniform meaning, and means to wheel, it has but one meaning; this is not true of ordination, ordain and ordained come from words with different meanings. But let us test Bro. Waller's logic a little. John baptized with water, Matt. iii. 11. John baptized in Jordan, iii. 6. Jesus being the greater, commanded John to baptize him, iii. 15. Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan. John was the administrator, Jesus was the subject, the water was the element. John whelmed him, this was the baptism. Water baptism is one of command, Matt. xxviii. 19, and see Acts viii. 38, 39, in this example: "Both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and Philip whelmed him." Here is the administrator, the subject, the element, and the action of baptism, all complete. Now, therefore, we conclude that all other baptisms of command are just like this one. Now, is this logical? And can Bro. Waller produce as full, clear, and complete an example of ordination, with all his elements present, where the whole are called ordain or ordained. You say that Paul was ordained in Acts xiii. 3; what was done to Saul in Acts ix? Here was valid choosing, here was a man doing evangelical work, here was fasting, Saul was three days without food or drink, Acts ix. 9, here was praying; Acts xxi. 11, for behold he prayeth; and here was the laying on of hands, ix. 17. Now, here are all the elements for a first class ordination according to Bro. Waller's theory. It is true that the word ordination does not occur, and it is also true that Ananias did not come to ordain Saul, but that he might receive his sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. Singular that our brother overlooked this example.

Bro. Waller tells us that he has given us three examples where the manner or mode of ordination is as clearly set forth as language can express it, and that in our long article we never gave one example, but we did, we gave the first example of the ordination of an officer after the ascension of Christ. See Acts i. 15, 26. This example is full, clear and complete, the record is full and unmistakable, both as to the necessity, nature, fact and manner, therefore we conclude that all other ordinations, in principle and manner are like this one. In Acts xiv. 23, the very word ordained means the same thing done in Acts i. 15, 16. Paul to Titus i. 5, we conclude that Titus ordained the same way that Peter did in Acts i. 15, 26, viz: he taught the brethren to do it. Our brother says that he has given us three clear cases, where the mode of ordaining is as clearly set forth as the mode of baptism, or any other command. Then why is it that many of our most learned brethren who have made this matter a special study can't see it as clear as Bro. Waller sees it. Bro. Waller's theory is mainly based upon one text that carries with it grave consequences. The assumption that our modern evangelists are invested with Supreme executive ordination powers is also necessarily, and indissolubly connected with the assumption that they are also invested with Supreme jurisdictional prerogatives. There is no logical escape from these conclusions. We make our appeal to the thoughtful reader, and ask if Titus had full executive ordination powers in those cities in Crete; had he not also full jurisdictional or governmental powers

over those same cities for the setting in order the things that were wanting, was as imperative as was the ordaining of elders. This assumption of Supreme executive and jurisdictional powers, is the very quintessence of clerical domination, and is the substance of Protestant Episcopacy, and is also Methodist Episcopacy. See Dr. Bangs "Original Church," page 140, referring to Timothy and Titus. He says that here was a proper itinerating Episcopacy, clothed with ample powers to superintend the affairs of the church, to set things in order, and to ordain elders in every city, not resembling the restricted jurisdiction of either the Congregational or Presbyterian pastors. Now, our Bro. Waller cannot claim the right of exclusive ordination powers for evangelists, and admit of restricted jurisdictional powers. We have read of ecclesiastical princes who exercised jurisdictional powers over provinces comprising many towns and cities, and of a college of Cardinals, from among whom and by whom a Pope was elected, all of which was the legitimate consequence of clerical assumption, is that system gone to seed, and is complete when the idea of apostolic succession is tacked on, which is always the case. The electric fluid of apostolic virtue that has come down through the dark centuries, through a channel reeking with corruption, licentiousness and blood, made up by an unbroken series of physical contacts by the imposition of hands, in what is called ordination, is not consistent with the Supreme moral government of God, and where there is an aggregation of power, either executive or jurisdictional, in the hands of men, the tendency is always to accumulation, no matter whether they are called evangelists, preachers in charge, presiding elders, bishops or cardinals; the principle is the same always.

Yours respectfully,
S. B. DUNTON.

Divine Origin of Christianity Demonstrated.

BY J. F. AMIS.

NUMBER VI.

I believe I have sufficiently shown in former portions of these papers that the Christian religion cannot be of human invention, but rests upon the sure foundation of divine truth. But in order to make assurance doubly sure I proceed to subjoin three additional marks, which no matter of fact, how true soever, either has had; or can have, except that of Christ, which will establish the truth of the divine origin of Christianity beyond a doubt. As follows:

1. Christ was previously announced for the very period that he appeared by a long train of prophecies running back 4000 years before Christ.
2. Prefigured by types, both of a circumstantial and personal nature, from the earliest ages.
3. That the facts of Christianity are such as to make it impossible for either their relaters or hearers to believe them if false, without supposing a universal deception of the senses of mankind. And first of the prophecies which I beg the skeptic to duly consider. For surely no reasonable mind would condemn Christianity, and risk his future state on such a condemnation until he had thoroughly investigated the main proofs upon which rests the system. The great fact of Christ's coming was previously announced to the Jews in the Old Testament "by all the holy prophets which have been since the world began." Luke i. 70. The first promise upon the subject was made to Adam immediately after the fall, 4000 years B. C. Gen. iii. 15. Compare Col. ii. 15, and Heb. ii. 14. He was again repeatedly promised to Abraham. Gen. xii. 3; xviii. 18; and xxii. 18; Gal. iii. 16; to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. 4; and to Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 14.

Jacob expressly prophesied of him under the appellation of "Savior," or "him that was to come, or to be sent." Gen. xlix. 10. Balam pronounced him "the star of Jacob, and the scepter of Israel." Num. xxiv. 17. Moses spoke of him as one greater than himself." Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19; Acts iii. 22; and Daniel hailed his arrival under the name of "Messiah the Prince," chap. ix. 25. It was foretold that he should be born of a virgin, Isa. vii. 14, in the city of Bethlehem, Micah v. 2; of the seed of Jesse, Ga. xi. 1, 10; that he should lead a life of poverty and suffering, Psalm xxii; inflicted upon him, not for himself, Dan. ix. 26, but for the sins of others, Isa. liii; and after a short confinement in the grave should rise again, Psalm xvi. 10; Acts ii. 27, 31, and xiii. 35, 37; that he "should sit upon the throne of David forever," and be called "the mighty God," Isa. ix. 6, 7; "the Lord our righteousness," Jer. xxxiii. 16; "Immanuel, that is, God with us," Isa. vii. 14; Matt. i. 23; and by David himself, whose son he was according to the flesh, "Lord," Psalm cxi; applied to Christ by himself, Matt. xxii. 44, and by Peter, Acts ii. 34. The time of his incarnation was to be before the scepter should depart from Judah, Gen. xlix. 10; during the continuance of the second temple, Hag. ii. 7, 9, and within seventy weeks, or 490 days, that is, according to the constant of prophecy, 490 years from its erection, Dan. ix. 24.

From these and many other predictions, the coming of Christ was at all times the general expectation of the Jews, and fully matured at the time of his actual advent. All over the east, indeed, it was a general tradition that about that time a King of the Jews would be born, who should govern the whole earth. This prevailed so strongly at Rome a few months before the birth of Augustus, that the senate made a decree to expose all the children born that year; but the execution of it was eluded by a trick of some of the senators, who from the pregnancy of their wives, were led to hope that they might be the fathers of the promised Prince.

In addition to the above general predictions of the coming, life, death, and resurrection of Christ, there are others, which tell more strikingly several particular incidents of the Gospel narrative; instances unparalleled in the whole range of history, and which could have been foreseen by God alone, they were certainly not foreseen by the human agents concerned in their execution, or they would never have contributed to the fulfillment of the prophecies referred even by themselves to the Messiah, and therefore verifying the divine mission of him whom they crucified as an imposter.

Behold how literally many of these predictions were fulfilled. Read Psalm lxxix. 21. "They gave me gall to eat, and vinegar to drink;" and compare Matt. xxvii. 34. "They gave him vinegar mingled with gall." Again it is said, Psalm xxii. 16-18, "They pierced my hands and my feet. They part my garments among them, and cast lots for my vesture;" as if it had been written after, John xix. 23, 24. It is predicted likewise Zech. xii. 10, "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced," and we are told, John xix. 34, that "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side." The soldiers did not tear his coat, because it was without seam, woven from the top throughout; and therefore they cast lots for it. But this was entirely accidental. With the passage in the Psalms, as Romans, they were not likely to be acquainted. The same remark applies to the next instance from Zechariah. And here let it be observed (in reply to those who magnify "the power of chance, the ingenuity of accommodation, and the industry of research," as chiefly supporting the credit of obscure prophecy) that greater plainness would

have enabled wicked men as free agents to prevent its accomplishment, when obviously directed against themselves. The Jews not understanding what Christ meant by his "lifting up," John viii. 28; xii. 32, 33; and not knowing that he had foretold his crucifixion to his apostles, Matt. xx. 19, instead of finally stoning him—the death appointed by their law, Lev. xxiv. 16, for blasphemy, Matt. xxxi. 63; more than once menaced against the Savior, John viii. 59; x. 33; and actually inflicted upon Stephen, Acts xii. 58, for that offence—unconsciously delivered him to the predicted Roman cross. Again the piercing of his side was no part of the Roman sentence, but merely to ascertain his being dead, previously to taking him down from the cross: "that the body might not remain there on the Sabbath day," which commenced that evening a few hours after the crucifixion. From his early giving up the ghost, however, it was not necessary that "a bone of him should be broken," Exod. xii. 46; Num. ix. 12; Psalm xxxix. 20; like those of the two thieves, his fellow-sufferers, John xix. 32, 36. Thus do the prophecies of the Old Testament, without variation, or ambiguity, refer to the person and character of Christ. His own predictions in the New demand a brief notice. Those relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, which specified that it should be "laid even with the ground" and "not one stone be left upon another," Luke ix. 44. "before that generation passed," Matt. xxiv. 35, were fulfilled in a most surprisingly literal manner, the very foundation of the temple being plowed up by Turnus Rufus.

In another remarkable prophecy he announced the many false messiahs that should come after him, and the ruin in which their followers should be involved—Matt. xxvi. 25, 26. That great numbers actually assumed that holy character before the final fall of the city, and led the people into the wilderness to their destruction, we learn from Josephus, Antiq. Jud. xxiii. 12; xx. 6; and B. J. viii. 31. Nay, such was their wretched infatuation, that under this delusion they rejected the offers of Titus who courted them to peace. It will be sufficient barely to mention his foretelling the dispersion of that unhappy people and the triumph of the Gospel over the gates of hell under every possible disadvantage,—himself low and despised, his immediate associates only twelve, and those illiterate and unpolished, and his adversaries the allied powers, prejudices, habits, interests, and appetites of mankind.

So much for our first mark under this head, that of the prophecies announcing the coming of Messiah.

And now as to our second mark under this head, the types and figures of the Bible foreshowing Christ and his church. These types were of a two fold nature, circumstantial and personal. Of those that were circumstantial may be mentioned: The passover, instituted in memory of the great night when the destroying angel, who slew all the first born of Egypt, passed over those houses upon whose door-posts the blood of the paschal lamb was sprinkled and directed to be eaten with what the apostle calls, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." And the annual expiation, in two respects; first as the high priest entered into the holy of holies (representing heaven, Exod. xxv. 40; Heb. ix. 24), with the blood of the sacrifice, whose body was burned without the camp; "wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate," Heb. xiii. 12, and "after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, forever sat down at the right hand of God," Heb. x. 12. And secondly, as all the iniquity of the children of Israel was put upon the head of the scape goat, Lev. xxi. 21. The brazen serpent, by looking up to