

Communications.

A Year in Tasmania.

BY O. A. CARR.

NUMBER II.

Trial for Heresy.

As remarked in former letter, my refusal to sign my name to the five-points aroused suspicion, and my sermon on "My sheep" was followed not by "excellent testimony," but by a call for a church meeting on Thursday night, and I was invited to be present.

A goodly number of the revived ones came, for they were puzzled. In their souls they felt that I had preached the truth which they loved and with it they found no fault, but what lay behind and which was hinted at in my refusal to sign the declaration was forbidding of evil. There was something kept back as they thought.

The charge of preaching "free grace" was made against me and the vote taken as to whether I should be allowed to preach in their meeting house any longer. All but three voted that I might preach there as long as I liked, and voted in a way that made me think they would come to hear. The three opposing were the chief men—officers of the church—and they vowed they would rather give up their lives than countenance "free grace" preaching. With them I did not argue then. They seemed to be true men and I respected them.

It was soon noised abroad that the new preacher at the Baptist church was a heretic and had been shut out. Then every church and public building in the city was guarded against my use, save one. The Odd Fellows hired me their hall. Bro. Smith and I also went upon the wharf. He did the singing and I preached, until the people got to thinking that it was a good kind of heresy, just what they read in their Bibles.

All these three months Mrs. Carr was teaching in Melbourne, and thereby earning money to support me in the work. Bro. Smith and a few others helped pay rent of hall, and we began on Lord's day morning, not by preaching a sermon, on that occasion, but we met for worship, and to remember Jesus, after the primitive manner by breaking the loaf and partaking of the cup. [Allow me here to remark that all through Australia we observe this practice, and I do hope the brethren there will never relinquish it. Would to God it were the custom everywhere, especially in America, as it is in England and her colonies. I am profoundly convinced that the American churches are being crippled by this everlasting preaching on all occasions to the exclusion of mutual edification and comfort.] That was a happy meeting in that hired upper room in Hobart Town, with those faithful few gathered around the emblems of our Lord's broken body and shed blood. The scenes of Gethsemane and of Calvary were reviewed with joyful sorrow, with humble but triumphant hope. Thus rightly started in the worship of God the brethren were happy and of one soul and one mind. The on-lookers wondered why I did not preach, but when they witnessed our order and recognized the primitive simplicity and beauty in it; they asked for no more sermons on such occasions. At once I had the brethren begin to take part in the worship, to announce a hymn, read the scriptures, lead in prayer, and talk to the brethren as best they could. In the evening was the time for preaching and the hall was soon filled. The people came to confess Christ and be baptized. We applied for the use of the baptistry in the Baptist chapel. Before granting our request it was decided that I should be examined on the "design of baptism." Accordingly a meeting was called. A full attendance, especially of those who had from among the

Baptists attended my preaching. A lawyer, a good young brother of the Baptist persuasion, was requested to conduct the examination. His questions were put in such a way that I had only to quote, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."

"Be baptized and wash away your sins," &c., to answer them fully. "Well," said he, "we believe those scriptures, but we want to know what you think of the design of baptism." I replied that it did not matter so far as the truth is concerned what I think. I think, however, just as the Savior and apostles expressed the will of heaven on this subject, and quoted the verses again. Then a brother who had been a leader among them, arose in my defence told of hearing every sermon I had preached and that he found no fault with any of them. He had just heard me on "What must I do to be saved," and he went over it, giving the scripture answer according to the condition of the enquirer, saying, when he quoted a verse, surely brethren you cannot object to this, and this. The vote was taken and all but three said I might use the baptistry whenever I wished, but I did not like to use it under protest of the good men who objected. In the bay near the city, were bath houses, which the city tendered to me. The audience could stand in the porch of a horseshoe and there were steps down into the water. This was delightful and so I did not ask any more favors of the Baptists.

Among those attending the meetings was a man given to drink. His wife had been baptized into Christ, but he boasted that he had not been in a church for 20 years, save on funeral occasions. Some people do seem to take more interest in funerals than in anything else religious, and will attend on such occasions. I have often thought that if I never went to a place of worship except when some died, I would have no heart to go then. But he would come to hear what was going on at the hall. After hearing several times he said, "Well I must either cease to go there or quit drink." His wife urged the latter, and with an eloquence which only she could use entreated him. He tried, and tried and was almost ready to give up. I went to see him. He talked freely and made an open confession of having mistreated his wife and children, and of having spent his own earnings and, as much of his wife's as he could get for drink. I gave him every encouragement to quit it. He finally succeeded in mastering his appetite, came forward, confessed Christ and was baptized. When he began walking uprightly, and had clothed himself anew with the money which otherwise would have gone for drink, his old friends hardly knew him as he walked beside his wife to church, a happy, blessed man. He loved much, because forgiven much. He told me of his wife's long suffering and patience towards him, of his ingratitude but he could not tell the joy he had in being made free from the curse, nor could his wife. I had a peculiar sorrow in parting with this good brother. He wished to give me some memento. He had a silver pen and pencil holder which his father gave him and nothing would satisfy him except my taking that as a keepsake. I have it in my writing desk and the sight of it recalls a train of events which have made me weep for joy, which the heart can feel of genuine friendship but which neither pen nor language can tell.

The higher up men go the more imperative becomes the necessity that they should live on; every high impulse, every feeling of self-esteem, every sense of dignity and worth, in mankind, calls out for immortality. Do you say that calling out for it is not evidence of it?

Our Troubles.

NUMBER XXX.

After presenting many causes of trouble, and prescribing remedies, we wish to close our series as soon as possible. We will therefore direct the attention of your readers to the

CHURCH.

I will not undertake to analyze the church or point out all the causes of trouble observable in the various organizations, with which I have been acquainted in the past. But will allude to a few prominent features, that have caused us trouble.

Martin Luther said, and all Protestants have adopted his motto, that the Bible and the Bible alone was the religion of Protestants. This motto is construed to embrace the law given both to the Patriarch and the Jew, for the long period of four thousand years. To obey all this law would make no human being a Christian. To adopt Luther's motto would make the Old Testament the greater part of the constitution and law of the church. A church or organization has the right to blot out, omit, disregard or fail to observe any clause in its fundamental law. Then suppose the Old Testament the larger part of the constitution of the church of Christ. How many of its ordinances must be disregarded? Every religious party would disregard that part of the Old Testament that does not suit the religion of his fathers, and hold fast to that which, in his estimation, sustains his notions or opinions. Thus much trouble has been and will be introduced into such churches whose preachers or members profess to take the Bible and the Bible only for their rule of faith and practice. How will this cause of trouble be removed? one is ready to ask. I answer, change the motto to that which is true, and say the New Testament is the religion of Christians, and act accordingly, and no trouble can ever come in. There will be no clause in the constitution to be repudiated.

The church was a grace or gift of God to men, designed to be a house or family into which they were to be collected, when he called them out of the world, so they could be separated from sinners, enjoy the society of the good and effectually work for the happiness of each other, the prosperity of the kingdom of heaven and the glory of God. When God gave to men the church or kingdom, he coronated his Son and delivered to him the reigns of government, which he is to hold and sway, until death, the last enemy of man, shall be destroyed. Jesus died, was buried, raised from the dead, ascended, and was crowned Lord of all. In the presence of all heavenly hierarches, his Father and his God proclaims, "Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." "Let all the angels of God worship him." "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of joy, above thy fellows."

Now we see Jesus crowned, and remember the proclamation made by Jehovah when Moses on the sacred mount delivered up his authority saying, "This is my beloved son, hear ye him." With the above decrees and ordinances of the only wise and true God before us, we are compelled to say that the New Testament is the religion, of all Christians. We give full credence, to all that Moses said believing it to be of divine authority, and containing all that was necessary during the Jewish and Patriarchal dispensation but not the law of Christians, nor Christianity. We then will look for trouble to come in, whenever a Christian teaches, that we must obey the law of Moses. Some Christians think, we must have a part of the law of Moses, to enable us to establish all moral principles, but there is no moral precept found in the law of Moses that is not found in the law of Christ. Whatever was moral in

the days of Moses was moral in the days of Christ, and will be throughout all time, and will continue through all eternity.

When we plant a church in the name of Christ, it must be of Christians, who will solemnly pledge themselves to take the New Testament as the constitution and law of said church without any addition of opinions either written or unwritten. We are to have no private interpretations of the New Testament. Peter told us that the prophecy of the Scriptures was of any private interpretations.

The church of Christ has no Pope, no Cardinal, no Elder (who presides over more than one church) no circuit rider, no class leader, no parson Reverend gentleman. But each congregation has its elders and deacons and if she possesses the material she sends out an evangelist. Every member is a priest or priestess, and each offers his sacrifice. They meet on the first day of the week, and serve and worship God and his Christ.

HENRY THOMAS.

Oakville, Aug. 1, 1878.

The Sabbath Question.

WHAT DAY SHALL CHRISTIANS KEEP?
THE SEVENTH OR THE FIRST?

BY F. WALDEN.

[Published in tract form by Central Book Concern, Oskaloosa, Iowa.]

(Continued.)

We have now before us the testimony of the two most eminent church historians of modern times, and find that they most explicitly and unequivocally sustain the position that the religious observance of the Lord's day has come down from the days of the apostles. Here we might let the matter rest and claim a verdict in our favor on the score of historic testimony, believing that the unprejudiced reader will grant what we ask. But in order to render conviction doubly sure, the investigation will be carried back further. Mosheim says that what he states "appears from the united testimony of the most credible writers." Let us go back then, and consult those ancient and "most credible writers" upon whom Mosheim and Neander relied, and see if they will perform the task assigned them. Accordingly we pass back to the days of Eusebius and consult him. He is properly called the father of church history, since he took the lead in this department of literature and furnished us with the first church history. He was born in Palestine as was educated in that country. He flourished in the latter part of the third century and in the beginning of the fourth. His history closes with the year 324. He was a man of great learning, and any one who reads his history will see that he had access to the writings of those who had lived before him, and that he consulted them without stint in his work of preparation. He has been quoted before in these articles, and what is his testimony? It is to the effect that no Christian kept the seventh day except the Ebionite heretics; that they kept both days, but that all others kept the Lord's day, in memory of his resurrection. I have his history now lying before me, and have read it, and consulted it for a number of years, and I aver that he does not give a trace of the Sabbath-keeping except among heretics. He states most emphatically that Christians do not keep the Sabbath but the Lord's day, in commemoration of his resurrection. He is careful to make mention of anything concerning which Christians had at any time disagreed, but not one word does he record that would give the least intimation that any disagreement had ever existed about keeping the first day of the week. And yet J. N. Andrews, in common with Seventh Day Adventists, would have us believe that during the period covered by Eusebius' history, first day observance was slowly fighting its way into rec-

ognition without apostolic precept or example, and only obtained a footing when corruption so prevailed that the authority of Christ and the example of the apostles were disregarded! Let those who can, swallow such a dose. I cannot.

We have now passed from our modern standard church historians back to the first church history, and what is the verdict an honest mind must render according to this testimony?

That verdict must be that Christians should not keep the seventh day, but the first. Sabbatarians have no alternative left but to abandon their position, or assume that these historians were either mistaken or dishonest. To take either of these positions puts them in no very enviable attitude before the public. While these historians need no defense at our hands, yet in order that our argument from history may stand without even the semblance of a flaw in it we propose to verify the statements which have been quoted. Fortunately we have some of the works upon which they based their statements, and can show that they were not mistaken, and did not deal dishonestly with the materials out of which they quarried their histories.

Tertullian was born in the latter half of the second century; was educated at Rome, and after his conversion to Christianity settled in Carthage, in North Africa. He was a man of great learning, and though of a speculative turn of mind, and fanciful in many of his interpretations of Scripture, yet entirely reliable in his statement of facts. When he states what was a custom in his day he is an unexceptional witness. Does he say that Christians kept the first day? These are his words: "The Lord's day is the holy day of the Christian Church. We have nothing to do with the Sabbath. The Lord's day is the Christians' solemnity."

For want of space, other testimonies will be given as briefly as possible as we move back to the days of the apostles. Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 192, says: "A Christian, according to the command of the Gospel, observes the Lord's day, thereby glorifying the resurrection of the Lord."

Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, A. D. 162, says: "Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the Lord's day, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead."

Passing by some other writers of the second century, I want to call special attention to the testimony of Justin Martyr. He was born not later than 103, and not earlier than 98, the precise time cannot be determined. His place of birth was the city of Flavia Neapolis, the ancient Sichem in Samaria. He was a man of great learning, and a very candid Christian. He traveled extensively and finally settled in Rome, where he became a Christian teacher and paid for his fidelity to Christ by suffering martyrdom in the year 165. No man of that day and age was better prepared to state what customs prevailed among Christians.

On account of a severe persecution having been stirred up in Rome against the Christians, Justin was aroused to offer an apology for them. This he addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, to his adopted son, and to the senate and people of Rome, and it could not, according to Neander, have been written later than the year 139. He is careful to state the practices of Christians both in the towns and in the country. Neander says that this apology, as well as the second, written sometime after, is the undoubted production of Justin. In this all scholars are agreed. The following is his testimony concerning the religious observance of the first day of the week: "On the day called Sunday, all Christians that live either in towns or in the country meet together, and the memoirs of the apostles, or the writ-